



Program Name: Psychology

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

Reporting cycle of Fall 2017 – Spring 2018

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: *2017-2018*

Submission Date: *October 27, 2018*

Note: This report updates data for PILOs # 2 and 4 (including NSSE data for the current cycle), as well as Enrollment of Applied and Scientific Psychology Camp.

Program Intended Learning Outcomes (PILO)	Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results
<p><i>Outcome #1</i> <i>Students will evidence a satisfactory level of knowledge of key theories, findings, and methods across a broad range of the primary subdisciplines in psychology.</i></p>	<p>ETS Major Field Test (MFT) in psychology</p> <p>Total score, four subscale scores, and six assessment indicators (11 total).</p> <p>See Appendix 1 for specific results from 2005-2011, 2014, and 2016.</p> <p>We aim to have the trend in our mean scores at or above the comparative mean in all areas of the MFT.</p>	<p>No data are included in this assessment cycle.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><i>Outcome #2</i> <i>Students will demonstrate familiarity with the ethical guidelines and procedures involved in developing, performing, and reporting psychological research.</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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 <i>novel problem</i>. Thus, the exam involves general knowledge and transfer of training.</p>	<p>Because a new rubric was used for the first time for both measures in this PILO, no comparison with prior data is done at this time. It is obvious, though, that across rubric elements the vast majority of students are meeting or exceeding expectations both in the Quizzes and in the Final Exam.</p>	<p>The instructor's discussion of rubric elements with students seems to be effective. No significant change in teaching is warranted at this time, but rubric adjustment may be needed if scores in some rubric elements continue to reach ceiling level in the future.</p>

<p><i>NSSE Engagement Indicator: Students will exercise Quantitative Reasoning (QR) as a characteristic feature of the MU Psychology Program.</i></p> <p><i>Construct: Students will reach conclusions based on their own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)</i></p>	<p>See Appendix 1 for details.</p> <p>We aim to have 66% of scores at or above the “Meets Expectations” level.</p> <p>NSSE Survey Criteria <u>QR</u>, – FY and SY Mean Scores will be \geq those for CCCU.</p> <p><u>QR (6a)</u> –More than 45% of SY will respond positively to reaching conclusions based on their own analysis.</p>	<p>Note: Scores in boldface print do not meet set criteria. FY Mean Score of 26.6 is $>$ that of CCCU, which is at 24.6, but SY Mean Score of 25.4 is $<$ that of CCCU, which is at 26.4.</p> <p>Only 39% of SY responded positively on 6a - reaching conclusions based on own analysis.</p> <p>It is noted that the NSSE FY results corroborate, but the NSSE SY results qualify the optimism stemming from the internal PILO #2 measures based on a new rubric.</p>	<p>To promote growth in the SY majors' self-perceived QR, PSYC 140 and the Research Methods course sequence will more strongly emphasize how to <i>deliberately</i> collect, summarize/plot, and use quantitative data to reach conclusions. In addition, across the psychology curriculum, all instructors are advised to <i>purposefully</i> and <i>consciously</i> engage students in steps toward data-informed conclusions (in addition to rational, opinion-based ones).</p>
<p><i>Outcome #3 Students will demonstrate a satisfactory ability to comprehend, synthesize, and critique psychological knowledge presented in primary journal articles</i></p>	<p>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</p>	<p>No data are included in this assessment cycle.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p><i>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.</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>See Appendix 1 for details; for earlier results, please refer to earlier reports and respective tables.</p> <p>We aim to have 66% of scores at or above “Meets Expectations” level in PSYC 480. PSYC 272 embedded assessment is formative.</p>		
<p><i>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</i></p>	<p>Paper on Christianity-PSYC relationship; scored with a rubric</p> <p>See Appendix 1 for details.</p> <p>We aim to have 66% of scores at or above “Meets Expectations” level.</p>	<p>No significant change in the data was noted relative to the last cycle when this PILO was assessed – see note below Table for PILO #4.</p>	<p>No significant change in teaching is warranted at this time.</p>

<p><i>their own personal philosophy of integration.</i></p> <p><u>NSSE Engagement</u> <u>Indicator: Students will exercise Reflective and Integrative Learning (RIL) as a characteristic feature of the MU Psychology Program.</u></p> <p><i>Construct: Students will examine the strengths and weaknesses of their own views on a topic or issue</i></p>	<p>NSSE Survey Criteria <u>RIL</u> - Mean score of SY will be > 44% and > that of CCCU.</p> <p><u>RIL (2d)</u> – SY % score > that for FY by about 5-10% points on the examination of strengths and weaknesses of own views on issues.</p>	<p>NSSE RIL data are mixed relative to the set criteria: SY Mean Score on RIL at 39.9 is < criteria of 44%, but is > that of CCCU, which is at 39.0%</p> <p>SY % score of 72 is > that of FY (69%) by 3% points on examination of strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<p>Mixed NSSE data relative to the set criteria suggest that not much change in teaching is warranted at this time. As additional data are collected in the future, the Psychology instructors will review how to best improve SY majors' <i>conscious</i> self-examination of their views.</p>
<p><i>Outcome #5</i> <i>Students will evidence reflection upon their reasons for studying psychology, their short-and long-term educational and career goals, and their intellectual, personal, and interpersonal strengths and weaknesses. They will also evidence the ability to reflect back on their undergraduate careers and</i></p>	<p>Seniors write a reflection paper 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).</p> <p>Scored with a rubric by both instructors. Rating discrepancies are resolved through discussion.</p> <p>See Appendix 1 for details.</p> <p>We aim to have 66% of scores at or above “Meets Expectations” level.</p>	<p>No data are included in this assessment cycle.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p><i>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.</i></p>			
---	--	--	--

