



Office of Program Review & Assessment  
400 Hal Greer Boulevard  
Huntington, West Virginia 25755-2003  
304/696-2494 Fax: 304/696-6612

2002

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Marty Amerikaner, Chair, Department of Psychology  
FROM: Bob Edmunds, Coordinator for Program Review and Assessment  
DATE: August 11, 2003

SUBJECT: Review of Yearly Assessment Report  
PROGRAM: PsyD, Psychology

1. Thanks for submitting the yearly assessment report for PsyD Psychology. Your report has been reviewed by members of the University Assessment Committee. What follows is a brief summary of the reviewer's comments as well as some suggestions for the program to consider as it begins its assessment work for 2003-2004.
2. Guidelines for Yearly Assessment Reports:
  - a. Program Goals: Please articulate the goals of the program.
  - b. Learning Outcomes and Data Collection: None listed.
  - c. Results: None listed. No students at the present time. Program admits students, Fall 2002.
  - d. Assessment Chart: None Presented. A chart should have been included which outlines the student outcomes and competencies for the program. The only spaces with no information would be the results/analysis column and the action taken column.
  - e. BOT Initiative #3: Not applicable to graduate programs.
  - f. Plans for the current year: With the admission of the first class during the 2002-2003 year, the program should begin to have results based on its assessment efforts.
  - g. Assistance needed: none listed
  - h. Lessons learned: none listed.
3. The feedback loop from data collection, analysis and interpretation to the addressed faculty will be important in future reports. Specific changes in the courses, program, requirements, etc., should be well documented. Programmatic changes should be based upon careful examination of the data presented.

C:\2003-2004 Program Assessment\PsyD Psychology.wpd

4. Primary Traits Analysis: As a part of our ongoing accreditation process with NCA/Higher Learning Commission, UAC has completed a chart identified as Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level. This is based on the student academic achievement assessment levels of implementation. Here is the committee's perception of the program's Efficacy of Assessment:
  - a. Learning Objectives: Level 0
  - b. Assessment Measures: Level 0
  - c. Feedback Loop: Level 0

Overall Score: 0

Range:

<b>Level One: Beginning Implementation of Assessment Programs</b>	<b>1-3</b>
<b>Level Two: Making Progress in Implementing Assessment Programs</b>	<b>4-6</b>
<b>Level Three: Maturing Stages of Continuous Improvement</b>	<b>7-9</b>

The reviewers completed an evaluation of the assessment report and feel that since no assessment information was presented that the program receive an overall score of Zero (0). Most of the information presented was procedural.

5. This program is new, and UAC recognizes that fact. However, the program should have articulated the program goals and the learning outcomes/student competencies it would like to see in its graduates. Obviously no data has been collected at this point so UAC would not be looking for that information. However, student outcomes, possible measuring instruments and standards should be in the planning stages and therefore, should be reported on the yearly assessment report. A full assessment report with changes in the program probably won't occur for approximately 3 years.
6. The program has spent a great amount of time organizing and implementing the doctorate in Psychology; however, assessment of the program and the student academic achievement of the candidates has not been articulated in this report. It appears that the report was written by the chair of the program without consultation of the faculty involved. For the program to be truly successful, it must be more than a collection of courses, and it must involve the input of the faculty.
7. Thank you for your report. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact this office.

**Assessment Committee Analysis of Yearly  
Departmental/Program Assessment Reports  
Report for the Academic Year 2001-2002**

Program: PSY D

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	<i>none listed</i>
b. Learning outcomes data collection	<i>Outcomes need to be listed as well as assessment Tools &amp; potential</i>
c. Results	<i>Benchmark - NO DATA REQ. NONE</i>
(Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/ the appropriate assessment tools/ standards/results/actions taken.)	Yes _____ No <u><i>X</i></u>
II. BOT Initiative #3 ( <u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) <i>N/A</i>
III. Plans for current Year	<i>First class to be admitted</i>
IV. Assistance needed	—
V. Most important thing learned through this process	—

# Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level

PSY D

## Marshall University

### PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS

NCA Levels of Implementation Academic Year 2002

DATE: Summer 2003

#### 1. Learning Objectives

##### Level 0

No objectives were provided.

##### Level 1

Learning objectives were identified.

##### Level 2

- Learning objectives were identified.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.

##### Level 3

- Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.
- Objectives are appropriate in number.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.
- They are measurable.
- They support Marshall's educational goals.
- They span multiple learning domains.

#### 2. Assessment Measures

##### Level 0

No measures were identified.

##### Level 1

Measures were identified.

##### Level 2

- Measures were identified.
- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They include direct measures of student learning.

##### Level 3

- Measures were identified.
- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.

