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Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers
For Academic Programs

Informed by your assessment activities related to student learning, what changes have you made in your degree program in the last three to five years? Describe the changes (e.g., curriculum revision, new courses, faculty development), the general results that prompted the changes (e.g., student performance on an assessment measure), and any impact on student learning that you might attribute to these changes.

Like the MA program, the PhD program is generally regarded as a high quality program by persons inside and outside of the University of Alabama. In fact, the PhD program is a continuation of the MA program and typically involves the same students (although some students do enter the program with a masters degree). The goal of our assessment procedures has been to ensure that we have data to maintain and improve upon our reputation. We are continually trying to construct new and better tools to assess student mastery of skills. As was the case with the MA program, the primary changes made to the PhD program in the past three years have involved the revision of various assessment materials. These changes have allowed us to look more closely at what skills and knowledge students have gained from completing various aspects of the program. In general, students believe that what they are learning in the program is highly valuable to them and their future careers and faculty report that virtually all students have learned much more than what is required to complete the program with greater than satisfactory knowledge and skills. More importantly, the addition of the new assessment materials will allow us to obtain more refined analyses of student learning throughout various courses and degree milestones (e.g., preliminary examinations, dissertation proposal, dissertation) and implement changes as they are deemed necessary.

Mission / Purpose

The Department of Psychology seeks to provide the highest quality education and training for undergraduate and graduate students via our teaching, research, and community outreach. Student involvement in these three areas is integral to our mission. At the undergraduate level, the Department of Psychology offers the BA and BS degrees. We also have an Honors Program in Psychology. Our primary mission is to prepare undergraduate majors for graduate work in Psychology and related disciplines. We also strive to provide the highest quality education and training for students obtaining majors and minors in Psychology, as well as students satisfying social science requirements and requirements of other academic units. At the Graduate level, the Department of Psychology offers the Ph.D. and M.A. degrees in psychology in seven concentrations across experimental and clinical psychology. Students are only admitted to the Ph.D. program and earn their M.A. as they work toward the Ph.D. The primary mission of the graduate program is to promote independent scholarship, excellent teaching skills, and clinical skills related to each student’s concentration. The graduate program has a goal of producing 8-10 Ph.D.’s each year who, upon graduation, will fill psychology-related positions. The American Psychological Association has accredited the Clinical Training Program for the past 40 years, and the department intends to continue to hold the high standards associated with that accreditation.

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

SLO 1: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization

Demonstrate knowledge in the student's area of specialization.

Connected Documents
Psychology Curriculum Map PhD
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

Relevant Associations:
Reflective statement: Data collection has begun for measure 1. Measure 2 indicates an outcome falling between very good and excellent.

Measure 2 is a newly implemented measure.

Change to be implemented: No change; we will continue to monitor measures 1 and 2.

Related Measures

M 1: Specialization Coursework Rubric
The replacement rubric is completed by the instructors of specialized courses (PY 608, 610, 612, 666, 677, 687, 690; and 693 if cognitive, developmental, or social) for each student who has completed their course. It consists of a 4-point rating scale (0 = inadequate mastery of the course material, 1 = minimally adequate mastery of the course material, 2 = good mastery of the course material, 3 = excellent mastery of the course material).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Documents
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target:
No target established.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Psychology PhD action plan

No changes in assessment measures are anticipated. Existing measures will continue to be monitored.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure**: Comparison of enrollment | **Outcome/Objective**: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
- **Measure**: Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure**: Specialization Coursework Rubric | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure**: Survey administered to experimental students | **Outcome/Objective**: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

Implementation Description: No changes are anticipated.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: David Boles

M 2: Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric
The replacement rubric measures students' cumulative knowledge by way of Student Activity Report (SAR) evaluations of progress in the domains of course work, progress in reaching degree milestones, and progress toward career goals / developing credentials. Each of these 3 domains is rated using a 3-point rating scale (0 = unsatisfactory, 1 = satisfactory, 2 = excellent) by the Clinical and Experimental Program Directors at the end of the academic year.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Documents
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target: No target established.

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

Psychology PhD action plan

No changes in assessment measures are anticipated. Existing measures will continue to be monitored.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- **Measure**: Comparison of enrollment | **Outcome/Objective**: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
- **Measure**: Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure**: Specialization Coursework Rubric | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure**: Survey administered to experimental students | **Outcome/Objective**: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

Implementation Description: No changes are anticipated.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: David Boles

SLO 2: Demonstrate competent research skills
Demonstrate competent research skills.

Connected Documents
- Psychology Curriculum Map PhD
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

Relevant Associations:

Reflective statement: Measure 3 indicates an excellent outcome for 63% of students in the reporting sample. Measure 4 indicates an excellent outcome for 92% of students in the reporting sample, compared to 67% previously.

Implemented changes: No changes were made.

Change to be implemented: No change; we will continue to monitor measures 3 and 4.

Related Measures

M 3: Preliminary Oral Exam Rubric
Preliminary Oral Exam Rubric. This rubric is used to assess students' performance on their preliminary oral defense, and reflects the quality of the student's dissertation plan based on both the written document and the oral presentation. At a minimum, each student should achieve 14 points of a possible 27. An achievement of 14-19 is considered competent, an achievement of 20-22 is considered good, and an achievement of 23-27 is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Connected Documents
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013
**M 4: Final Oral Exam Rubric**

Final Oral Exam Rubric. This rubric is used to assess students' performance on their final oral defense, and reflects the quality of the student's dissertation research based on both the written document and the oral presentation. At a minimum, each student should achieve 14 points of a possible 27. An achievement of 14-19 is considered competent, an achievement of 20-22 is considered good, and an achievement of 23-27 is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Connected Documents**
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

**Target:**
- No target established.

**SLO 3: Demonstrate competent clinical skills**

Demonstrate competent clinical skills.

**Connected Documents**
- Psychology Curriculum Map PhD
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Relevant Associations:**

Reflective statement: Measure 5 indicates an excellent outcome for 85% of students in the reporting sample. Measure 6 indicates that 100% of students in the reporting sample completed internships with positive evaluation, compared to 100% previously.

Implemented changes: No changes were made.

Change to be implemented: No change; we will continue to monitor measures 5 and 6.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Clinical Skills Rubric**

Clinical Skills Rubric. This rubric assesses students' clinical skills via supervisor ratings of assessment, case presentation, ethical considerations, social responsibility, and psychotherapy. At a minimum, each student should achieve 10 points of a possible 15. An achievement of 12-13 points is considered good, and an achievement of 14-15 points is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Documents**
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

**Target:**
- No target established.

**M 6: Successful completion of the year-long clinical internship**

Successful completion of the year-long clinical internship, with positive evaluation from the internship site supervisor. Goal is for each student to complete the internship with positive evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Documents**
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

**Target:**
- Target is for each student to complete the internship with positive evaluation.

**SLO 4: Demonstrate competent teaching skills**

Demonstrate competent teaching skills.

**Connected Documents**
- Psychology Curriculum Map PhD
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Relevant Associations:**

Reflective statement: Measure 7 is available for only one student in the reporting sample. Measure 8 indicates that 23% of students in the reporting sample had an excellent outcome, compared to 57% previously.

Implemented changes: No changes were made.

Change to be implemented: No change; we will continue to monitor measures 7 and 8.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Teaching Skills Rubric**

Teaching Skills Rubric. This rubric measures students' teaching skills during the semester in which they take the Teaching of Psychology course and teach their own section of PY101 Introduction to Psychology. Ratings are
provided by the instructor of the Teaching of Psychology course on 7 items, covering several aspects of effective teaching. At a minimum each student should achieve 14 points of a possible 21. An achievement of 16-17 points is considered good, and an achievement of 18-21 points is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Documents
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target:
No target established.

M 8: Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI) ratings
Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI) ratings are used to measure the undergraduate response to graduate students’ teaching. SOIs completed during the semester the student took Teaching of Psychology and taught PY101 are used. At a minimum students should achieve a mean of 3.0 for Course and 3.0 for Instructor. An achievement of 3.6 - 4.2 on both Course and Instructor ratings is considered good, and an achievement of 4.3 to 5.0 on both Course and Instructor ratings is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Documents
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target:
No target established.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcn 5: Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Relevant Associations:

Reflective statement: Measure 9 indicates that the Ph.D. program is of exceptionally high quality. Measure 10 indicates that many characteristics of the doctoral program are of high quality, but outcomes-vs.-goals assessments are deferred for 2 years.

Implemented changes: The decision was made to leave both measures in qualitative form.

Change to be implemented: No change; we will continue to monitor measures 9 and 10.

Related Measures

M 9: Assessment of Program Quality using Departmental Review
Assessment of the level of recognized program quality using Departmental Review. The decision was made to leave this rubric in qualitative form.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Document
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target:
No target established.

M 10: Assessment of Program Quality using APA
Assessment of the level of recognized program quality using American Psychological Association (APA) Accreditation of our Clinical PhD program. The decision was made to leave this rubric in qualitative form.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Connected Document
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target:
No target established.

OthOtcn 6: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Relevant Associations:

Reflective statement: Measure 11 indicates the department has slightly above average enrollment compared to others in our Carnegie classification. Measure 12 indicates a one-year graduation rate greatly above the ACHE visibility standard, which is also well advanced over the previous year’s rate.

Implemented changes: No changes.

Change to be implemented: No change; we will continue to monitor measures 11 and 12.

Related Measures

M 11: Comparison of enrollment
Comparison of enrollment to those of psychology departments with PhD programs at peer institutions in the same Carnegie Category.
Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

**Connected Document**
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

**Target:**
No target established.

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

**Psychology PhD action plan**
No changes in assessment measures are anticipated. Existing measures will continue to be monitored.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure:** Comparison of enrollment | **Outcome/Objective:** Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
- **Measure:** Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure:** Specialization Coursework Rubric | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure:** Survey administered to experimental students | **Outcome/Objective:** Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

Implementation Description: No changes are anticipated.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: David Boles

**M 12: Comparison of the number of degree completions**
Comparison of the number of degree completions to the optimum level of degree completions using Alabama Commission on Higher Education (ACHE) viability standards.
Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

**Connected Document**
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target:
No target established.

**OthOtcm 7: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates**
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

**Relevant Associations:**
Reflective statement: Measure 13 indicates a modest increase in the valuation of the clinical program by clinical students. Measure 14 indicates a fairly high valuation of the experimental program by experimental students.

Implemented changes: No changes.

Change to be implemented: No change; we will continue to monitor measures 13 and 14

**Related Measures**

**M 13: Survey administered to clinical students**
Survey administered to year 3+ students as part of a Self-study of the Clinical PhD program.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Connected Document**
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target:
No target established.

**M 14: Survey administered to experimental students**
Survey to be designed for administration to year 4 students in the Experimental PhD program.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Connected Document**
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target:
No target established.

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

**Psychology PhD action plan**
No changes in assessment measures are anticipated. Existing measures will continue to be monitored.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

- **Measure:** Comparison of enrollment | **Outcome/Objective:** Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
- **Measure:** Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure:** Specialization Coursework Rubric | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
knowledge in area of specialization

Measure: Survey administered to experimental students | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

Implementation Description: No changes are anticipated.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: David Boles

OthOtcM 8: Evaluation of Outcome Achievements
The Director of Graduate Studies will review the findings from the previous year and highlight the outcome with the most improvement.

Related Measures

M 15: Most Improved Outcome
The outcome from the previous year that had the most improvement.
Source of Evidence: Evaluations

Target:
Outcome with most achievement.

Finding (2013-2014) - Target: Met
The most improved assessment in the 2012-2013 cycle, by percent improvement, was for measure 12, comparison of the number of degree completions. Ph.D. degree completions increased from 9 to 15, a 67% increase.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Psychology PhD action plan
No changes in assessment measures are anticipated. Existing measures will continue to be monitored.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comparison of enrollment | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
Measure: Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
Measure: Specialization Coursework Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
Measure: Survey administered to experimental students | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

Implementation Description: No changes are anticipated.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: David Boles
Mission / Purpose

The Department of Psychology seeks to provide the highest quality education and training for undergraduate and graduate students via our teaching, research, and community outreach. Student involvement in these three areas is integral to our mission. At the undergraduate level, the Department of Psychology offers the BA and BS degrees. We also have an Honors Program in Psychology. Our primary mission is to prepare undergraduate majors for graduate work in Psychology and related disciplines. We also strive to provide the highest quality education and training for students obtaining majors and minors in Psychology, as well as students satisfying social science requirements and requirements of other academic units. At the Graduate level, the Department of Psychology offers the Ph.D. and M.A. degrees in psychology in seven concentrations across experimental and clinical psychology. Students are only admitted to the Ph.D. program and earn their M.A. as they work toward the Ph.D. The primary mission of the graduate program is to promote independent scholarship, excellent teaching skills, and clinical skills related to each student's concentration. The graduate program has a goal of producing 8-10 Ph.D.'s each year who, upon graduation, will fill psychology-related positions. The American Psychological Association has accredited the Clinical Training Program for the past 40 years, and the department intends to continue to hold the high standards associated with that accreditation.

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

SLO 1: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
Demonstrate knowledge in the student's area of specialization.

Connected Documents
Psychology Curriculum Map PhD
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

Relevant Associations:
Reflective statement: No data are available for this outcome.
Implemented changes: n/a.
Change to be implemented: Both measures will be replaced effective in fall 2012.

Related Measures

M 1: Specialization Coursework Rubric
The replacement rubric is completed by the instructors of specialized courses (PY 608, 610, 612, 666, 677, 687, 690; and 693 if cognitive, developmental, or social) for each student who has completed their course. It consists of a 4-point rating scale (0 = inadequate mastery of the course material, 1 = minimally adequate mastery of the course material, 2 = good mastery of the course material, 3 = excellent mastery of the course material).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Documents
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Data collection has begun on current students. Findings will not be available until the graduation of a reporting sample that has had the opportunity to take each of the core courses.

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

Psychology PhD action plan

Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization outcome: both measures to be replaced effective fall 2012. Replacements have already been approved by faculty.

Sustain optimal level of enrollment outcome: the first measure (Comparison of enrollment) will be implemented this year.

Will be highly valued by program graduates outcome: the second measure (Survey administered to experimental students) will be implemented this year.

All of these actions are intended to further complete the set of measures. Once the measures have been collected and replicated, it should be possible to use assessment findings to formulate future action plans.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comparison of enrollment | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
M 2: Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric

The replacement rubric measures students' cumulative knowledge by way of Student Activity Report (SAR) evaluations of progress in the domains of course work, progress in reaching degree milestones, and progress toward career goals / developing credentials. Each of these 3 domains is rated using a 3-point rating scale (0 = unsatisfactory, 1 = satisfactory, 2 = excellent) by the Clinical and Experimental Program Directors at the end of the academic year.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Implementation Description: Design and implement 4 new measures.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: David Boles

SLO 2: Demonstrate competent research skills

Demonstrate competent research skills.

Connected Documents

Psychology Curriculum Map PhD
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
Measure: Specialization Coursework Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
Measure: Survey administered to experimental students | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

Implementation Description: Design and implement 4 new measures.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: David Boles

M 3: Preliminary Oral Exam Rubric

Preliminary Oral Exam Rubric. This rubric is used to assess students' performance on their preliminary oral defense,
and reflects the quality of the student's dissertation plan based on both the written document and the oral presentation. At a minimum, each student should achieve 14 points of a possible 27. An achievement of 14-19 is considered competent, an achievement of 20-22 is considered good, and an achievement of 23-27 is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Connected Documents
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target: No target established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Completed rubrics are available for 8 of the 15 students in the reporting sample, defined as those students who graduated with their MA degree in Psychology in the May, August, and December graduations. (Note: Many of the students in the sample completed their preliminary exam prior to adoption of the rubric.) Of the 8, 5 students were rated excellent, 2 were rated good, and 1 was rated competent. The highest rated items were Organization and clarity of presentation (mean= 2.80), Ability to use the English language (2.80), and Response to questions (2.59). The lowest rated were Soundness of conceptual analysis of problem (2.18) and Grasp of methodological context of the problem (2.22). Taken together, these results indicate thesis research quality well above the required minimum, with a rating of excellent for 63% (5/8) of the students in the reporting sample for whom data are available.

