



Program Name: Psychology

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

Reporting cycle of Fall 2016 – Spring 2017

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: *2016-2017*

Submission Date: *10/17/2017*

Note: This report updates data for PILOs # 1, 3, and 5, and includes Applied and Scientific Psychology Camp data for summer 2017.

<i>Program Intended Learning Outcomes (PILO)</i>	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>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>The overall scale score for this cycle dropped by 5 points relative to last cycle's, falling slightly below the national comparative mean. The same applies to three of four measured areas. Percept/Comp/Eth/ Sens/Physio was the only one above the normative mean. The six more specific sub-field mean % correct scores also fell slightly below their respective national means, except that the Sensory & Physiological areas stood above the national mean. The Social and the Measure & Method areas fell a little further below national norms relative to their levels in the last cycle for which data are available (2014).</p>	<p>Taken together, the data suggest a likely cohort effect. Where differential performance levels are noted, characteristics of courses (e.g., required vs. elective, how often they are offered), and of students in specific courses (e.g., majors, statuses) are likely contributing factors. Because the performance decline is generalized and, in most cases, so small, no pedagogical measure is warranted at this time. The faculty will continue to monitor especially those areas in which score decline has been most pronounced and repeated (e.g., Social and Measurement & Method). Caution is also needed where curricular/delivery/transfer policy changes</p>

			may differentially impact the areas of assessment.
<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>See Appendix 1 for details.</p> <p>We aim to have 66% of scores at or above the “Meets Expectations” level.</p>	<p>No data are included in this assessment cycle. As noted in the last report, a new rubric with fewer elements and four well-defined levels of performance will be used in the next cycle.</p>	<p>N/A</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</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>Data were collected in the fall 2016 for pre-test (PSYC 272) and post-test (PSYC 480) using the same standard rubric as in the last cycle. As in the previous cycle, students in the formative phase (PSYC 272) did not typically score at the target level of 3-4</p>	<p>- PSYC 480 instructors have intentionally highlighted additional instruction related to REs # 2 and 3. That RE #3 slightly increased for this relatively underperforming</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>across Rubric Elements (REs), which is to be expected.</p> <p>The PSYC 480 data suggest that this cohort of seniors had a performance level below that of the last cohort (2015), except for RE #3 (Connection with other reading or theoretical/theological/practical issue), which slightly increased. No RE reached the target performance level, but RE #s 3 and 4 (Writing) were only slightly below the target. REs # 1, 3, and 4 had a mode of 3 (= <i>Meets Expectation</i>), and contrary to the 2014 cycle, not a single student scored at the 1 (= <i>Inadequate</i>) level in REs #3 and 4.</p>	<p>cohort is encouraging and suggests that some of the instructors' effort has been effective in helping students synthesize reading materials.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued attention is needed to REs # 1 (Summary of key aspects of empirical study) and 2 (Critical analysis of issue/problem), which have been challenging even to cohorts with better overall performance. - In order to improve RE #4 performance, it may be necessary to further emphasize it since the freshman year, as many students are coming to college without basic writing skills, let alone knowledge of APA style.
<p><i>Outcome #4 Students will articulate an informed position on foundational issues,</i></p>	<p>Paper on Christianity-PSYC relationship; scored with a rubric</p>	<p>No data are reported for this cycle.</p>	<p>N/A.</p>

<p><i>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>See Appendix 1 for details.</p> <p>We aim to have 66% of scores at or above “Meets Expectations” level.</p>		
<p><i>Outcome #5</i></p> <p><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 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>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 2016 using the same rubric adopted in the last cycle for the first time.</p> <p>As in the last cycle, REs #1-3 had % rates well above the target performance level, but RE #4 (reflection on connections among faith, learning, and living) continued below the target mark. It is noteworthy that RE #4 showed a sizeable growth relative to the last assessment cycle, though.</p>	<p>- As in the last cycle, the instructors' encouragement of vocational reflection from the very beginning of the academic semester seems to continue bearing good fruit.</p> <p>- The use of more explicit guidance for students to link their faith to their vocational reflection, plan for the future, and life endeavors may be just starting to reflect in the students' RE #4 rate. Continued attention to this RE is needed, perhaps through more conspicuous role modeling.</p>

Summer Camp Assessment

Summer 2017

Areas of assessment	Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success	Summary of Data Collected	Use of Results
Overall expectation of Psych Campers being met	<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>The 2017 data show a 100% of "Yes" response rate to this survey item (see table in Appendix 2)</p>	<p>- The data suggest that overall the camp experience has fully met all participants' expectations.</p>
Enrollment in the Psych Camp	<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 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>	<p>The 2017 head count was 16 (a 60% increase from the first year, 2016). In an email to Admissions copied to the Psych Camp director, Connie Brannon informed that 20% of all campers have enrolled at MU this academic year.</p> <p>See Appendix 2</p>	<p>- The data suggest that the Applied and Scientific Psych Camp should continue to impact the general MU enrollment by attracting a good number of campers to an exciting summer experience on our campus.</p>
Camp Program	<p>One item in the general PR survey, rated 1 (=worst) to 5</p>	<p>The 2017 general program item exceeded expectations by far.</p>	<p>- Although it is unclear how much of the Psych-specific aspects of</p>

	<p>(=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>	<p>Psych Program-related "faves" exceeded the criterion (68.75%), but the +/- ratio of comments on the Psych Camp program fell below the target. Several of the negative entries concerned the long amount of time spent in the classroom.</p> <p>See Appendix 2</p>	<p>the program influenced the general program rate, which was very good, an examination of the favorite rates along with the various comments suggests that there may still be some room for adjusting the distribution of time spent on field trips, labs/ games and other "hands-on" activities, relative to more "seriously academic" topical discussions. The heterogenous mix of the audience may pose some challenge to this, but we will keep on trying.</p>
--	--	--	---

Appendix 1

**Annual Assessment Report, PSYC 2016-17 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
--	--	---------------------	--	----------------------	------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

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

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 2016, 2015, 2014, 2013

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

	5	4	3	2	1	Mean (SD)	% ≥ 3
--	---	---	---	---	---	-----------	-------

	Superior	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Inadequate		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 2016, 2015, 2014, 2013

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)	% ≥ 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)	% ≥ 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

Student Learning Outcome #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

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)	% ≥ 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 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 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 educational & 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 (<i>1=worst, 5=best</i>)	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

APPENDIX 3:
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>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.