

## MAP Annual Learning Results Summary, AY 2016-17

The following table summarizes the assessment of PLOs for the MAP program for assessment cycle (2017). This process is conducted regularly as part of the annual learning results assessments, which measure two or three PLOs for each program each year. This summary report is to be submitted to the EEC upon its completion.

<b>Program</b>	Master of Applied Psychology
<b>Assessment Period</b>	FA 2016 to SP 2017
<b>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</b>	PLO 1- Integrate God's Word within the profession of psychology PLO 2 - Demonstrate effective written communication.
<b>Standards of Success</b>	PLO 1: Student paper scores for the APSY 550 -Signature Assignment will be 'Satisfactory' or higher as measured by the writing assignment rubric. Satisfactory equates to an 80% level. PLO 2: Student paper scores for the APSY 680 Research Project Assignment will be 'Satisfactory' or higher as measured by the writing assignment rubric. Satisfactory equates to an 80% level.
<b>Evidence</b>	PLO 1: Signature Assignment for APSY 550 Professional and Ethical Issues Sample Size: 32 artifacts (41% of 79) PLO 2: Research Project Assignment for APSY 680 Research Project Sample Size: 16 artifacts (50% of 32)
<b>Assessment Tool</b>	PLO 1: Direct-assessment rubric for evaluating artifact; inter-rater reliability exercise conducted. PLO 2: Direct-assessment rubric for evaluating artifact; inter-rater reliability exercise conducted.
<b>Assessors</b>	PLO 1 and 2: Shannon Hunt Dr. David King Dr. Lora Erickson (tie-breaker)
<b>Results</b>	PLO 1: Out of 32 randomly assigned items, 18 passed and 14 failed (for a 56% pass rate). PLO 2: Out of the 16 randomly assigned items, 7 passed and 9 failed (for an 44% pass rate).

<b>Discussion of Results</b>	<p>PLO 1: There was a 50% consistency between Assessor 1 and Assessor 2. This demonstrates a correlation between the two scorers, indicating that this direct method of assessment needs additional standardization. Future research could investigate whether there were any common traits that emerged from the failures or successes of the <i>APSY 550 Signature Assignment</i> pass rates.</p> <p>PLO 2: There was a 75% consistency between Assessor 1 and Assessor 2. This demonstrates a correlation between the two scorers, indicating that this direct method of assessment may benefit from some increased standardization. Future research could investigate whether there were any common traits that emerged from the failures or successes of the <i>APSY 680 Research Project</i> pass rates.</p>
<b>Proposed Changes</b>	<p>PLO1: a) Rework course instructions, syllabus, and rubric to include more clarity on what it looks like to effectively implement God’s word.          b) Ensure that course instructions, syllabus, and rubric all align in terms of expectation for students.</p> <p>PLO 2: a) Consider how early courses in the MAP program could be re-modeled to better thread important foundational research methodology skills. b) Increase focus on written communication at the graduate level in all foundational classes.</p>
<b>Rationale for Proposed Changes</b>	<p>PLO 1: According to the results measured against the performance levels of an 80% minimum pass rate for this criterion, the evidence demonstrates that the PLO 1 for ASPY 550 was not met.</p> <p>PLO 2: According to the results measured against the performance levels of an 80% minimum pass rate for this criterion, the evidence demonstrates that the PLO 2 for ASPY 680 was not met.</p>
<b>Financial Resources Required</b>	<p>PLO 1: Minimal, included in normal course revision budget</p> <p>PLO 2: Minimal, included in normal course revision budget</p>
<b>Annual Learning Report for MAP Approved</b>	<p>ALR recommended for AC acceptance by EEC on May 2, 2018</p>
<b>Follow Up (Closing the Loop)</b>	<p>N/A There was no prior annual assessment.</p>