M 4: Final Oral Exam Rubric
Final Oral Exam Rubric. This rubric is used to assess students' performance on their final oral defense, and reflects the quality of the student's dissertation research based on both the written document and the oral presentation. At a minimum, each student should achieve 14 points of a possible 27. An achievement of 14-19 is considered competent, an achievement of 20-22 is considered good, and an achievement of 23-27 is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Connected Documents
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target: No target established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Completed rubrics are available for 13 of 15 students in the reporting sample, defined as those students who graduated with their PhD degree in Psychology in the May, August, and December graduations. Of these, 12 students were rated excellent, and 1 was rated competent. The highest rated items were Response to questions (2.86), Organization and clarity of presentation (2.84), and Grasp of theoretical context of the problem (2.83). The lowest rated were Soundness of conceptual analysis of problem (2.74) and Appropriateness and adequacy of data analyses (2.77). Taken together, these results indicate final oral defense quality above the required minimum in all students, with a rating of excellent for 92% (12/13) of the students in the reporting sample. This compares to 67% in the previous assessment.

SLO 3: Demonstrate competent clinical skills
Demonstrate competent clinical skills.

Connected Documents
Psychology Curriculum Map PhD
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

Relevant Associations:
Reflective statement: Based on one of two measures that are available, this outcome is highly favorable and is equivalent to that from the previous assessment.

Implemented changes: n/a.

Change to be implemented: None planned. We may have data from the first measure this year, if students for whom it is available graduate and become part of the reporting sample.

Related Measures

M 5: Clinical Skills Rubric
Clinical Skills Rubric. This rubric assesses students' clinical skills via supervisor ratings of assessment, case presentation, ethical considerations, social responsibility, and psychotherapy. At a minimum, each student should achieve 10 points of a possible 15. An achievement of 12-13 points is considered good, and an achievement of 14-15 points is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Documents
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target: No target established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Completed rubrics are available for all 13 of clinical students in the reporting sample, defined as those students who graduated with their PhD degree in Psychology in the May, August, and December graduations. Of these, 11 students were rated excellent, and 2 were rated satisfactory. The highest rated item was Assessment usage and selection (2.92), and the lowest rated was Psychotherapy skills and knowledge (2.77).
These results indicate final oral defense quality above the required minimum in most students, with a rating of excellent for 85% (11/13) of the students in the reporting sample. There are no previous figures for comparison.

**M 6: Successful completion of the year-long clinical internship**

Successful completion of the year-long clinical internship, with positive evaluation from the internship site supervisor.

Goal is for each student to complete the internship with positive evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Documents**

Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

**Target:**

Target is for each student to complete the internship with positive evaluation.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

All 13 of the clinical students in the reporting sample undertook year-long clinical internships. All 13 (100%) successfully completed their internship with positive evaluation from the internship site supervisor. This compares to 100% in the previous assessment.

**SLO 4: Demonstrate competent teaching skills**

Demonstrate competent teaching skills.

**Connected Documents**

Psychology Curriculum Map PhD
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Relevant Associations:**

Reflective statement: Based on one of two measures that are available, this outcome is favorable and shows improvement from the previous assessment.

Implemented changes: n/a.

Change to be implemented: None planned. We may have data from the first measure this year, if students for whom it is available graduate and become part of the reporting sample.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Teaching Skills Rubric**

Teaching Skills Rubric. This rubric measures students' teaching skills during the semester in which they take the Teaching of Psychology course and teach their own section of PY101 Introduction to Psychology. Ratings are provided by the instructor of the Teaching of Psychology course on 7 items, covering several aspects of effective teaching. At a minimum each student should achieve 14 points of a possible 21. An achievement of 16-17 points is considered good, and an achievement of 18-21 points is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Documents**

Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

**Target:**

No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Completed rubrics are available for only 1 of 15 students in the reporting sample, defined as those students who graduated with their PhD degree in Psychology in the May, August, and December graduations. The single student was rated satisfactory, with all items rated 2.00. Very little can be made of this isolated result. There are no previous figures for comparison.

**M 8: Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI) ratings**

Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI) ratings are used to measure the undergraduate response to graduate students' teaching. SOIs completed during the semester the student took Teaching of Psychology and taught PY101 are used.

At a minimum students should achieve a mean of 3.0 for Course and 3.0 for Instructor. An achievement of 3.6 - 4.2 on both Course and Instructor ratings is considered good, and an achievement of 4.3 to 5.0 on both Course and Instructor ratings is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Documents**

Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

**Target:**

No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**

Of the 15 students in the reporting sample (defined as those students who graduated with their PhD degree in Psychology in the May, August, and December graduations), 13 took Teaching of Psychology. SOIs are available for all 13 of the semester they took the course and taught PY101. Of these, 3 were excellent, 7 were good, 2 were satisfactory, and 1 was unsatisfactory. These results indicate Student Opinion of Instruction above the required minimum in 12 of 13 students, with a rating of excellent for 23% (3/13) of the students in the reporting sample for whom data were available. This compares to 57% in the previous assessment.
Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 5: Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Relevant Associations:

Reflective statement: No data are available for this outcome.

Implemented changes: n/a.

Change to be implemented: Both measures will be quantified in a future assessment cycle.

Related Measures

M 9: Assessment of Program Quality using Departmental Review
Assessment of the level of recognized program quality using Departmental Review. The decision was made to leave this rubric in qualitative form.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Connected Document
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met

In 2011-2, the department was reviewed by the The Office for Academic Affairs under authority from the Provost. The external consultant characterized the Ph.D. program as follows:

"The Department of Psychology at the University of Alabama has, for a number of years, been a very strong academic department that has also been consistently under-recognized nationally for its quality and accomplishments. More recently, the department has engaged in a number of initiatives that have served to further strengthen their programs considerably, including expanding the Experimental Program, making a number of outstanding junior faculty hires, and implementing efforts to enhance the activity and visibility of the department's research programs. These initiatives have clearly paid off, as is reflected in part by the department's rise in the recently released latest NRC rankings: The department is now clearly within the second quartile of doctoral programs (S-rankings of 67-121 out of 237), whereas the department was clearly below the national mean in the immediately preceding NRC rankings (112 out of 185). In my view, the department currently stands among the top 10% of the schools listed as "Peer" departments of psychology, and can continue to raise their national reputation to a level comparable to those schools listed as "Aspirational" psychology departments.

"The strengths of the current department are numerous, including an exceptional degree of collegiality and supportive atmosphere that is rarely seen in psychology departments, strong and visionary leadership within the department provided by the chair as well as by other senior faculty, and productive and energetic junior faculty members with high potential for national and international recognition. Despite these strengths, however, a few obstacles to growth still remain that serve to highlight areas of opportunity that can be targeted in order to promote continued growth of the department and to enhance its profile. The Department of Psychology is in many ways a hidden gem, and the implementation of some relatively modest initiatives could lead to substantial gains in national standing."

The internal review committee evaluated the department as follows:

"The Department of Psychology has consistently been one of the most well-rounded and strongest departments in the College of Arts and Sciences for many years. The department has several notable strengths; given the reputation of the department, the committee members went into this review process leery of being able to find sufficient areas of opportunity to complete this report. Administrators at the University spoke most highly of the department during the interview process.

"1. Collegiality. This is perhaps the most consistent finding from our interviews with all stakeholders. The department has a reputation for good leadership and excellent functioning; the faculty uniformly agree that the department functions excellently using a consensus-driven decision-making process; and office staff and students at all levels speak of being treated with respect and observing respectfully relations among the faculty.

"2. Research. Rapid growth of a strong research profile, as evidenced by high and increasing NRC rankings; high faculty productivity in terms of quantity and quality of publications, presentations, and grant submissions; two robust and productive research centers (CMHA, CPYBP) that serve as a hub for grantwriting and research collaborations; and strong recent faculty hires. The department has also made forward-looking investments in their research program, such as the hiring of a departmental grantwriting specialist who several faculty cited as a major asset.

"3. Excellence and innovation in teaching. The department has been experimenting with a wide array of complementary approaches to maintaining and enhancing teaching quality at both undergraduate and graduate levels, even while enrollment grows. Particularly important innovations include the highly regarded "Teaching in Psychology" graduate seminar that prepares graduate students to transition from leading sections to being instructors of record; building a robust and successful online curriculum which competes favorably with traditional instructional formats in terms of student satisfaction and performance, while not seeking to replace traditional in-class sections; building a well-structured curriculum where courses systematically build on each other; the development of discussion sections where needed for certain unavoidably large service courses; and ample undergraduate research experiences both inside and outside of the departmental honors program. The undergraduate honors program is especially impressive innovation, a model for the university in terms of effectiveness in structuring a research thesis experience for the most qualified undergraduates.

"4. Quality of department chair. Effective departmental leadership is in place that provides vision and
4. Quality of department chair. Effective departmental leadership is in place that provides vision and direction for a large and complex department, balancing the needs of multiple constituencies (clinical vs. experimental and its multiple subfields) without sacrificing the consensus-driven approach noted earlier.

"5. Vibrant graduate program. The Department has been able to attract excellent students have generated a strong record of graduate student retention, graduation, and post-graduate success and vibrant environment for research and learning in the department."

Thus this qualitative rubric shows the program to be of exceptionally high quality.

M 10: Assessment of Program Quality using APA
Assessment of the level of recognized program quality using American Psychological Association (APA) Accreditation of our Clinical PhD program. The decision was made to leave this rubric in qualitative form.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Connected Document Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target: No target established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
In 2012-3, the department participated in an APA Accreditation review of the Ph.D. clinical program. The Commission on Accreditation issued its assessment in May 2013, accrediting the program until 2015. The great majority of its assessment concerned the Ph.D. program.

The assessment indicated that "The program has a committed, highly qualified, and talented group of core faculty" and "is successful in recruiting targeted numbers of highly qualified students with interests that match the training model". It has also "documented systematic, long-term efforts to attract and retain students and faculty from diverse backgrounds".

With respect to student-faculty relations, it was noted that the program treats students "with courtesy, respect, collegiality, and ethical sensitivity". However, some deficiencies were noted in the reporting (not necessarily the positive achievement) of outcomes as tied to training goals and objectives.

In summary, the program was viewed as successful in attracting appropriately-oriented, highly qualified students, including student from diverse backgrounds. The program was found to treat students in a courteous, respectful, collegial, and ethical manner. Assessment of the match between outcomes and goals was deferred until the next accreditation review in 2015.

Thus this qualitative rubric finds many characteristics of the doctoral program to be of high quality, but outcomes-vs.-goals analyses are deferred for 2 years.

OthOtcm 6: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Relevant Associations: Reflective statement: Based on one of two measures that are available, this outcome is favorable. A reduction in the number of PhDs relative to last year bears watching to determine whether or not it is a continuing trend.

Implemented changes: n/a.

Change to be implemented: The first measure will be implemented sometime this year.

Related Measures

M 11: Comparison of enrollment
Comparison of enrollment to those of psychology departments with PhD programs at peer institutions in the same Carnegie Category.

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

Connected Document Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

Target: No target established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The University of Alabama is in the Carnegie classification of Comprehensive doctoral (no medical/veterinary). In the last list available to us, there were 56 institutions in the category, 50 of which had departments of psychology with full-time enrollments given in Graduate Study in Psychology (2011). Our department had a full-time enrollment of 98, ranking 23rd of 50 (54th percentile where the top rank is the 100th percentile). Thus our department compares well with other universities in our Carnegie classification.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Psychology PhD action plan

Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization outcome: both measures to be replaced effective fall 2012. Replacements have already been approved by faculty.

Sustain optimal level of enrollment outcome: the first measure (Comparison of enrollment) will be implemented this year.

Will be highly valued by program graduates outcome: the second measure (Survey administered to experimental students) will be implemented this year.

All of these actions are intended to further complete the set of measures. Once the measures have
been collected and replicated, it should be possible to use assessment findings to formulate future action plans.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Comparison of enrollment | **Outcome/Objective:** Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
- **Measure:** Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure:** Specialization Coursework Rubric | **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure:** Survey administered to experimental students | **Outcome/Objective:** Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

**Implementation Description:** Design and implement 4 new measures.
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013
**Responsible Person/Group:** David Boles

**M 12: Comparison of the number of degree completions**
Comparison of the number of degree completions to the optimum level of degree completions using Alabama Commission on Higher Education (ACHE) viability standards.

**Source of Evidence:** Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

**Connected Document**
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The Alabama Commission on Higher Education (ACHE) viability standards indicate that a PhD program should have an average of 2.25 graduates per year. In the reporting period (May, August, and December 2011 graduations), the department graduated 15 PhD students. The department's one-year graduation rate for PhD students in 2012 was substantially above the ACHE viability standard, exceeding it by 567%. This compares to 300% in the previous assessment.

**OthOtm 7: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates**
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

**Relevant Associations:**
Reflective statement: Based on one of two measures that are available, this outcome is favorable, but there is no previous assessment of the outcome to compare it to.

Implemented changes: n/a.

Change to be implemented: The second measure will be implemented sometime this coming year.

**Related Measures**

**M 13: Survey administered to clinical students**
Survey administered to year 3+ students as part of a Self-study of the Clinical PhD program.

**Source of Evidence:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Connected Document**
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
A questionnaire administered to year 3+ clinical students in 2012-2013 produced the following means. 5.91 courseload (0 = extremely underloaded, 10 = extremely overloaded); 7.45 quality of instructors (0 = poor, 10 = excellent); 7.73 financial support (0 = inadequate, 10 = ample); 8.27 department has a scientist-practitioner philosophy (0 = strongly disagree, 10 = strongly agree); 8.73 experiences have been “as advertised” (0 = strongly disagree, 10 = strongly agree); 9.55 satisfaction with choice of University of Alabama (0 = extremely dissatisfied, 10= extremely satisfied). Gains (+) or losses (-) in these categories, relative to 2011-2012, were -.46 (courseload), -.23 (quality of instructors), +1.84 (financial support), -.10 (scientist-practitioner philosophy), +.51 (experiences as advertised), and +.96 (satisfaction with choice of university). The program is highly valued by current PhD students, with a mean of 7.94 (of 10) across items, an increase of .50 from the previous assessment, indicating it will be highly valued by future graduates.

**M 14: Survey administered to experimental students**
Survey to be designed for administration to year 4 students in the Experimental PhD program.

**Source of Evidence:** Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Connected Document**
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales 2013

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
A questionnaire administered to year 3+ experimental students in 2012-2013 produced the following means:
5.36 course load (0 = extremely underloaded, 10 = extremely overloaded); 7.82 quality of instructors (0 = poor, 10 = excellent); 7.55 financial support (0 = inadequate, 10 = ample); 8.18 experiences have been “as advertised” (0 = strongly disagree, 10 = strongly agree); 9.09 satisfaction with choice of University of Alabama (0 = extremely dissatisfied, 10 = extremely satisfied). Together these results indicate that the Ph.D. program in experimental psychology is highly valued by students, with a mean across items of 7.60. There are no previous comparative data.

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

Psychology PhD action plan

Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization outcome: both measures to be replaced effective fall 2012. Replacements have already been approved by faculty.

Sustain optimal level of enrollment outcome: the first measure (Comparison of enrollment) will be implemented this year.

Will be highly valued by program graduates outcome: the second measure (Survey administered to experimental students) will be implemented this year.

All of these actions are intended to further complete the set of measures. Once the measures have been collected and replicated, it should be possible to use assessment findings to formulate future action plans.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comparison of enrollment | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
Measure: Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
Measure: Specialization Coursework Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
Measure: Survey administered to experimental students | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

Implementation Description: Design and implement 4 new measures.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: David Boles

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Psychology PhD action plan

Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization outcome: both measures to be replaced effective fall 2012. Replacements have already been approved by faculty.

Sustain optimal level of enrollment outcome: the first measure (Comparison of enrollment) will be implemented this year.

Will be highly valued by program graduates outcome: the second measure (Survey administered to experimental students) will be implemented this year.

All of these actions are intended to further complete the set of measures. Once the measures have been collected and replicated, it should be possible to use assessment findings to formulate future action plans.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Comparison of enrollment | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
Measure: Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
Measure: Specialization Coursework Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
Measure: Survey administered to experimental students | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

Implementation Description: Design and implement 4 new measures.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: David Boles
Mission / Purpose

The Department of Psychology seeks to provide the highest quality education and training for undergraduate and graduate students via our teaching, research, and community outreach. Student involvement in these three areas is integral to our mission. At the undergraduate level, the Department of Psychology offers the BA and BS degrees. We also have an Honors Program in Psychology. Our primary mission is to prepare undergraduate majors for graduate work in Psychology and related disciplines. We also strive to provide the highest quality education and training for students obtaining majors and minors in Psychology, as well as students satisfying social science requirements and requirements of other academic units. At the Graduate level, the Department of Psychology offers the Ph.D. and M.A. degrees in psychology in seven concentrations across experimental and clinical psychology. Students are only admitted to the Ph.D. program and earn their M.A. as they work toward the Ph.D. The primary mission of the graduate program is to promote independent scholarship, excellent teaching skills, and clinical skills related to each student's concentration. The graduate program has a goal of producing 8-10 Ph.D.’s each year who, upon graduation, will fill psychology-related positions. The American Psychological Association has accredited the Clinical Training Program for the past 40 years, and the department intends to continue to hold the high standards associated with that accreditation.

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

SLO 1: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization

To demonstrate knowledge in the student's area of specialization. Student Learning Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). We plan to replace the Specialization Coursework Rubric, eliminating any reference to student grades.

We will begin to implement the Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric this year.

Connected Documents
- Psychology Curriculum Map PhD
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

Relevant Associations:

Reflective statement: No data are available for this outcome.

Implemented changes: n/a.

Change to be implemented: Both measures will be replaced effective in fall 2012.

Related Measures

M 1: Specialization Coursework Rubric
Specialization Coursework Rubric. This rubric measures students' knowledge using their performance in coursework in their specialization area. At a minimum, each student should achieve 8 points. An achievement of 10 points is considered very good, and an achievement of 12 or more points is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Connected Document
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
No data are presented for this measure, because the department faculty have agreed to replace it to eliminate any reference to grades. The replacement will become effective in fall 2012.

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

Psychology PhD action plan

Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization outcome: both measures to be replaced effective fall 2012. Replacements have already been approved by faculty.

Sustain optimal level of enrollment outcome: the first measure (Comparison of enrollment) will be implemented this year.

Will be highly valued by program graduates outcome: the second measure (Survey administered to experimental students) will be implemented this year.

All of these actions are intended to further complete the set of measures. Once the measures have been collected and replicated, it should be possible to use assessment findings to formulate future action plans.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Comparison of enrollment | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
**Measure**: Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization

**Measure**: Specialization Coursework Rubric | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization

**Measure**: Survey administered to experimental students | **Outcome/Objective**: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

**Implementation Description**: Design and implement 4 new measures.

**Projected Completion Date**: 05/2013

**Responsible Person/Group**: David Boles

---

**M 2: Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric**

Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric. This rubric measures students' knowledge via faculty assessment of students' knowledge of major theories, research traditions, and influential studies in the student's specialization area. At a minimum, each student should achieve 6 points. An achievement of 7-8 points is considered very good, and an achievement of 9 points is considered excellent.

**Source of Evidence**: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Document**: Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

No data are presented for this measure, which the department faculty have agreed to replace. The reason for the replacement is that a polling of faculty in fall 2011 indicated that advisors do not believe they can necessarily assess knowledge in these specific areas. The replacement will become effective in fall 2012

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

**Psychology PhD action plan**

Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization outcome: both measures to be replaced effective fall 2012. Replacements have already been approved by faculty.

Sustain optimal level of enrollment outcome: the first measure (Comparison of enrollment) will be implemented this year.

Will be highly valued by program graduates outcome: the second measure (Survey administered to experimental students) will be implemented this year.

All of these actions are intended to further complete the set of measures. Once the measures have been collected and replicated, it should be possible to use assessment findings to formulate future action plans.

**Established in Cycle**: 2011-2012

**Implementation Status**: Planned

**Priority**: High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**

- **Measure**: Comparison of enrollment | **Outcome/Objective**: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
- **Measure**: Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure**: Specialization Coursework Rubric | **Outcome/Objective**: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure**: Survey administered to experimental students | **Outcome/Objective**: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

**Implementation Description**: Design and implement 4 new measures.

**Projected Completion Date**: 05/2013

**Responsible Person/Group**: David Boles

---

**SLO 2: Demonstrate competent research skills**

To demonstrate competent research skills. Student Learning Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). We should have data from the Preliminary Oral Exam Rubric this year. We will need to replicate it and also replicate the results from the Final Oral Exam Rubric before decisions can be made about improvements.

**Connected Documents**

- Psychology Curriculum Map PhD
- Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Relevant Associations**: Reflective statement: Based on one of two measures that are available, this outcome is favorable but may show slight deterioration from the previous assessment.

Implemented changes: n/a.

Change to be implemented: No changes planned. Data from the first measure will be available as students graduate and become part of the reporting sample.

**Related Measures**

**M 3: Preliminary Oral Exam Rubric**

Preliminary Oral Exam Rubric. This rubric is used to assess students’ performance on their preliminary oral defense, and reflects the quality of the student's dissertation plan based on both the written document and the oral presentation. At a minimum, each student should achieve 14 points of a possible 27. An achievement of 14-19 is considered competent, an achievement of 20-22 is considered good, and an achievement of 23-27 is considered
excellent.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Connected Document**
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data are presented for this measure at this time, because all of the students in the reporting sample (defined as those students who graduated with their PhD degree in Psychology in the May, August, and December graduations) completed their preliminary oral exam before the implementation of the rubric in fall 2010.

**M 4: Final Oral Exam Rubric**
Final Oral Exam Rubric. This rubric is used to assess students' performance on their final oral defense, and reflects the quality of the student's dissertation research based on both the written document and the oral presentation. At a minimum, each student should achieve 14 points of a possible 27. An achievement of 14-19 is considered competent, an achievement of 20-22 is considered good, and an achievement of 23-27 is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

**Connected Document**
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**
Results Summary:
Completed rubrics are available for all 9 students in the reporting sample, defined as those students who graduated with their PhD degree in Psychology in the May, August, and December graduations. Of these, 6 students were rated excellent, 2 were rated good, and 1 was rated competent. The highest rated items were Ability to use the English language to communicate (mean= 2.75) and Relation of problem to existing literature (2.72), and the lowest rated were Appropriateness and adequacy of data analyses (2.31) and Adequacy of experimental and/or measurement operations (2.36).

**Interpretations and Conclusions:**
Taken together, these results indicate final oral defense quality well above the required minimum in 8 of 9 students, with a rating of excellent for 67% (6/9) of the students in the reporting sample. This compares to 75% in the previous assessment.

**SLO 3: Demonstrate competent clinical skills**
To demonstrate competent clinical skills. Student Learning Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). We will need to replicate the results of both measures before making any decisions about improvements.

**Connected Documents**
Psychology Curriculum Map PhD
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Relevant Associations:**
Reflective statement: Based on one of two measures that are available, this outcome is highly favorable and is equivalent to that from the previous assessment.

Implemented changes: n/a.

Change to be implemented: None planned. We may have data from the first measure this year, if students for whom it is available graduate and become part of the reporting sample.

**Related Measures**

**M 5: Clinical Skills Rubric**
Clinical Skills Rubric. This rubric assesses students' clinical skills via supervisor ratings of assessment, case presentation, ethical considerations, social responsibility, and psychotherapy. At a minimum, each student should achieve 10 points of a possible 15. An achievement of 12-13 points is considered good, and an achievement of 14-15 points is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Document**
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data are presented for this measure at this time, because the rubric had not yet been properly implemented at the end of the academic year prior to the year in which the students received the PhD degree, for the reporting sample.

(Note: Results for this rubric were reported in error in the last assessment. The rubric calls for using a form completed by the Director of Clinical Psychology at the end of the academic year prior to the year in which the student has received the PhD degree. Instead, the last assessment used the form completed the
same year as the one in which the student received the PhD degree. Because of internal departmental confusion over this difference, the proper data were also not collected for the present reporting sample.)

**M 6: Successful completion of the year-long clinical internship**
Successful completion of the year-long clinical internship, with positive evaluation from the internship site supervisor. Goal is for each student to complete the internship with positive evaluation.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Document**  
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Target:**  
Target is for each student to complete the internship with positive evaluation.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

**Results Summary:**
Five of the students in the reporting sample undertook year-long clinical internships. All 5 successfully completed their internship with positive evaluation from the internship site supervisor.

**Interpretations and Conclusions:**
The target is fully met, with 100% of those students in the reporting sample who took internships having completed them with positive evaluation. This compares to 100% in the previous assessment.

**SLO 4: Demonstrate competent teaching skills**
To demonstrate competent teaching skills. Student Learning Outcome #4 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report). We may have data from the Teaching Skills Rubric this year. We will need to replicate it and also replicate the results from the Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI) ratings before decisions can be made about improvements.

**Connected Documents**  
Psychology Curriculum Map PhD  
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Relevant Associations:**
Reflective statement: Based on one of two measures that are available, this outcome is favorable and shows improvement from the previous assessment.

Implemented changes: n/a.

Change to be implemented: None planned. We may have data from the first measure this year, if students for whom it is available graduate and become part of the reporting sample.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Teaching Skills Rubric**
Teaching Skills Rubric. This rubric measures students' teaching skills during the semester in which they take the Teaching of Psychology course and teach their own section of PY101 Introduction to Psychology. Ratings are provided by the instructor of the Teaching of Psychology course, and cover several aspects of effective teaching. At a minimum each student should achieve 10 points of a possible 15. An achievement of 12-13 points is considered good, and an achievement of 14-15 points is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Document**  
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Target:**  
No target established.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
No data are presented for this measure at this time, because all of the students in the reporting sample who completed Teaching of Psychology did so before the implementation of the rubric in fall 2010.

**M 8: Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI) ratings**
Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI) ratings are used to measure the undergraduate response to graduate students' teaching. SOIs completed during the semester the student took Teaching of Psychology and taught PY101 are used. At a minimum students should achieve a mean of 3.0 for Course and 3.0 for Instructor. An achievement of 3.6 - 4.2 on both Course and Instructor ratings is considered good, and an achievement of 4.3 to 5.0 on both Course and Instructor ratings is considered excellent.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

**Connected Document**  
Psychology Graduate Rubrics and Scales

**Target:**  
No target established.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**

**Results Summary:**
Of the 9 students in the reporting sample (defined as those students who graduated with their PhD degree in Psychology in the May, August, and December graduations), 8 took Teaching of Psychology. SOIs are available for 7 of the 8 from the semester they took the course and taught PY101. Of these, 4 were excellent, 2 were good, and 1 was competent.
Interpretations and Conclusions:

These results indicate Student Opinion of Instruction well above the required minimum in 6 of 7 students, with a rating of excellent for 57% (4/7) of the students in the reporting sample for whom data were available. This compares to 17% in the previous assessment.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

**OthOtcm 5: Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality**

The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality. Program Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced. Development of quantitative criteria for Measures 1.1 and 1.2.

**Relevant Associations:**

Reflective statement: No data are available for this outcome.

Implemented changes: n/a.

Change to be implemented: Both measures will be quantified in a future assessment cycle.

**Related Measures**

**M 9: Assessment of Program Quality using Departmental Review**

Assessment of the level of recognized program quality using Departmental Review.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**

- **Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
  
  No results reported. Although a departmental review was completed in 2011-2012, and the outcome was qualitatively very positive, we need to develop quantitative outcomes that can be extracted from this and future reviews.

**M 10: Assessment of Program Quality using APA**

Assessment of the level of recognized program quality using American Psychological Association (APA) Accreditation of our Clinical PhD program.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**

- **Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
  
  No results reported. We need to develop quantitative measures that can be extracted from APA accreditation results.

**OthOtcm 6: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment**

The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion. Program Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced. Departmental consideration of the outcomes of Measures 2.1 and 2.2, with action to be proposed to overcome any deficiencies.

**Relevant Associations:**

Reflective statement: Based on one of two measures that are available, this outcome is favorable. A reduction in the number of PhDs relative to last year bears watching to determine whether or not it is a continuing trend.

Implemented changes: n/a.

Change to be implemented: The first measure will be implemented sometime this year.

**Related Measures**

**M 11: Comparison of enrollment**

Comparison of enrollment to those of psychology departments with PhD programs at peer institutions in the same Carnegie Category.

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

**Target:**

- **Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
  
  No results reported. We need to assess enrollments in peer institutions, to allow an enrollment comparison.

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

**Psychology PhD action plan**

Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization outcome: both measures to be replaced effective fall 2012. Replacements have already been approved by faculty.

Sustain optimal level of enrollment outcome: the first measure (Comparison of enrollment) will be implemented this year.

Will be highly valued by program graduates outcome: the second measure (Survey administered to experimental students) will be implemented this year.

All of these actions are intended to further complete the set of measures. Once the measures have been collected and replicated, it should be possible to use assessment findings to formulate future action plans.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: Comparison of enrollment | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
  Measure: Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
  Measure: Specialization Coursework Rubric | Outcome/Objective: Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
  Measure: Survey administered to experimental students | Outcome/Objective: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

Implementation Description: Design and implement 4 new measures.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2013
Responsible Person/Group: David Boles

M 12: Comparison of the number of degree completions
Comparison of the number of degree completions to the optimum level of degree completions using Alabama Commission on Higher Education (ACHE) viability standards.

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met

Results Summary:
The Alabama Commission on Higher Education (ACHE) viability standards indicate that a PhD program should have an average of 2.25 graduates per year. In the reporting period (May, August, and December 2011 graduations), the department graduated 9 PhD students.

Interpretations and Conclusions:
The department’s one-year graduation rate for PhD students in 2011 was substantially above the ACHE viability standard, exceeding it by 300%. This compares to 567% in the previous assessment.

OthOtcm 7: Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves. Program Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced. Design of a survey for purposes of Measure 3.2.

Related Associations:
Reflective statement: Based on one of two measures that are available, this outcome is favorable, but there is no previous assessment of the outcome to compare it to.

Implemented changes: n/a.

Change to be implemented: The second measure will be implemented sometime this coming year.

Related Measures

M 13: Survey administered to clinical students
Survey administered to year 3+ students as part of a Self-study of the Clinical PhD program.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met

Results Summary:
A questionnaire administered to year 3+ clinical students in 2011-2012 produced the following means.
6.37 course load (0 = extremely underloaded, 10 = extremely overloaded);
7.22 quality of instructors (0 = poor, 10 = excellent);
5.89 financial support (0 = inadequate, 10 = ample);
8.37 department has a scientist-practitioner philosophy (0 = strongly disagree, 10 = strongly agree);
8.22 experiences have been "as advertised" (0 = strongly disagree, 10 = strongly agree);
8.59 satisfaction with choice of University of Alabama (0 = extremely dissatisfied, 10 = extremely satisfied).

Interpretations and Conclusions:
The program is highly valued by current PhD students, with a mean of 7.44 (of 10) across items, indicating it will be highly valued by future graduates. There are no previous data for comparison.

M 14: Survey administered to experimental students
Survey to be designed for administration to year 4 students in the Experimental PhD program.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This questionnaire is to be designed.
**Psychology PhD action plan**

Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization outcome: both measures to be replaced effective fall 2012. Replacements have already been approved by faculty.

Sustain optimal level of enrollment outcome: the first measure (Comparison of enrollment) will be implemented this year.

Will be highly valued by program graduates outcome: the second measure (Survey administered to experimental students) will be implemented this year.

All of these actions are intended to further complete the set of measures. Once the measures have been collected and replicated, it should be possible to use assessment findings to formulate future action plans.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Comparison of enrollment  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
- **Measure:** Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure:** Specialization Coursework Rubric  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure:** Survey administered to experimental students  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

**Implementation Description:** Design and implement 4 new measures.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** David Boles

---

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Psychology PhD action plan**

Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization outcome: both measures to be replaced effective fall 2012. Replacements have already been approved by faculty.

Sustain optimal level of enrollment outcome: the first measure (Comparison of enrollment) will be implemented this year.

Will be highly valued by program graduates outcome: the second measure (Survey administered to experimental students) will be implemented this year.

All of these actions are intended to further complete the set of measures. Once the measures have been collected and replicated, it should be possible to use assessment findings to formulate future action plans.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012  
**Implementation Status:** Planned  
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Comparison of enrollment  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
- **Measure:** Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure:** Specialization Coursework Rubric  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Demonstrate knowledge in area of specialization
- **Measure:** Survey administered to experimental students  |  **Outcome/Objective:** Program Outcome: Will be Highly Valued by Program Graduates

**Implementation Description:** Design and implement 4 new measures.  
**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2013  
**Responsible Person/Group:** David Boles
### CURRICULUM MAP (STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES)
Psychology Department MA and PhD Programs

**Student Learning Outcomes:**
- **MA:** SLO 1 = To demonstrate knowledge in advanced psychology
- **MA:** SLO 2 = To demonstrate competent research skills
- **PhD:** SLO 1 = To demonstrate knowledge in the student’s area of specialization
- **PhD:** SLO 2 = To demonstrate competent research skills
- **PhD:** SLO 3 = To demonstrate competent clinical skills
- **PhD:** SLO 4 = To demonstrate competent teaching skills

#### Curriculum Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical and Experimental Psychology Graduate Programs</th>
<th>MA1 Knowl Adv Psych</th>
<th>MA2 Research Skills</th>
<th>PhD1 Knowl Specialization</th>
<th>PhD2 Research Skills</th>
<th>PhD3 Clinical Skills</th>
<th>PhD4 Teaching Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Core: PY650</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Core: PY651 or PY629</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Core: 2 of PY670, PY652 (or HD501), PY672</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills Core: PY602</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills Core: PY603</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills Core: PY607</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills Core: Approved Advanced Statistics Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Oral Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Oral Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Clinical Program                                      |                      |                     |                           |                     |                     |                     |
| Clinical Core PY658                                   |                      |                     |                           |                     |                     |                     |
| Clinical Core: PY609- Psych Assmt 1                    | X                   |                     |                           |                     |                     |                     |
| Clinical Core: PY619/693 – PPsychother & Lab          | X                   |                     |                           |                     |                     |                     |
| Clinical Core: PY631 – Practicum I - 7 hrs            |                     | X                   |                           |                     |                     |                     |
| Clinical Core: PY608: Intro to Ethics                  | X                   |                     |                           |                     |                     |                     |
| Clinical Core: PY690 – Cultural Competency             | X                   |                     |                           |                     |                     |                     |
| Clinical Core: PY693 (Psychometrics)                  | X                   |                     |                           |                     |                     |                     |
| Clinical Core: PY610 or PY612 (Adv Assessment)        | X                   |                     |                           |                     |                     | X                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Geropsy</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Py - Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PY666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY669 x 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>DEVEL SCI</td>
<td>COGNITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY688x4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HP/BM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HP/BM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HP Practicum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY688 x 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PY677</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PY676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PY637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PY679 x 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>DEVEL SCI</th>
<th>COGNITIVE</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PY695</td>
<td>Teaching of Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PY698 – First-year Project -3-6 hrs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PY625 – Contemporary Issues x4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>DEVEL SCI</th>
<th>COGNITIVE</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD561/535/664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD602/603/512-6 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY693 -6 hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDFS Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PY693-Cog -9hr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PY693 -3hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PY693-Soc -9hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PY693 -3hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessments:
- Psychology Core Coursework Rubric
- Oral Examination Rubric
- Clinical Internship Evaluation
- Research Skills Core Rubric
- Specialization Coursework Rubric
- Student Opinion of Instruction
- Faculty Assessment of Knowledge
- Clinical Skills Rubric
- Teaching Skills Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Requirement</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLINICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY GRADUATE PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Core: PY650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Core: PY651 or PY629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Core: 2 of PY670, PY652 (or HD501), PY672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills Core: PY602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills Core: PY603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills Core: PY607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubric</td>
<td>Thesis Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Skills Core: Approved Advanced Statistics Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Oral Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Oral Defense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLINICAL PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Core: PY658 – Psychopathology</th>
<th>Core Course work</th>
<th>Faculty Assmt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Core: PY609 - Psych Assessment I</td>
<td>Core Course work</td>
<td>Faculty Assmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Core: PY619/693 – PPsychother &amp;Lab</td>
<td>Core Course work</td>
<td>Faculty Assmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Core: PY631 – Practicum I -7 hrs</td>
<td>Core Course work</td>
<td>Faculty Assmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Core: PY608 - Intro to Ethics</td>
<td>Special Course work</td>
<td>Clinical Skills Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Core: PY690 – Cultural Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Core: PY693 – Psychometrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Core: PY610 or PY612 – Advanced Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Internship offsite (1 year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLINICAL CHILD</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLINICAL GEROPSY</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLINICAL HEALTH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY669 x 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Name</td>
<td>Special Course work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY642</td>
<td>Clinical Skills Rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY688x4</td>
<td>Clinical Skills Rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP/BM I</td>
<td>Special Course work Faculty Assmt</td>
<td>Clinical Skills Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP/BM II</td>
<td>Faculty Assmt</td>
<td>Clinical Skills Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY688 (multiple)</td>
<td>Clinical Skills Rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY688 x 4</td>
<td>Clinical Skills Rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY677</td>
<td>Special Course work Faculty Assmt</td>
<td>Clinical Skills Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY676</td>
<td>Clinical Skills Rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Skills Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY678</td>
<td>EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY637</td>
<td>EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY679 x 4</td>
<td>EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM**

PY695 – Teaching of Psychology
(includes teaching a section of PY101)

PY698 – First-year Project - 3-6 hrs

PY625 – Contemporary Issues x 4

**DEVELOP. SCIENCE**

- HD561, HD535, or HD664

**COGNITIVE PSYCHOL**

**SOCIAL PSYCHOL**

Special Course work Faculty
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Assmt</th>
<th>Special Course work</th>
<th>Assmt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD602, HD603, or HD512</td>
<td>-6 hrs</td>
<td>Faculty Assmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY693</td>
<td>-6 hrs</td>
<td>Faculty Assmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDFS Seminar</td>
<td>-3 hrs</td>
<td>Faculty Assmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY693-Cog</td>
<td>-9 hrs</td>
<td>Faculty Assmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY693</td>
<td>-3 hrs</td>
<td>Faculty Assmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY693-Social</td>
<td>-9 hrs</td>
<td>Faculty Assmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY693</td>
<td>-3 hrs</td>
<td>Faculty Assmt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus far, all rubric and scale developmental work, and data collection, has concerned Student Learning Outcomes. The following describes the current disposition of the rubrics and scales.

**MA DEGREE**

**Reporting sample.** The sample on which any yearly report is based (e.g., for 2012) is those students who have graduated with their MA degree in Psychology in the May, August, and December graduations (e.g., May 2011, August 2011, and December 2011).

Note that students are only admitted for the Ph.D. degree and they earn their MA within the Ph.D. program. MA coursework overlaps into Ph.D. coursework. Across the seven Ph.D. concentrations, students will have different sets of coursework pre-masters. However, to earn the MA degree, all students must have 24 hours of coursework in their curriculum including PY607 and PY602, in addition to a completed, accepted thesis.

**Student Learning Outcome 1. To demonstrate knowledge in advanced psychology**

**Measure 1-1. Psychology Core Coursework Rubric**

This rubric measures students' knowledge in advanced psychology using their performance in psychology core and/or clinical psychology core coursework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Course Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F or D = 0 Inadequate mastery of the course material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. PY 650 Cognition and Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PY651 Physiological Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PY 672/652/670 Social/Lifespan/Perception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PY 672/652/670 Social/Lifespan/Perception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PY 658 Psychopathology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PY 619 Principles of Psychotherapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PY 609 Psychological Assessment I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum = 8 points pre-MA, or the equivalent of 4 courses taken, with grades of B or better. An achievement of 10 points is considered very good, and an achievement of 12 or more points is considered excellent. This rubric will be completed by the Director of Graduate Studies at the end of the academic year in which the student has received the MA degree.

**Measure 1.2. Faculty Assessment of Advanced Psychology Knowledge**

This rubric measures students' knowledge via faculty assessment of students' knowledge of major theories, research traditions, and influential studies in the field of psychology.
### Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate mastery in 3 subfields</td>
<td>Minimally adequate mastery in 3 subfields</td>
<td>Good mastery in 3 subfields</td>
<td>Excellent mastery in 3 subfields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Major theories in psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Major research traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most influential studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum = 6 points, or the equivalent of good mastery in all areas in 3 subfields. An achievement of 7-8 points is considered very good, and an achievement of 9 points is considered excellent. This rubric will be completed by the student's research mentor during the semester the student is awarded the MA degree.