- They are multiple.
- They emphasize direct learning.
- They focus on real-world tasks.
- They stress higher order learning.
- They are integrated in the curriculum.
- They allow performance to be gauged over time.

#### 3. Feedback Loop

##### Level 0

The feedback loop was not described.

##### Level 1

- Some data are being collected but not interpreted or not used.
- No performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Assessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair.

##### Level 2

- Data are being collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Data are being shared by other appropriate constituents.
- Data are considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.

##### Level 3

- Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.
- Data are being shared with other appropriate constituents.
- Data are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.
- The improvement of student learning is central to the department.
- Assessment is a part of the culture of the department.

**Assessment Committee Analysis of Yearly  
Departmental/Program Assessment Reports  
Report for the Academic Year 2001-2002**

Program: Psy D

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	<i>These need to be articulated</i>
b. Learning outcomes data collection	<i>Program is new. Premature to collect this data.</i>
c. Results	"
(Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/ the appropriate assessment tools/ standards/results/actions taken.)	Yes _____ No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
II. BOT Initiative #3 ( <u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only )
III. Plans for current Year	<i>These are well articulated</i>
IV. Assistance needed	<i>Workshops. Models of successful assessment plans</i>
V. Most important thing learned through this process	<i>Too early for that.</i>

## Marshall University

## PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS

NCA Levels of Implementation 2002-2003

DATE: 3/30/031. *Learning Objectives*

## Level 0

 No objectives were provided.

## Level 1

 Learning objectives were identified.

## Level 2

Learning objectives were identified.  
 They describe student behaviors.  
 They are program, not class or course, objectives.  
 They are clear.

## Level 3

Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.  
 Objectives are appropriate in number.  
 They describe student behaviors.  
 They are program, not class or course, objectives.  
 They are clear.  
 They are measurable.  
 They support Marshall's educational goals.  
 They span multiple learning domains.

2. *Assessment Measures*

## Level 0

 No measures were identified.

## Level 1

 Measures were identified.

## Level 2

Measures were identified.  
 They relate to the learning objectives.  
 They include direct measures of student learning.

## Level 3

Measures were identified.  
 They relate to the learning objectives.  
 They emphasize direct measures of student learning.

They are multiple.  
 They emphasize direct learning.  
 They focus on real-world tasks.  
 They stress higher order learning.  
 They are integrated in the curriculum.  
 They allow performance to be gauged over time.

3. *Feedback Loop*

## Level 0

 The feedback loop was not described.

## Level 1

Some data are being collected but not interpreted or not used.  
 No performance expectations/standards have been established.  
 Assessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair.

## Level 2

Data are being collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.  
 Performance expectations/standards have been established.  
 Data are being shared by other appropriate constituents.  
 Data are considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.

## Level 3

Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.  
 Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.  
 Data are being shared with other appropriate constituents.  
 Data are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.  
 The improvement of student learning is central to the department.  
 Assessment is a part of the culture of the department.

## **Psy D Program Assessment Report 2001-02**

The entire academic year was spent on planning for the beginning of the program in Fall, 2002. Thus, there is little formal data to report and nothing to include in the chart(s) requested. The following is a brief assessment of progress based on several of the areas covered in our formal assessment plan.

**Program Administration:** No new information. Dr. Marianna Footo Linz continues as the program coordinator

**Resources:** Current Expenses, Faculty, Staff, Library, Student Support: Our budget was approved for the current (2002-03) year; we were able to hire a .5 FTE administrative aide to assist with multiple aspects of the program and larger department needs; the library has secured a subscription to PsychArticles, a major online full text resource; we explored several options for GA support for new students (which resulted in funding for all students who wanted it for the current (02-03) year

**Student Achievement and Progress** Through the Program: Not meaningful; except that we completed the review of our first set of student applications, and accepted a total of 12 new students out of approximately 35 completed applications.

**Faculty Development:** We hired two new tenure track faculty members who bring a great deal of experience and expertise to the department and program. In support of the upcoming dissertation needs of program students, we negotiated a new workload process whereby more faculty can apply for time to engage in research activities

**Academic Curriculum Development:** Discussion of curriculum was ongoing; 13 new courses were approved by Graduate Council, with more under development;

**Practicum and Internship Site Development:** Many meetings were conducted in this arena; practicum field placements were ready for the first group of students; preliminary work was done on development of our rural practicum placements.

**Program Development and Accreditation:** All of the above reflects program development for the beginning of the program. All aspects of the work and hiring last year included reference to our professional accreditation criteria; no application for accreditation is possible for 2 more years, though preliminary evaluation will be possible in another year or so.

**Graduates' Professional Placements and Accomplishments:** Not meaningful