

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: Psychology (BA)

SUBMITTED BY: Linda R. Cote-Reilly & Jo-Ann Amadeo

DATE: September 28, 2020

Executive Summary: Description of Assessment Process

List *all* of the program’s learning outcomes, as of the assessment year's catalog: (*regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year*)

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year	Year of Next Planned Assessment
Research - <i>Students will apply psychological research methodologies and statistical techniques to a research question.</i> (Construction of knowledge)	2013-2014	No	2021-2022
Critical Thinking - <i>Students will demonstrate critical evaluation of a psychological topic through effective writing.</i> (Analysis of knowledge)	2013-2014	No	2021-2022
Oral Communication - <i>Students will demonstrate effective presentation skills within the discipline.</i> (Transmission of knowledge)	2015-2016	Yes	2019-2020
Career Preparation – <i>Students will apply specialized psychological knowledge in an internship setting.</i> (Application of knowledge)	2015-2016	Yes	2019-2020
Notes: In Fall 2014, we were approved to move to biennial assessment reporting. All 4 of our current learning outcomes were assessed during our 2018-2019 program review. Our 4 learning outcomes (listed above) are consistent with American Psychological Association recommendations for undergraduate psychology programs (APA Guidelines for the Undergraduate Psychology Major – Version 2.0, 2012).			

Provide a **brief** description of the assessment process used including how results are shared and discussed and strengths, challenges, and planned improvements to the **process**, providing evidence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment. If there is something that is impeding your ability to implement improvements, please comment on those issues (*generally not more than two paragraphs, may use bullet points*):

Results of the assessment process are shared with other faculty members in the department by posting the assessment report and UAC feedback on our departmental Canvas “course” and discussed in departmental meetings.

Strengths of the assessment process include:

- **course-embedded assessment** for all four of our learning outcomes. Course-embedded assessment is recommended by the American Psychological Association (APA) as a “best practice” in the teaching of psychology. Oral communication is assessed using the rubric in Appendix A; the assessed product is the presentation of their semester-long research paper. 125 student products were rated over the past 4 years (Fall 2016 through Spring 2020). During this time, 5 different full-time faculty taught PSY 497 Senior Seminar.

Professional development was assessed using the internship supervisor evaluations; see Appendix B for the rubric.

- **use of psychometrically solid rubrics.** The presentation rubric showed a high degree of interitem reliability, Cronbach's $\alpha = .865$ ($N = 122$ valid cases); Cronbach's $\alpha \geq .70$ is considered acceptable. There was also a high degree of interrater reliability for the presentation rubric. Specifically, 38.4% of papers were coded by a second reviewer (another FT faculty member in the department). When student products were rated by two faculty members, the mean ratings across all 10 items on the rubric did not differ significantly, $t(47) = 1.29$, $p = .204$, and their ratings were significantly positively correlated, $r(46) = .53$, $p < .001$, indicating that raters agreed about the quality of student products.
- A final strength of the assessment process is that we have a **large sample size**. Specifically, we were able to gather direct assessments from 80% of students who completed PSY 497 Senior Seminar in the past 4 years and 100% of students who completed their internship (PSY 400) in the past 4 years. Thus we have direct performance data from nearly all students, giving us a large and robust dataset.
- The **use of student feedback** from the Graduating Student Survey (GSS) and Alumni Survey (AS).

Challenges include:

- **Collecting presentation rubrics** from PSY 497 due to Covid. As mentioned above, 20% of data were missing for presentation. Although this is a small amount of missing data for a large major, our hope was that by using course-embedded assessment we would have 100% data. One semester we failed to collect data from a single section of PSY 497. Then in Spring 2020, 2/3 instructors teaching PSY 497 did not do a formal presentation because of the pandemic (the instructors felt that moving it to Zoom would be too challenging for students and did not match the rubric well (e.g., making eye contact). Planned improvements include modifying the rubric for semesters in which PSY 497 is taught online, and incorporating some exercises into OL sections of PSY 497 so that students are prepared to present via Zoom. Another issue is that the Chair must remind faculty to complete and return the rubrics each semester.
- **Getting user-friendly supervisor evaluations** to assess professional development. We generally have to ask the Career Development Center or the instructor of PSY 400 Internship for the supervisor evaluations, because the Department Chair is not able to access the evaluations (or anything) in Handshake, and the PSY 400 instructor's access to Handshake is limited to approving internships. When the evaluations arrive, they are not in user-friendly format (there are many questions, not all of which are relevant for assessment purposes, and the rating scale is in words rather than numbers). The Career Center is willing to reformat the evaluations for us, but that is a cumbersome task for them. We wonder if there is a more accessible and user-friendly way to collect these data. Further, the survey given in Fall 2019 was different from the surveys administered from fall 2016 to spring 2019. The spring 2019 survey does not include psychology-specific items (i.e., rapport with clients) nor are there any items that overlap with the previous surveys.
- **Response rates for the GSS and AS** are low, so their generalizability is limited.

