

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025	
<i>College of Education and Behavioral Sciences</i>	<i>Psychology</i>
<i>Psychology MA, Clinical Concentration 092</i>	
<i>Frederick G. Grieve</i>	
Is this an online program? ☐ Yes ☒ No	Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here ☒ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under Evaluation)

Instructions: For the 2024-25 assessment, we are asking you to reflect on the last three-year cycle rather than collect data. It's important to take time to look over the results from the last assessment cycle and really focus on a data-informed direction going forward. In collaboration with your assessment team and program faculty, review each submitted template from 2021-2024 and consider the following for each Program Learning Outcome, add your narrative to the template, and submit the draft to your **ASL Rep** by **May 15, 2025**.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Upon completion of this program, students will be able to accurately administer and score standardized, norm-referenced intelligence tests.
Evaluation	Based on results from the last three assessment cycles, this SLO remains relevant. It directly reflects a critical skillset for graduate-level clinical work and aligns with professional practice standards as well as employer expectations. Given the importance of accurate psychological assessment in clinical settings, we continue to view this as a foundational competency that should be retained. The outcome is clearly measurable and uses active verbs that align with Bloom's Taxonomy. Specifically, the verbs "administer" and "score" correspond to the "apply" level of Bloom's Taxonomy, which involves executing or implementing procedures in practical contexts. This indicates that students are expected not only to understand the material but to demonstrate their ability to use it in authentic, professional situations. While the outcome technically includes two distinct skills (administration and scoring), these are closely related within the context of standardized testing. Thus, although slightly double-barreled, the outcome remains functionally appropriate for assessment purposes. However, if future data suggest meaningful variation between these two skills, we may consider splitting them into separate outcomes.
Measurement Instruments	The current measurement instrument is a direct measure that effectively evaluates the stated outcome: students' ability to accurately administer and score standardized, norm-referenced intelligence tests. The structured rubric appears to be well-aligned with the outcome, focusing on specific administration tasks and scoring accuracy. Given that all students in recent cohorts achieved the benchmark proficiency level, the instrument demonstrates strong alignment with the intended skill-based outcome and appears to be an appropriate and effective tool for assessment. Should the Student Learning Outcome evolve to include more advanced competencies—such as interpreting test results or integrating findings into clinical reports—additional instruments would be needed to fully capture those higher-order skills. Examples could include supervisor evaluations during practicum, mock case studies, or written reports. For the current outcome, however, the artifact is well chosen. AI does not currently pose a significant challenge to this form of assessment, as the physical and interpersonal components of standardized test administration require direct human performance and observation.
Criteria & Targets	The criteria for success appear to be appropriate for the task. We have been able to hit the target over the last three years of the cycle.

	However, the focus of the program is on providing instruction for all students to learn how to appropriately administer these measures, so adjusting the criteria is not warranted at this time
Results & Conclusion	Results: The results are what were expected. What stands out is that we prepare students very well to complete psychological assessments. Conclusions: We believe that the hands-on practice approach we have been using for the past three years has led to students being able to understand how to administer and score intelligence assessment materials. Where we have seen some need for improvement is on the understanding of psychometric theory that underlies the testing process. We will work to emphasize this information as it is presented in the class next year.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Based on the results from the last three years, the feedback from the program review this year, and the experiences of faculty in the program, we will make the following changes to the assessments: 1) There are three main areas of training in clinical psychology: therapy, assessment, and research; thus, there should be a SLO that addresses each of these areas. 2) In addition, ethics is a big part of psychological practice; we need to ensure that our students are ethical practitioners. Thus, there should be a SLO that addresses this issue. 3) In order to avoid having way too many SLOs, we will combine therapy and assessment into a single SLO. 4) Because we are creating new SLOs, we will more than likely re-evaluate the artifacts used to assess them and have new assessment measures/artifacts for the next cycle.

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Upon completion of this program, students will be able to display in a practice setting: knowledge of professional ethics, diagnosis, interventions and intellectual assessment.
Evaluation	This program learning outcome is relevant to the goals of a Clinical Psychology M.A. program. These competencies are essential for effective, ethical psychological practice and align with the expectations of licensing bodies and professional guidelines. Student success on the comprehensive exam suggests the outcome is being achieved and continues to reflect important domain knowledge. However, while the outcome is measurable, it is also triple-barreled, combining three or more distinct content areas: ethics, diagnosis, interventions, and intellectual assessment. This makes it harder to determine precisely which area may be responsible for changes in performance, especially if student outcomes vary across dimensions. The verb “display” is somewhat vague from a Bloom’s Taxonomy perspective. More precise, measurable verbs such as “analyze,” “apply,” or “evaluate” might strengthen the outcome and better indicate higher-order cognitive skills. Thus, in order to improve clarity and assessment alignment, we may want to divide this outcome into multiple, more focused outcomes.
Measurement Instruments	We like the current measurement instrument because it directly measures the SLO. It assesses student knowledge across key areas: professional ethics, diagnosis, interventions, and intellectual assessment. As a direct measure, it provides tangible evidence of student learning and content retention, aligning well with the goal of evaluating readiness for clinical practice. The breakdown into seven dimensions allows for some disaggregation, though this could be improved if the outcome were revised to be more focused and less multi-barreled. The artifact is appropriate for the level of professional judgment and integration required in clinical psychology. However, supplementing the exam with additional artifacts such as case conceptualizations or supervisor evaluations during practicum could provide additional depth, particularly in applied areas like intervention strategy and diagnostic formulation.

	As for AI's impact, it is unlikely to affect this assessment significantly at present, given that it is proctored and involves applied, discipline-specific knowledge that is not easily outsourced to generative tools. However, continued vigilance is warranted to ensure that any written components remain authentically student-generated.
Criteria & Targets	The criteria for success have been consistently met across the assessment cycle. We think this is reflective of the focus on student preparation and the criteria do not necessarily need to be modified.
Results & Conclusion	Results: The results are what was expected. We have a strong focus on training good student practitioners and the results of the ASLs reflect that focus. Conclusions: We believe that the results indicate that we have a good program.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	Based on the results from the last three years, the feedback from the program review this year, and the experiences of faculty in the program, we will make the following changes to the assessments: 1) There are three main areas of training in clinical psychology: therapy, assessment, and research; thus, there should be a SLO that addresses each of these areas. 2) In addition, ethics is a big part of psychological practice; we need to ensure that our students are ethical practitioners. Thus, there should be a SLO that addresses this issue. 3) In order to avoid having way too many SLOs, we will combine therapy and assessment into a single SLO. Because we are creating new SLOs, we will more than likely re-evaluate the artifacts used to assess them and have new assessment measures/artifacts for the next cycle.

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Add the Program Student Learning Outcome from CourseLeaf HERE
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy?
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted?
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets?
Results & Conclusion	Results: Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain Conclusions: What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g.

	classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in “closing the loop.” For example, you may decide to: • collect a more appropriate artifact • create new program outcomes • adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met • need to reconstruct your curriculum map • sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle.