



Program Name: Psychology

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

Date/Cycle of Assessment:

Reporting cycle of Fall 2015 – Spring 2016

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: *2015-2016*
Submission Date: *September 23, 2016*

Note: All SLOAP data but #1 are reported. The Psychology Program will strategically select and rotate SLOAP data in future reports.

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.</p>	<p>Departmental data and national comparative data have been gathered since 1998. As of fall 2014, the Psychology Department decided to administer the MFT every other year.</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 were collected for the 2015-2016 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 (formerly, PSYC 373) 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>We aim to have 66% of scores at or above the "Meets Expectations" level.</p> <p>Data were collected in PSYC 273 in the spring of 2016. As in the last cycle, this year's Quiz data show a high percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations across all items of SLOAP #2 (from 68.75% to 100%). Final Exam data show a noteworthy improvement under the rating element (RE) #4, knowledge of research ethics ("states level of review required," from 50% in the last year to 100% this year), but RE #5, description of research methods ("sampling techniques") still fell slightly below the desired performance level, despite a growth</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The instructional changes in lecture and resource materials on ethics and participant sampling seem to be paying dividends, especially on the former. - Instructors will confer to identify ways in which they can help students to better propose data analysis strategies in novel research projects. - As indicated in a previous report,

	See Appendix 1 for details.	<p>trend relative to last year. RE #6, proposal for data analysis, dropped significantly from last year's performance level (43.75% this year from 93.75% last year), whereas all other REs had a high percentage of students rated at or above expected levels in the 2015-16 assessment cycle.</p> <p>It should be noted that SLOAP #2 measures have not yet been scored on a rubric following the standard adopted by the department, rendering interpretation relative to other SLOAPS impossible. Additionally, instructors of PSYC 273 note that the Final Exam assesses the transfer of research methods knowledge to a completely new research problem, which is more difficult than knowledge about research methods within the context of students' own PSYC273 research project, as done in quizzes.</p>	<p>persistently high target % rates across many REs in recent years suggest that a rubric with fewer elements and 4 well-defined levels of performance may help improve rate distribution. Our goal is to have this done by the end of this Fall Semester.</p>
<p><i>Outcome #3</i> <i>Students will demonstrate a satisfactory ability to comprehend, synthesize, and critique psychological knowledge presented in primary journal articles which are judged by the</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 scored with a rubric, and used</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>Data were collected in the fall 2015 (PSYC 272 and 480); this was the first time when both pre- and post-tests used the same standard rubric, which allows for better comparison (with the caveat</p>	<p>- Although it's still early to compare formative and summative data, the present cross-sectional data suggest a general growth trend which affirms the instructional and curricular efforts adopted by the</p>

<p><i>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>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>that still different cohorts are being measured). As expected for students in the formative phase (PSYC 272), a low % of students scored at the target level of 3-4 across REs. However, it is encouraging to see that about a third of this PSYC 272 sample met the target performance level on RE #3 (critical analysis of issue/problem) or #4 (connection with other reading or theoretical/theological/ practical issue).</p> <p>However, the PSYC 480 data suggest that this cohort of seniors reached the target level in RE #4 (writing mechanics & APA style, at 72.8%), but not in any other RE. RE #1 (summary of key aspects of empirical study) remained relatively unchanged since the previous assessment cycle, and together with RE #4 (connection to other reading or theoretical/theological/ practical issue), fell slightly below the benchmark of 66%. RE #2 (critical analysis of issue/problem) % rates at the 3-4 level of performance dropped from 78.6 last year to 36.4 this year. An examination of the SumCrit essays suggests that this cohort of students struggled either to specify a problem/ issue of <i>significance</i> or to provide an acceptable justification for it. With the exception of the 2014-15 assessment cycle, this pattern has been</p>	<p>psychology program concerning SLOAP #3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In light of relatively stable senior data in the last two assessment cycles, PSYC 480 instructors will continue with their revised instructions and concentrated coaching of SumCrits. Special attention will be given to RE #2, encouraging students to more specifically identify an important problem/issue and present more acceptable justification for it on theoretical, theological or methodological grounds. - Instructors will continue encouraging students to use resources available on Moodle (e.g., APA tutorial and statistics review).
--	--	--	--

		longstanding among psychology seniors, probably because this particular RE of SLOAP #3 is quite ambitious for psychology undergraduates.	
<p><i>Outcome #4</i> <i>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.</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>Data were collected in the spring 2016 (PSYC 410). Percentage rates fell at or above target level, from 73.3% to 93.3% across REs. A growth trend was also found across REs relative to the previous assessment cycle.</p>	<p>Instruction and material adopted seem to have yielded desired outcomes across REs. If this pattern persists in future years, the faculty will consider adjustments in the rubric.</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 describe continuity 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>See prior reports for results in previous assessment cycles.</p>	<p>We aim to have 66% of scores at or above “Meets Expectations” level.</p> <p>Data were collected in the Fall Semester 2015 using a new rubric with 4 REs and 4 well-defined levels of performance.</p> <p>REs #1-3 had % rates fell well above target performance level (from 72.8% to 100%), but RE #4 (reflection on connections among faith, learning, and living) fell at 36.4%. This pattern seems to be longstanding in the psychology program, but it is noted</p>	<p>- PSYC 480 instructors have been encouraging vocational reflection from the very beginning of the academic semester, which seems to be yielding some favorable results.</p> <p>- Instructors need to come up with novel, more effective ways of stimulating students to bring their faith to bear on their vocational reflection,</p>

<p><i>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> <p>Note. The Psychology Program expects to include summer camp data in the next report.</p>		<p>that this was the first time that the current rubric was used.</p>	<p>plan for the future, and life endeavors in general.</p>
---	--	---	--

Appendix 1

**Annual Assessment Report, PSYC 2014-15 Cycle (and Some Previous Ones)
Assessment Data**

**Student Learning Outcome I: ETS Major Field Test in Psychology (2012 and 2013 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
2005 N=7	M SD	156 11	58 17	58 16	55 17	57 9
2006 N=8	M SD	158 11	58 15	56 16	60 12	60 10

2007 N=19	M SD	154 13	48 12	54 16	59 12	57 13
2008 N=10	M SD	151 11	54 13	50 10	52 14	53 11
2009 N=19	M SD	154 15	55 17	53 16	56 14	56 16
2010 N=13	M SD	156 11	60 14	58 14	60 15	55 13
2011 N=12	M SD	160 15	59 14	60 15	57 15	64 15
2014 N=14	M SD	158 11	56 16	62 12	60 12	57 12
National Data 2/05 to 12/06	M SD	156 9	56 8	57 8	56 7	56 8
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 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

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	National Data ^a 2/05 to 12/06, ^b 2/05 to 6/10 ^c 2011, ^d 9/14 to 06/15
Memory & Thinking	47	45	41	43	49	55	52	48	^a 48 ^b 49 ^c 44 ^d 46.1
Sensory & Physio	40	40	37	30	36	40	55	61	^a 38 ^b 39 ^c 49 ^d 53.8

Developmental	52	52	48	43	45	47	67	59	^a 46 ^b 47 ^c 52 ^d 49.6
Clin. & Abnormal	64	73	70	64	67	71	64	74	^a 66 ^b 66 ^c 59 ^d 70.1
Social	59	65	63	58	63	61	68	58	^a 61 ^b 62 ^c 57 ^d 63.8
Meas. & Method.	52	49	48	50	48	48	52	52	^a 53 ^b 53 ^c 54 ^d 55.2

Student Learning Outcome #2: Specific Research Method Skills (2013-2016; see previous reports for data prior to 2013)

Quizzes (PSYC 273): Psychology majors only

Spring 2013-2016

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

	5 Superior	4 Exceeds Expectations	3 Meets Expectations	2 Needs Improvement	1 Inadequate	Mean (SD)	% \geq 3 Meets Expectations
1. The Student is able to describe the problem area in his/her research study.							
Spring 2016, N=16	12	0	4	0	0	4.50 (0.89)	100
Spring 2015, N=16	6	8	2	0	0	4.25 (0.68)	100
Spring 2014, N=21	10	4	7	0	0	4.14 (0.91)	100
Spring 2013, N=7	6	0	1	0	0	4.71 (0.76)	100
2. The student is able to state a hypothesis about the study outcomes.							
Spring 2016, N=16	10	4	2	0	0	4.50 (0.73)	100
Spring 2015, N=16	1	13	2	0	0	3.94 (0.44)	100
Spring 2014, N=21	7	10	4	0	0	4.14 (0.73)	100
Spring 2013, N=7	4	1	2	0	0	4.29 (0.95)	100