Summer Camp Assessment

Program Intended Learning Outcome (PILO)	Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results
<p>Overall expectation of Psych Campers being met</p>	<p>Item from general PR survey ("Did camp meet your expectations?")</p> <p>We aim to have 3/4 (75%) of campers saying "Yes" to this survey item.</p>		
<p>Enrollment in the Psych Camp</p>	<p>Head count of campers in the Psych Camp; % of MU campers who enroll for a program at MU.</p> <p>We aim to reach a minimal head count of 12, which is set by the University Relations Dept. as the</p>		

	<p>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%</p>		
Camp Program	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		

Appendix 1

**Annual Assessment Report, PSYC 2017-18 Cycle (and Some Previous Ones)
Assessment Data**

PILO #1: ETS Major Field Test in Psychology (2012, 2013, 2015, 2017 were skipped)
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 to take the MFT on-line in 2005.

		Overall Scale Score		Learning & Cognition	Percept/Comp/ Eth/Sens/Physio	Abnormal & Personality	Developmental & Social
2016 N=17	M SD	153 11		54 13	59 12	53 11	50 11
2014 N=14	M SD	158 11		56 16	62 12	60 12	57 12
2011 N=12	M SD	160 15		59 14	60 15	57 15	64 15
2010 N=13	M SD	156 11		60 14	58 14	60 15	55 13
2009 N=19	M SD	154 15		55 17	53 16	56 14	56 16
2008 N=10	M SD	151 11		54 13	50 10	52 14	53 11
2007 N=19	M SD	154 13		48 12	54 16	59 12	57 13
2006 N=8	M SD	158 11		58 15	56 16	60 12	60 10
2005 N=7	M SD	156 11		58 17	58 16	55 17	57 9
National Data 2016	M SD	155.6 9.6		55.7 9.4	55.5 8.5	55.8 7.9	55.5 8.8

National Data 9/14 to 6/15	M SD	156.2 9.3		56 9.1	55.9 8.4	56.1 7.6	56.3 8.6
National Data 2/05 to 6/11	M SD	156 14.9		56 15	56.9 15.4	55.9 14.3	56.0 14.7
National Data 2/05 to 12/06	M SD	156 9		56 8	57 8	56 7	56 8

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	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
Memory & Thinking	47	45	41	43	49	55	52	48	44	^a 48 ^b 49 ^c 44 ^d 46.1 ^e 45.5
Sensory & Physio	40	40	37	30	36	40	55	61	58	^a 38 ^b 39 ^c 49 ^d 53.8 ^e 53.3
Developmental	52	52	48	43	45	47	67	59	47	^a 46 ^b 47 ^c 52 ^d 49.6 ^e 48.9
Clin. & Abnormal	64	73	70	64	67	71	64	74	69	^a 66 ^b 66 ^c 59 ^d 70.1 ^e 69.8
Social	59	65	63	58	63	61	68	58	52	^a 61 ^b 62 ^c 57 ^d 63.8 ^e 62.8
Meas. & Method.	52	49	48	50	48	48	52	52	51	^a 53 ^b 53 ^c 54 ^d 55.2 ^e 54.5

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 2018 (N=6)	3.34 (.82)	3	2	1	0	83.33%
Ethical Considerations 2018 (N=6)	3.67 (.52)	4	2	0	0	100%
Design and Procedures 2018 (N=6)	3.17 (.75)	2	3	1	0	83.33%
Clarity and Coherence 2018 (N=6)	3.34 (.82)	3	2	1	0	83.33%

* A new rubric was pilot tested in 2017. The first year for its implementation was 2018.

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 2018 (N=6)	3.83 (.41)	5	1	0	0	100%
Ethical Considerations 2018 (N=6)	3.50 (.84)	4	1	1	0	83.33%
Design and Procedures 2018 (N=6)	3.67 (.52)	4	2	0	0	100%
Clarity and Coherence 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.