### Student Learning Outcome 2. To demonstrate competent research skills

#### Measure 2-1. Oral Exam Rubric

This rubric assesses students' performance on their thesis defense, and reflects the quality of the student's thesis research based on both the written document and the oral presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Document</th>
<th>Inadequate (0 points)</th>
<th>Adequate (2 points)</th>
<th>Superior (3 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relation of problem to existing literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Soundness of conceptual analysis of problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adequacy of experimental and/or measurement operations (includes reliability, validity, freedom from artifacts, and controls adequate to exclude reasonable alternative interpretations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Appropriateness and adequacy of data analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ability to use the English language to communicate all of the above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Presentation</th>
<th>Inadequate (0 points)</th>
<th>Adequate (2 points)</th>
<th>Superior (3 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Grasp of theoretical context of the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grasp of methodological context of the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organization and clarity of presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Response to questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum = 14 points, or the equivalent of "adequate" on 7 items and "inadequate" on 2 items. An achievement of 14-19 is considered competent, an achievement of 20-22 is considered good, and an achievement of 23-27 is considered excellent. This rubric will be completed by the student's thesis or dissertation committee members. It is completed at the thesis defense.
Measure 2-2. Research Skills Core Rubric

This rubric measures students' research skills as measured in research skills courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Performance</th>
<th>F or D = 0</th>
<th>C = .5</th>
<th>B = 2</th>
<th>A = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Inadequate mastery of the course material</td>
<td>Minimally adequate mastery of the course material</td>
<td>Good mastery of the course material</td>
<td>Excellent mastery of the course material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Research Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advanced Statistics I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advanced Statistics II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum = 6 points pre-MA, or the equivalent of 3 B’s. An achievement of 8-9 points is considered very good and an achievement of 10 or more points is considered excellent. This rubric will be completed by the Director of Graduate Studies at the end of the academic year in which the student has received the MA degree.

**PHD DEGREE**

**Reporting sample.** The sample on which any yearly report is based (e.g., 2012) is those students who have graduated with their Ph.D. degree in Psychology in the May, August, and December graduations (e.g., May 2011, August 2011, and December 2011).

**Student Learning Outcome 1. To demonstrate knowledge in the student’s area of specialization**

**Measure 1-1. Specialization Coursework Rubric**

This rubric measures students' knowledge using their performance in coursework in their specialization area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Performance</th>
<th>F or D = 0</th>
<th>C = .5</th>
<th>B = 2</th>
<th>A = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Program Course</td>
<td>Inadequate mastery of the course material</td>
<td>Minimally adequate mastery of the course material</td>
<td>Good mastery of the course material</td>
<td>Excellent mastery of the course material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Program Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. PY 610 or 612 Adv Assessment II or III</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PY 666, 677, or 687 Concentration Course</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PY 608 Intro to Ethics</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PY 690 Cultural Competency</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum = 8 points, or the equivalent of 4 B’s. An achievement of 10 points is considered very good, and an achievement of 12 or more points is considered excellent. This rubric will be completed by the Director of Graduate Studies at the end of the academic year in which the student has received the Ph.D. degree.

**Measure 1-2. Faculty Assessment of Knowledge Rubric**

This rubric measures students' knowledge via faculty assessment of students' knowledge of major theories, research traditions, and influential studies in the student's specialization area.
Student Learning Outcome 2. To demonstrate competent research skills

Measure 2-1. Preliminary Oral Exam Rubric

This rubric is used to assess students' performance on their preliminary oral defense, and reflects the quality of the student's dissertation plan based on both the written document and the oral presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRITTEN DOCUMENT</th>
<th>Inadequate 0 points</th>
<th>Adequate 2 points</th>
<th>Superior 3 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relation of problem to existing literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Soundness of conceptual analysis of problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adequacy of experimental and/or measurement operations (includes reliability,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>validity, freedom from artifacts, and controls adequate to exclude reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative interpretations).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Appropriativeness and adequacy of data analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ability to use the English language to communicate all of the above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ORAL PRESENTATION                                                                |                     |                   |                   |
| 6. Grasp of theoretical context of the problem                                   |                     |                   |                   |
| 8. Organization and clarity of presentation                                      |                     |                   |                   |
| 9. Response to questions                                                          |                     |                   |                   |

Minimum = 14 points, or the equivalent of “adequate” on 7 items and “inadequate” on 2 items. An achievement of 14-19 is considered competent, an achievement of 20-22 is considered good, and an achievement of 23-27 is considered excellent. This rubric will be completed by the student’s thesis or dissertation committee members. It is completed at the preliminary oral defense.
Measure 2-2. Final Oral Exam Rubric

This rubric is used to assess students' performance on their final oral defense, and reflects the quality of the student's dissertation research based on both the written document and the oral presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRITTEN DOCUMENT</th>
<th>Inadequate 0 points</th>
<th>Adequate 2 points</th>
<th>Superior 3 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relation of problem to existing literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Soundness of conceptual analysis of problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adequacy of experimental and/or measurement operations (includes reliability,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>validity, freedom from artifacts, and controls adequate to exclude reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative interpretations).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Appropriateness and adequacy of data analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ability to use the English language to communicate all of the above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORAL PRESENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Grasp of theoretical context of the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grasp of methodological context of the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organization and clarity of presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Response to questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum = 14 points, or the equivalent of “adequate” on 7 items and “inadequate” on 2 items. An achievement of 14-19 is considered competent, an achievement of 20-22 is considered good, and an achievement of 23-27 is considered excellent. This rubric will be completed by the student’s thesis or dissertation committee members. It is completed at the final oral defense.

Student Learning Outcome 3. To demonstrate competent clinical skills

Measure 3-1. Clinical Skills Rubric

This rubric assesses students' clinical skills via supervisor ratings of assessment, case presentation, ethical considerations, social responsibility, and psychotherapy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inadequate = 0</th>
<th>Adequate = 2</th>
<th>Superior = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• use of diagnostic interviews and major personality and intelligence tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ability to select appropriate test instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Case Presentation of Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ethical Considerations of Assessment and Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social responsibility and respect for cultural and individual differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Psychotherapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• skills in conceptualizing client problems and personalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• knowledge of the empirical status of psychosocial interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• knowledge of ethical considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum = 10, or the equivalent of adequate on all 5 criteria. An achievement of 12-13 points is considered good, and an achievement of 14-15 points is considered excellent. This rubric will be completed by the Director of Clinical Psychology at the end of the academic year prior to the year in which the student has received the Ph.D. degree.

Measure 3-2. Successful completion of the year-long clinical internship
Successful completion of the year-long clinical internship, with positive evaluation from the internship site supervisor. Goal is for each student to complete the internship with positive evaluation.

**Student Learning Outcome 4. To demonstrate competent teaching skills**

**Measure 4-1. Teaching Skills Rubric**

This rubric measures students' teaching skills during the semester in which they take the Teaching of Psychology course and teach their own section of PY101 Introduction to Psychology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate = 0</th>
<th>Adequate = 2</th>
<th>Superior = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Providing students with high-quality content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Using a variety of teaching techniques early in the semester and evaluating which works best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Keeping careful records of student performance and promptly scoring tests and assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Treating students respectfully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collecting and considering feedback from students, peers, and supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Writing a statement of teaching philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Contributing consistently and thoughtfully to the weekly teaching seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum = 14, or the equivalent of adequate on all 7 criteria. An achievement of 16-17 points is considered good, and an achievement of 18-21 points is considered excellent. This rubric will be completed by the instructor of the Teaching of Psychology course at the end of the semester in which the student has completed Teaching of Psychology.

**Measure 4-2. Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI) ratings**

Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI) ratings are used to measure the undergraduate response to graduate students' teaching.

SOIs completed **during the semester the student took Teaching of Psychology and taught PY101** will be used. At a minimum students should achieve a mean of 3.0 for Course and 3.0 for Instructor. An achievement of 3.6-4.2 on both Course and Instructor ratings is considered good, and an achievement of 4.3 to 5.0 on both is considered excellent.