3. The student is able to describe the basic procedures associated with IRB submissions and is able to identify key ethical concerns.								
Spring 2016, N=16	7	2	4	3	0	3.81 (1.22)	81.25	
Spring 2015, N=16	2	11	3	0	0	3.94 (0.57)	100	
Spring 2014, N=21	7	7	6	1	0	3.95 (0.92)	95.24	
Spring 2013, N=7	4	2	1	0	0	4.43 (0.79)	100	
4. The student is able to describe the basic design of the study and its procedures.								
Spring 2016, N=16	3	6	5	2	0	3.63 (0.96)	87.5	
Spring 2015, N=16	4	1	9	2	0	3.44 (1.03)	87.5	
Spring 2014, N=21	5	10	5	1	0	3.90 (0.83)	95.24	
Spring 2013, N=7	4	1	2	0	0	4.29 (0.95)	100	
5. The student is able to describe the sampling techniques.								
Spring 2016, N=16	7	2	2	4	1	3.63 (1.45)	68.75	
Spring 2015, N=16	4	7	4	1	0	3.88 (.89)	93.75	
Spring 2014, N=21	6	1	1	13	0	3.00 (1.38)	38.1	
Spring 2013, N=7	5	0	0	2	0	4.14 (1.46)	71	
6. The student is able to state a plausible statistical procedure for analyzing data from his/her project								
Spring 2016, N=16	1	3	7	4	1	2.94 (1.00)	68.75	
Spring 2015, N=16	0	3	10	3	0	3.00 (0.63)	81.25	
Spring 2014, N=21	10	7	4	0	0	4.29 (0.78)	100	
Spring 2013, N=7	3	3	0	1	0	4.14 (1.07)	86	
7. The student communicates ideas clearly and demonstrates knowledge of key terms used in psychological research.								
Spring 2016, N=16	0	7	8	1	0	3.38 (0.62)	93.75	
Spring 2015, N=16	2	6	5	3	0	3.44 (0.96)	81.25	
Spring 2014, N=21	2	4	15	0	0	3.38 (0.67)	100	
Spring 2013, N=7	1	3	3	0	0	3.71 (0.76)	100	

Student Learning Outcome #2: Specific Research Method Skills (2013-2016; see previous reports for data prior to 2013)

Final Exams (PSYC 273) Psychology majors only

Spring 2013-2016

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

	5 Superior	4 Exceeds Expectations	3 Meets Expectations	2 Needs Improvement	1 Inadequate	Mean (SD)	% \geq 3 Meets Expectations
1. Overall clarity							
Spring 2016, N=16	0	1	13	2	0	2.94 (0.44)	87.5
Spring 2015, N=16	1	2	12	1	0	3.19 (0.66)	93.75
Spring 2014, N=21	0	8	12	1	0	3.34 (0.58)	95.24
Spring 2013, N=7	1	4	1	0	0	4.00 (0.63)	100
2. Overall correctness of content							
Spring 2016, N=16	0	2	13	1	0	3.06 (0.44)	93.75
Spring 2015, N=16	1	2	13	0	0	3.25 (0.58)	100
Spring 2014, N=21	2	9	9	1	0	3.57 (0.75)	95.24
Spring 2013, N=7	2	3	1	0	0	4.17 (0.75)	100
3. Statement of the problem							
Spring 2016, N=16	11	1	3	1	0	4.38 (1.02)	93.75
Spring 2015, N=16	6	4	4	1	1	3.81 (1.22)	87.5
Spring 2014, N=21	19	2	0	0	0	4.81 (0.51)	100
Spring 2013, N=7	3	1	2	0	0	4.17 (0.98)	100