PILO #3

SumCrit Paper #1 (PSYC 272)*

Fall 2016, 2015

Note. 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 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 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 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 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 2016, 2015, 2014

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 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 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 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=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 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 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 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 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)	% ≥ 3 Meets Expectations
1. Reflection on reasons for studying psychology						
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 education & career goals						
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 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 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 <i>(a set of statements to propose a research project, given the context of a completely novel problem)</i>		<i>The student demonstrates superior understanding of research through description of a research problem, goal, and at least one hypothesis.</i>	<i>The student demonstrates basic understanding of research through description of a research problem, along with one goal, or one hypothesis.</i>	<i>The student demonstrates rudimentary understanding of research through description of a research problem, but fails to accurately identify an associated goal and/or hypothesis.</i>	<i>The student fails to demonstrate understanding of research through description of a research problem, goal, and/or hypothesis.</i>
Ethical Considerations		<i>The student demonstrates superior understanding of research ethics by identifying two risks and two safeguards in a</i>	<i>The student demonstrates basic understanding of research ethics by identifying one risk and one safeguard; or two risks but no</i>	<i>The student demonstrates rudimentary understanding of research ethics by identifying either one risk, or one safeguard in a</i>	<i>The student fails to demonstrate rudimentary understanding of research ethics through description of a risk or safeguard in a novel</i>

		<i>novel research problem.</i>	<i>safeguards; or two safeguards but no risks in a novel research problem.</i>	<i>novel research problem.</i>	<i>research problem.</i>
Design and Procedures		<i>The student demonstrates superior understanding of research design and methods by naming a study/design type and exploring its application (with sampling and procedures) to a novel research problem.</i>	<i>The student demonstrates basic understanding of research design and methods by naming a study/design type and describing its application (with procedures) to a novel research problem.</i>	<i>The student demonstrates rudimentary understanding of research design and methods by describing the application of a design (with at least one procedure or sampling technique) to a novel research problem. The name of the study/design type might be missing.</i>	<i>The student fails to demonstrate rudimentary understanding of research design and methods through description of a study type/design.</i>
Clarity and Coherence		<i>The student demonstrates superior clarity and coherence in communication about a novel research problem. Ideas flow very well;</i>	<i>The student demonstrates basic clarity and coherence in communication about a novel research problem. Ideas flow well; writing is</i>	<i>The student demonstrates rudimentary clarity and coherence in communication about a novel research problem. Ideas do not</i>	<i>The student fails to demonstrate rudimentary clarity and coherence in communication about a novel research problem. Ideas do not flow</i>

		<i>writing is very clear and nearly free of grammatical errors and misspellings.</i>	<i>generally clear, but there may be up to four grammatical errors and/or misspellings.</i>	<i>necessarily flow well; writing is not necessarily clear, and there may be several grammatical errors and/or misspellings.</i>	<i>well; writing is not clear and there are several/many grammatical errors and/or misspellings.</i>
--	--	--	---	--	--

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

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

				does <i>not</i> follow the current APA style (title page, headings – if used, citations, references, etc.) <i>for the most part.</i>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

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 <i>explores</i> their own metaphysical assumptions <i>thoroughly</i> .	Student demonstrates basic awareness of how worldviews shape the way one conceives of epistemology, cosmology, and philosophical anthropology, and <i>identifies several</i> 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 Integration		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		<p>Addresses TWO or more different reasons.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Provides a <u>thorough</u> explanation of continuity and/or change over time, including TWO or more specific influences.</p>	<p>Addresses TWO or more different reasons.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Provides an <u>explanation</u> of continuity and/or change, including at least ONE reference to a specific influence.</p>	<p>Addresses only ONE reason.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Provides only <u>minimal</u> explanation of continuity and/or change WITHOUT reference to a specific influence.</p>	<p>Addresses only ONE reason.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Merely lists reasons without explaining continuity or change over time.</p>
Reflection on Educational and Career Goals		<p>Addresses several specific goals, including at least one clear goal for the future (or provides a compelling rationale for being uncertain at this time).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Provides a <u>thorough</u> explanation of continuity and/or change over time, including TWO or more specific influences.</p>	<p>Addresses several specific goals, including at least one clear goal for the future (or provides a compelling rationale for being uncertain at this time).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Provides an <u>explanation</u> of continuity and/or change, including at least ONE reference to a specific influence.</p>	<p>Addresses only a few goals or several vague goals.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Provides only <u>minimal</u> explanation of continuity and/or change WITHOUT reference to a specific influence.</p>	<p>Addresses only a few goals.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Merely lists goals without explaining continuity or change over time.</p>
Reflection on Personal, Interpersonal, and Intellectual Strengths and Weaknesses		<p>Addresses all 3 types of traits as well as both strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Provides a <u>thorough</u> explanation of continuity and/or change over</p>	<p>Addresses two types as well as both strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Provides an <u>explanation</u> of continuity and/or change, including at least ONE reference to a specific influence.</p>	<p>Addresses only one type.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Provides only <u>minimal</u> explanation of continuity and/or change WITHOUT reference to a specific influence.</p>	<p>Addresses only one type.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Merely lists traits without explaining continuity or change over time.</p>

		time, including TWO or more specific influences.			
Reflection on Connections Between Faith, Learning, and Living		<p>TWO or more especially specific and/or compelling connections to connections between faith and learning/living.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Successfully weaves faith issues into a coherent narrative throughout the essay.</p>	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.