

University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Detailed Assessment Report 2015-2016 Psychology MS

As of: 11/01/2016 03:18 PM CENTRAL

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked *One-Time, Recurring, No Request.*)

Mission / Purpose

The Department of Psychology at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette strives to promote the study of psychology as a science, as a profession, and as a means of promoting human welfare. To that end, a two year Master's Program is offered in General Experimental Psychology. After obtaining their degree, students are expected to pursue the doctorate at other universities. Students are required to do research under the supervision of a faculty member throughout their graduate training. Students may elect to complete 500 hours of supervised field practicum. All students are expected to learn to read, understand and critically analyze current research.

Revised 1/31/2014 to reflect curriculum changes now current.

Revised 5/16/2016 to reflect curriculum changes now current.

Connected Document

[Responses to Assessment in the Graduate Psychology program](#)

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Understanding Basic Principles

Both applied and experimental track students - Understand the basic principles of the science of psychology.

Students completing the degree are expected to demonstrate an understanding of the general principles of the science of psychology including physiological mechanisms underlying behavior, historical and current trends in the field, research and design principles, learning theory, and social influence on behavior.

Connected Documents

[Comprehensive Exam Questions and Grading Rubric](#)

[Responses to Assessment in the Graduate Psychology program](#)

Related Measures

M 1: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams

Preliminary Exams are really Comprehensive Exams, per change in name 2014. The comprehensive exams are typically administered at the beginning of the second year (generally after core course completion). All students taking Comprehensive Exams were evaluated. Outcomes of comprehensive examinations are taken each semester of each year.

Source of Evidence: Writing exam to assure certain proficiency level

Connected Documents

[Comprehensive Exam Questions and Grading Rubric](#)

[Responses to Assessment in the Graduate Psychology program](#)

Target:

Goal Eighty percent pass rate on preliminary examinations.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

For the comprehensive exam, administered in the Fall of 2015, 22 students attempted the Comprehensive exam and 20 successfully passed it, for a 91% pass rate (90.9%). Four students were attempting the Comprehensive for the second time and all had clear passes (M = 3.04, Range 2.99 – 3.10). One of the students who did not pass did not complete the test.

This year we attempted to utilize a rating system, but there was some disagreement about the scale of the ratings. We converted all ratings to the standard 4.0 scale, with a 2.5 as the minimum pass. The mean passing score was 3.1 out of 4.0, equivalent to a B. The range on the passing scores was 2.81 – 3.56. Of the two failing students, one missed the passing mark by 0.043 points (2.457), the other got a 1.5, but again, failed to complete the test.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Faculty Communication via progress checklists

Increased communication between faculty regarding student progress. The Graduate Curriculum Committee is developing a tracking form that can be distributed to and commented on by all faculty. A first draft was developed this year and has been reviewed and is being redrafted. A final draft is expected during the 2014-2015 Academic year

This action plan is not completed as it spurred an overhaul of the entire graduate program.

Revisit the issue of a progress check-list or tracking form to keep all graduate students on track for completing their degrees in a two year time.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Measure: Thesis Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Measure: Thesis Proposal Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Implementation Description: Currently developing the form. The development of this form spurred the complete overhaul of the program. We are returning to this Action plan in the 2016-17 cycle.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2015

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Amy Brown and the Graduate Curriculum Committee

Additional Resources: none

Increased Guidance for Comprehensive Exams

Explanation: Increased structure and guidance for students preparing to take the comprehensive exam to include basic/conceptual questions to be included as part of core course exams. Dr. Perkins has developed a meeting to take place several months before scheduled qualifying exams. In this lecture he will explain the expectations of the faculty for demonstrating mastery. He will explain the exact procedures involved in the testing environment. He will discuss preparation and studying strategies with the students. Faculty will provide Dr. Perkins with information about the topics likely to show up on the test and be available to students to discuss preparation and to answer questions and clarify ideas. communication, in the few weeks prior to the exams.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Implementation Description: These review sessions will be implemented during the Fall of 2014. In the 2015-16 cycle, the preparation and guidance for the comprehensive exam was shifted to the individual mentors, who went over the Comps policy with the students prior to the start of the examination. Each student had access to 4 people to help them prepare for and complete the comprehensive exam, their thesis chair and the three subject area experts, Drs. Perkins, Smith and Yang.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2015

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Rick Perkins

Additional Resources: None

Change the name of the preliminary exam

Recognizing that the term Preliminary Examination means something very different to the Graduate College at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette, the Graduate Curriculum Committee resolved to change the name of the examination we give to the Comprehensive Examination. That resolution was proposed and approved in the Fall of 2014. However, while we have made this change, we cannot change the name of the assessment measure in WEAVE Online without destroying the continuity of the measure.

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Implementation Description: Faculty will begin to refer to the exam as the Qualifying examination. This change will appear in the 2015 Graduate catalog.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2015

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Amy Brown and the Graduate Curriculum Committee

Additional Resources: None

Review and modify the evaluation of Comprehensive Examinations to provide a more sensitive measure of student performance.

Currently, all that is recorded is the pass rate for each year. For most of the past 3 years we have easily met the standard of an 80% pass rate. We are suggesting we implement a more sensitive evaluation so that greater information is available for program evaluation.

Plan 1: Have each evaluator rate each essay on a simple 3 point scale: 0 = Fail; 1 = Acceptable Pass, 2 = Exemplary Pass. Advantage to this is that it is similar to the scales used for evaluating proposals and defenses. Averages of faculty ratings would be computed for each question attempted, for each student. The Comprehensive Exam committee would then compute a test average (across questions) for each student. Those averages would then be reported to the Assessment Committee for inclusion in WEAVE reports. Assessment would compute a grand average for the year, to be reported. Initially, we would set our target at a grand average greater than 1.0 (everyone passes the prelims), perhaps with the stipulation that no individual student have a test average of less than 1.0.

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015

Implementation Status: Terminated

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Implementation Description: : The Graduate Curriculum Committee will meet to discuss revisions to the evaluation of Comps, and perhaps pilot one or more plans at the winter administration of the exam. Fall 2016, following the revision of the Comprehensive Exam, a new scoring system has been implemented and this action plan is discontinued.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2016

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Amy Brown and the Graduate Curriculum Committee.

Additional Resources: None

Connected Document

[Responses to Assessment in the Graduate Psychology program](#)

Revise the Comprehensive Examination to be in line with new curriculum

The Graduate Curriculum Committee will examine the form and expectations of the Qualifying Examination, decide on a form in keeping with the new curriculum and establish the new form for students entering the program in the fall of 2015

Established in Cycle: 2014-2015

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Implementation Description: The Graduate Curriculum Committee will meet regularly throughout the year to review, revise and document an update in keeping with the new curriculum..

Projected Completion Date: 05/2015

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Amy Brown and the Graduate Curriculum Committee.

Additional Resources: none

Connected Documents

[Comprehensive Exam Questions and Grading Rubric Responses to Assessment in the Graduate Psychology program](#)

Create New Scoring for New Comprehensive Exams

Currently, the new comps proposals have specified a five point scale, roughly corresponding to grades, where 1 = Catastrophic Fail; 2 = Fail; 3 = marginal pass; 4 = satisfactory pass; 5 = exemplary pass. Each question on the comps are read by three people, and the score is an average of the three ratings.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Implementation Description: The system described above is being implemented in the new cycle 2016-2017. See supportive documents for more detail.

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Curriculum Committee, Amy Brown Chair, and Graduate Assessment Coordinator, Mike McDermott

Additional Resources: None

Connected Document

[Comprehensive Exam Questions and Grading Rubric](#)

New Procedure to Assign Students to Thesis Advisors.

Develop a procedure to rapidly assign new graduate students to mentors. Implement this plan in the Fall of 2016. This policy/procedure will be added to the Graduate Student Handbook and become a policy statement.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Measure: Thesis Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Measure: Thesis Proposal Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Implementation Description: Piloting will begin with the new students in the fall of 2016, and revisions made for implementation in subsequent cycles.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2016

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Coordinator (Emily Sandoz) and Graduate Curriculum Committee (Amy Brown, Chair)

Procedure for Changing Thesis Chair

Develop a policy to enable students to change thesis chair prior to completion of their thesis project. This Action plan requires the development of a statement of the the roles and responsibilities of the thesis chair, the mentor and the mentee. This statement was developed in the Fall of 2016 and is attached.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Measure: Thesis Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Measure: Thesis Proposal Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Implementation Description: Graduate Curriculum Committee is working on this policy statement.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2016

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Curriculum Committee (Amy Brown, Chair)

Connected Document

[Mentorship Policy](#)

Revise Program Description on the Departmental Web Page

Revise master's program description on departmental website to improve quality of applicants.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Implementation Description: Graduate Curriculum Committee (Amy Brown, Chair)

SLO 2: Research Skills

Experimental track students - Possess the skills necessary to conduct research.

Students completing the degree are expected to be able to conduct independent psychological research related to their chosen field of study.

Connected Documents

[Mentorship Policy](#)

[Responses to Assessment in the Graduate Psychology program](#)

Related Measures

M 2: Thesis Defense

Completion of thesis defense and thesis committee member ratings (generally during the last semester before graduation). Thesis defense outcomes and thesis committee member ratings are taken each semester of each year as students defend their thesis. All students defending theses were evaluated.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Connected Document

[Responses to Assessment in the Graduate Psychology program](#)

Target:

Goal – Successful completion of thesis defense and an average ratings of 1.0 for the oral presentation of the thesis, as rated by thesis committee members. Ratings are 0 (unsatisfactory), 1 (satisfactory) and 2 (exemplary).

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

Ten students defended their Master's thesis and were graduated with an Master's of Science degree in the 2015-16 Academic Year. The average rating for the thesis document was a 1.27, or Satisfactory rating. The mean rating for the Thesis presentation was a 1.63, approaching an Exemplary rating. Only one student had a rating below a 1.0, and that was only for the document. The over-all or grand mean was a 1.45 which is between a Satisfactory and an Exemplary rating.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Faculty Communication via progress checklists

Increased communication between faculty regarding student progress. The Graduate Curriculum Committee is developing a tracking form that can be distributed to and commented on by all faculty. A first draft was developed this year and has been reviewed and is being redrafted. A final draft is expected during the 2014-2015 Academic year

This action plan is not completed as it spurred an overhaul of the entire graduate program.

Revisit the issue of a progress check-list or tracking form to keep all graduate students on track for completing their degrees in a two year time.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Measure: Thesis Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Measure: Thesis Proposal Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Implementation Description: Currently developing the form. The development of this form spurred the complete overhaul of the program. We are returning to this Action plan in the 2016-17 cycle.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2015

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Amy Brown and the Graduate Curriculum Committee

Additional Resources: none

New Procedure to Assign Students to Thesis Advisors.

Develop a procedure to rapidly assign new graduate students to mentors. Implement this plan in the Fall of 2016. This policy/procedure will be added to the Graduate Student Handbook and become a policy statement.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Measure: Thesis Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Measure: Thesis Proposal Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Implementation Description: Piloting will begin with the new students in the fall of 2016, and revisions made for implementation in subsequent cycles.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2016

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Coordinator (Emily Sandoz) and Graduate Curriculum Committee (Amy Brown, Chair)

Online Assessments of Defense Meetings.

Convert the ratings of thesis proposals and defenses to a survey-monkey questionnaire from the current procedure of completing and submitting a MS Word form. The following Survey is submitted for review and approval.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/ZFTNW2Y>

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Thesis Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Measure: Thesis Proposal Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Implementation Description: The new survey is posted and available.

Faculty will begin using this assessment resource immediately.

Responsible Person/Group: Valanne MacGyvers developed the survey and Mike McDermot will monitor it. It is a short survey and is posted to Survey Monkey free of charge.

Additional Resources: None

Procedure for Changing Thesis Chair

Develop a policy to enable students to change thesis chair prior to completion of their thesis project. This Action plan requires the development of a statement of the the roles and responsibilities of the thesis chair, the mentor and the mentee. This statement was developed in the Fall of 2016 and is attached.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Measure: Thesis Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Measure: Thesis Proposal Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Implementation Description: Graduate Curriculum Committee is working on this policy statement.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2016

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Curriculum Committee (Amy Brown, Chair)

Connected Document

[Mentorship Policy](#)

M 6: Thesis Proposal Evaluation

Each student completing a thesis has a thesis proposal meeting with their committee in order to review the hypotheses, their research design, their literature review and their plan for data analysis. Students prepare a formal oral presentation for the committee, and provide a written proposal to their committee. Each of these is evaluated on a three point scale, 0 = Unsatisfactory; 1 = Satisfactory; 2 = Exemplary. Students must successfully pass their proposal review before submitting their research proposal to the IRB.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:

Goal is to maintain high achievement, with a mean rating across all students above 1.0, and no student receiving an average rating below 1.0

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

Eight students completed a thesis proposal defense this year, and all successfully passed the proposal defense. The average rating for the proposal document was a 1.11, or Satisfactory rating. The mean rating for the proposal presentation was a 1.48, between a Satisfactory and an Exemplary rating. Only one student had a rating below a 1.0, and that was only for the document. The over-all or grand mean was a 1.30 which is between a Satisfactory and an Exemplary rating.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**Faculty Communication via progress checklists**

Increased communication between faculty regarding student progress. The Graduate Curriculum Committee is developing a tracking form that can be distributed to and commented on by all faculty. A first draft was developed this year and has been reviewed and is being redrafted. A final draft is expected during the 2014-2015 Academic year

This action plan is not completed as it spurred an overhaul of the entire graduate program.

Revisit the issue of a progress check-list or tracking form to keep all graduate students on track for completing their degrees in a two year time.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Measure: Thesis Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Measure: Thesis Proposal Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Implementation Description: Currently developing the form. The development of this form spurred the complete overhaul of the program. We are returning to this Action plan in the 2016-17 cycle.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2015

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Amy Brown and the Graduate Curriculum Committee

Additional Resources: none

New Procedure to Assign Students to Thesis Advisors.

Develop a procedure to rapidly assign new graduate students to mentors. Implement this plan in the Fall of 2016. This policy/procedure will be added to the Graduate Student Handbook and become a policy statement.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Measure: Thesis Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Measure: Thesis Proposal Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Implementation Description: Piloting will begin with the new students in the fall of 2016, and revisions made for implementation in subsequent cycles.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2016

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Coordinator (Emily Sandoz) and Graduate Curriculum Committee (Amy Brown, Chair)

Online Assessments of Defense Meetings.

Convert the ratings of thesis proposals and defenses to a survey-monkey questionnaire from the current procedure of completing and submitting a MS Word form. The following Survey is submitted for review and approval.

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/ZFTNW2Y>

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Thesis Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Measure: Thesis Proposal Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Implementation Description: The new survey is posted and available. Faculty will begin using this assessment resource immediately.

Responsible Person/Group: Valanne MacGyvers developed the survey and Mike McDermot will monitor it. It is a short survey and is posted to Survey Monkey free of charge.

Additional Resources: None

Procedure for Changing Thesis Chair

Develop a policy to enable students to change thesis chair prior to completion of their thesis project. This Action plan requires the development of a statement of the the roles and responsibilities of the thesis chair, the mentor and the mentee. This statement was developed in the Fall of 2016 and is attached.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Comprehensive Exams, formerly Preliminary Exams | **Outcome/Objective:** Understanding Basic Principles

Measure: Thesis Defense | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Measure: Thesis Proposal Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Research Skills

Implementation Description: Graduate Curriculum Committee is working on this policy statement.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2016

Responsible Person/Group: Graduate Curriculum Committee (Amy Brown, Chair)

Connected Document

[Mentorship Policy](#)

SLO 3: Ethical Research Practices

Experimental track students - Students must demonstrate ethical research practices.

Students are expected to gain competency in implementing ethical research practices.