4. Knowledge about ethics:								
*states level of review required								
Spring 2016, N=16	3	5	8	0	0	3.69 (0.79)	100	
Spring 2015, N=16	3	0	5	1	7	2.44 (1.55)	50	
Spring 2014, N=21	8	1	8	1	3	3.48 (1.44)	80.95	
Spring 2013, N=7	4	0	0	0	2	3.67 (2.07)	67	
*iterates at least two potential ethical issues in the proposed research								
Spring 2016, N=16	2	3	7	4	0	3.19 (0.98)	75	
Spring 2015, N=16	7	1	5	1	2	3.63 (1.45)	81.25	
Spring 2014, N=21	9	2	2	8	0	3.57 (1.40)	61.9	
Spring 2013, N=7	2	1	2	0	1	3.50 (1.52)	83	
*iterates at least two approaches to minimize risks to SS								
Spring 2016, N=16	2	4	7	3	0	3.31 (0.95)	81.25	
Spring 2015, N=16	6	2	4	1	3	3.44 (1.55)	75	
Spring 2014, N=21	9	4	4	4	0	3.86 (1.20)	80.95	
Spring 2013, N=7	2	2	2	0	0	4.00 (0.89)	100	
5. Description of research methods:								
*sampling techniques								
Spring 2016, N=16	2	2	6	6	0	3.00 (1.03)	62.5	
Spring 2015, N=16	4	1	4	6	1	3.06 (1.34)	56.25	
Spring 2014, N=21	3	1	9	7	1	2.90 (1.09)	61.9	
Spring 2013, N=7	3	0	1	2	0	3.67 (1.51)	67	
*type of study/design								
Spring 2016, N=16	5	5	4	0	2	3.69 (1.30)	87.5	
Spring 2015, N=16	6	2	5	2	1	3.63 (1.31)	81.25	
Spring 2014, N=21	11	2	3	5	0	3.90 (1.30)	76.19	
Spring 2013, N=7	1	1	4	0	0	3.50 (0.84)	100	

*methods of data collection								
Spring 2016, N=16	2	5	6	3	0	3.38 (0.96)	81.25	
Spring 2015, N=16	7	5	2	2	0	4.06 (1.06)	87.5	
Spring 2014, N=21	2	2	14	2	1	3.10 (0.89)	85.71	
Spring 2013, N=7	3	2	1	0	0	4.33 (0.82)	100	
*methods of data recording								
Spring 2016, N=16	0	0	14	2	0	2.88 (0.34)	87.5	
Spring 2015, N=16	5	3	3	3	2	3.38 (1.45)	68.75	
Spring 2014, N=21	3	3	7	3	3	3.10 (1.26)	71.43	
Spring 2013, N=7	2	3	0	1	0	4.00 (1.10)	83	
6. Proposal for data analysis								
Spring 2016, N=16	0	4	3	9	0	2.69 (0.87)	43.75	
Spring 2015, N=16	2	2	11	1	0	3.31 (0.79)	93.75	
Spring 2014, N=21	4	4	9	4	0	3.38 (1.02)	80.95	
Spring 2013, N=7	2	0	4	0	0	3.67 (1.03)	100	
7. Description of the desired conclusions								
Spring 2016, N=16	0	2	12	1	1	2.94 (0.68)	87.5	
Spring 2015, N=16	4	1	8	3	0	3.38 (1.09)	81.25	
Spring 2014, N=21	8	4	8	1	0	3.90 (1.00)	95.24	
Spring 2013, N=7	1	2	1	2	0	3.33 (1.21)	67	

Student Learning Outcome #3

SumCrit Paper #1 (PSYC 272)*

Fall 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%.

*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 2015, N=16	0	0	10	6	1.63 (.50)	0
2. Critical analysis of issue/problem						
Fall 2015, N=16	0	5	8	3	2.13 (.72)	31.25
3. Connection with other reading or theoretical/theological/practical issue						
Fall 2015, N=16	0	6	8	2	2.25 (0.68)	37.50
4. Writing – mechanics & APA style						
Fall 2015, N=16	0	2	7	7	1.69 (.70)	12.5

Student Learning Outcome #3

SumCrit Paper #2 (PSYC 480)

Fall 2014, 2015

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 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 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 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 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

Student Learning Outcome #4

Integration of Faith and Learning

Spring 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. Foundational Issues						
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 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 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 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

Student Learning Outcome #5

Personal and Vocational Reflection Paper (PVRP)

Fall 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 2015, N=11	3	8	0	0	3.27 (0.47)	100
2. Reflection on educat'l & career goals						
Fall 2015, N=11	3	7	0	1	3.09 (0.83)	90.9
3. Reflection on personal, interpersonal, and intellectual strengths & weaknesses						
Fall 2015, N=11	4	4	3	0	3.09 (0.83)	72.8
4. Reflection on connections among faith, learning, and living						
Fall 2015, N=11	3	1	3	4	2.27 (1.27)	36.4

APPENDIX 2: RUBRICS

SLOAP #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>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

SLOAP #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.

SLOAP #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		<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.