Connected Document

[Responses to Assessment in the Graduate Psychology program](#)

Related Measures

M 3: Online Training Course

Successful completion of the NIH online training course in research ethics, IRB reviews, and Animal Care and Use reviews. All students taking NIH course or submitting institutional review proposals were evaluated. NIH course completion, IACUC proposal, and University IRB proposal results are taken each year as students submit proposals. The NIH course is usually taken during the first or second semester of the first year. IAUCC and University IRB proposals usually precede the thesis by one semester.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:

100% successful completion of the NIH online training course in research ethics, IRB reviews, and Animal Care and Use reviews.

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

The IRB training task shifted from Psyc 597 to Psyc 510 Ethics. 15 out of 15 students successfully completed the training, for a 100% completion rate.

Graduate students submitted 15 research proposals to the IRB in the 2015-2016 academic year, and all were approved. In addition, two more proposals were submitted to the Departmental Review Board and were approved. In total, 17 proposals for research were submitted for ethical review and all were approved, for a 100% approval rate.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

New Course Requirement: IRB training

NIH ethics course to be required as part of first-semester first-year research hours.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Online Training Course | **Outcome/Objective:**
Ethical Research Practices

Implementation Description: All students in Psyc 597, first semester training class are required to complete the NIH/IRB training and to submit their certificates to course instructor. Established in Fall 2011 by Valanne MacGyvers and continued in fall of 2012. In fall 2013 Emily Sandoz took over the course and continues the requirement

Projected Completion Date: 08/2011

Responsible Person/Group: Valanne MacGyvers, Instructor, Psyc 597, first semester and Emily Sandoz, Instructor, Psyc 597, first semester

Additional Resources: none

SLO 4: Competent and Ethical Service to Community

Applied track students - Demonstrate the implementation of ethical and competent psychological services in the community.

Students are expected to implement ethical and competent psychological services within the community.

Connected Document

[Responses to Assessment in the Graduate Psychology program](#)

Related Measures**M 4: Field Practicum Evaluation**

Review of supervisor evaluations from Psy 595 Field Practicum. All students completing their Applied Field Practicum are evaluated. Psy 595 Field Practicum supervisor ratings are taken at the end of each semester of each year, and is usually taken during the last year. Ratings are taken by on-site practicum supervisors independent of the Psychology Department.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target:

Students are rated across 9 areas of functioning as Mental Health Service Providers (Ethics, Establishing and Maintaining Therapeutic Relationships, Mastery of Counseling Techniques, Facilitate Client Awareness of Needs and Goal Setting, Testing and Assessment Competence, Staffing Competence, Termination or Referral of Clients, Integrating Theory with Practice; Personal Identification with Professional Role. Each of these areas is rated on a 5 point scale (1= inadequate or D level work; 2 = below average or C level work; 3 = Average work or typically acceptable or B level work; 4 = Above average or low A level work; 5 = Superior Performance or high A level work). Target is to have a Grand Mean Rating (across all areas and all students) of 3.0 or better, with no individual student's mean rating below 3.0

Finding (2015-2016) - Target: Met

Two students completed a practica experience in the 2015-16 academic year. Both performed well and had final ratings between 3.0 and 4.0 or in the average or typically acceptable level or B performance. Their overall mean ratings were 3.83 and 3.53 for an overall average of 3.68.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):**Increased Communication for Practica Supervisors**

Increase communication between off-site and on-site supervisors.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Field Practicum Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:**
Competent and Ethical Service to Community

Implementation Description: Drs. Sandoz and Wozencraft have added regular phone contact with off-site practica supervisors, at a minimum of once a semester. In addition, they are maintaining regular email contact and conduct regular site visits of practica sites. These contacts are in addition to the previously standard evaluation forms.

Projected Completion Date: 08/2013

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Theresa Wozencraft (Practica supervisor) and Dr. Emily Sandoz (Applied Program Coordinator)

Remain in contact with Graduates

Develop a means of following Graduates through their career. Specifically, to have email and phone contact with them subsequent to their graduation. To develop our graduates as potential supervisors.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Field Practicum Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Competent and Ethical Service to Community

Implementation Description: The Graduate Curriculum Committee will consider this issue and develop a plan, perhaps using an exit interview or survey and some form of social media.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2016

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Amy Brown and the Graduate Curriculum Committee.

Additional Resources: Unknown

New Policies to Govern New Psychological Assessment Clinic

Develop a set of policies to govern the new Psychological Assessment Clinic located on the first floor of Girard Hall. Part of this process will be to request a dedicated graduate assistant to manage the clinic.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Field Practicum Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Competent and Ethical Service to Community

Implementation Description: A policy must be established before the clinic can be opened.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2017

Responsible Person/Group: Clinical faculty, especially Mike McDermott, Theresa Wozencraft, Emily Sandoz and Rick Perkins

Additional Resources: Unknown

Practicum Assessment Forms Revised

The clinical faculty will meet to review and revise the practicum assessment forms. These forms have been in use for several years and there have been some issues of clarity related to the forms.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: In-Progress

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Field Practicum Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Competent and Ethical Service to Community

Implementation Description: Revise forms that community supervisors complete for practicum students.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2017

Responsible Person/Group: Emily Sandoz, Theresa Wozencraft, Rick Perkins, Mike McDermott are the clinical faculty who will work on this.

Additional Resources: none

Professional Relationships in Practicum Training

A new component will be added to the pre-practicum course, Psych 594 covering the management of professional relationships.

Established in Cycle: 2015-2016

Implementation Status: Planned

Priority: Medium

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Field Practicum Evaluation | **Outcome/Objective:** Competent and Ethical Service to Community

Implementation Description: Emily Sandoz will develop the component and add it to the course she teaches.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2017

Responsible Person/Group: Emily Sandoz and Theresa Wozencraft

Additional Resources: none

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

How were assessment results shared and evaluated within the unit?

Assessment results were shared on the Faculty Moodle page and all faculty were invited to suggest action plans. Because we were engaged in the process of revising the program, the interest in the results of assessment was high. The faculty responded with more action plans than we have ever developed for the graduate program. The faculty are very interested in supporting the students and improving the program.

Identify which action plans [created in prior cycle(s)] were implemented in this current cycle. For each of these implemented plans, were there any measurable or perceivable effects? How, if at all, did the findings appear to be affected by the implemented action plan?

Faculty Communication via progress checklists: We have continued to experiment with various tracking forms. While we have checklists, there does not seem to be clear increases in faculty communication. Not all the action plans we make in the graduate programs have a direct link to the assessments we are collecting, so there is no clear measure of the effectiveness of the plan, as it is more about the faculty being effective than about the students doing a better job.

Change the name of the preliminary exam. This has been fully implemented this year and there are very few continuing references to a preliminary exam. Not all the action plans we make in the graduate programs have a direct link to the assessments we are collecting, so there is no clear measure of the effectiveness of the plan, as it is more about the faculty being effective than about the students doing a better job.

Review and modify the evaluation of Comprehensive Examinations to provide a more sensitive measure of student performance. While we attempted to implement this Action Plan, the communication regarding the scoring was not made clear to all graders, and so several systems were used. At the same time, the Graduate Curriculum Committee elected to completely change the Comprehensive exam in both form and grading. So this Action Plan was rendered obsolete by the end of Spring 2016.

Revise Master's Program Curriculum for the 2015 Catalog: This action plan was fully accomplished. The new Curriculum was developed and piloted in the fall of 2015. During that semester, some modifications were made to the curriculum to make it more reasonable for the students.

Revise the Comprehensive Examination to be in line with new curriculum: This action plan was fully implemented, and is being piloted in the Fall of 2016. We expect two consequences, One: we have changed the grading scale to a 5 point scale, which will allow for a higher ceiling than a simple pass/fail account we have been utilizing. This will allow us to continue to look at improving the program. Two: We expect that we will have to modify the implementation of the plan as we see how the students are fairing under the new rubrics. So while this plan is being implemented, there is no data yet to provide a measurable outcome to the changes implemented.

What has the unit learned from the current assessment cycle? What is working well, and what is working less well in achieving desired outcomes?

Given that our unit has been functioning at a very high level, our focus has been on revising the program to be more consonant with similar programs across the country. We have been successful in placing students into doctoral programs. So for now, we are on track and pretty much at ceiling. We will, in the next cycle, begin to implement other sorts of assessments that would provide an area of growth.