Closing the Loop: Progress on Planned Improvements from Prior Year

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update
Critical thinking	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only FT faculty will teach PSY 497 2. Revision of writing assignments in the PSY 300-level WI that is a prereq for PSY 497, so that students must “Conduct research to support a position” (i.e., literature review and synthesis) 3. Clarify “conduct research to support a position” on GSS and AS 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only FT faculty have been assigned to teach PSY 497 since this outcome was assessed last. 2. The writing assignments in all 300-level PSY WI courses now require that students conduct a literature review and write an APA format paper where they synthesize that research to support a position. We have 3 different WI courses taught by 4 different professors, so this was no easy challenge. 3. We cannot clarify “conduct research to support a position” on GSS and AS because this is an item created by PIE. We have no control over this particular question on the GSS and AS, so we will use only the questions that ask specifically about critical thinking, and not “conduct research to support a position”.
Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • investigating ways we might give students a better background in SPSS • Insure that PSY 302 is assigned to an appropriate classroom, where students can access SPSS on a computer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have discussed utilizing our PSY 396 Special Topics course as a potential avenue for giving students more practice with SPSS. • Now we have a dedicated research laboratory for Psychology, where students can access computers with SPSS and enter data in a confidential setting <i>outside</i> of class time. This is what students needed all along – a space where they can practice SPSS and get a faculty member’s help, if needed. At the moment, because of Covid, students are not able to take advantage of this new space, but we will insure that they do once we are post-Covid.

Provide a response to last year’s University Assessment Committee review of the program’s learning assessment report:

Comment:

“You provide an exhaustive, thorough analysis and discussion of a robust assessment process. We commend the program for this but recommend that you consider ways of paring down the information you provide to the committee to a more concise, focused report. For example, in the planned improvements, you really only need to give us a brief update for each improvement. For the appendices, we don’t need to see SPSS output and your notes on the output. We don’t require this level of discussion in your report; and we don’t require this level of instrument validation. We want to respect your time. We are happy to read through your results in the depth that you’ve presented them here, but we recommend that you think of ways to discuss your process in a more concise way.”

Response:

We have tried to write a more concise report. For example, we do not provide SPSS output and tried to keep the instrument validation to a minimum. The Assessment Committee has also revised and shortened the Assessment Report template itself, which has helped us to create a more concise report. We have also tried to use more bullet points and less prose.

Outcomes Assessment 2019-2020

Learning Outcome 1: Oral Presentation

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define the acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?</i></p>	<p>Result <i>Did you meet your target? What was the result?</i></p>
<p>Direct Measure: Instructors and outside faculty evaluators used the Oral Communication rubric (see Appendix A) to evaluate the final presentations in 6 sections of PSY 497 (Senior Seminar) over 4 semesters (2014-2016).</p>	<p>5-point rating scale scored 1-5, an acceptable level of performance is a mean of at least 3.0 and at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students earning ratings of 3.0 or above (3=meets standard).</p>	<p>5 instructors and 4 outside faculty evaluators used the Oral Communication rubric to evaluate the final presentations in 13 sections of PSY 497 (Senior Seminar) over 8 semesters (2016-2020). In total 125 student presentations were evaluated.</p> <p>The presentation rubric contains 10-items, and a composite score was calculated for each presenter. Items were rated on a 5-point response scale (ranging from 1 = <i>Unsatisfactory</i> to 5 = <i>Excellent</i>).</p>	<p>The Oral Communication data for 125 students were entered into SPSS. An average composite score was calculated across all items for each participant. Mean instructor rating across the entire rubric exceeded 3 (M = 4.05, SD = .57) and 95.2% of students achieved a mean rating of 3.0 or higher. Thus, students exceeded acceptable levels of performance on the direct measure of Oral Communication.</p>
<p>Indirect Measure: Marymount Graduating Student Survey – Psychology Program. There is one item on the GSS relevant to assessing Oral Communication (Quality of preparation in program to deliver a <i>coherent oral presentation</i>). All items assessed via student self-report.</p>	<p>With a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 = <i>Poor</i> to 5 = <i>Excellent</i>, an acceptable level of performance is a mean of at least 3.0 and at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students reporting ratings of 4.0 or above (very good or excellent).</p>	<p>The GSS was administered and analyzed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. In total 95 Psychology majors responded to the GSS from 2017 to present</p>	<p>The sample size (n), M, SD, and % reporting 4.0 or above are as follows:</p> <p>2016-2017 (n = 43): M = 4.07, SD = 1.01, 74.4%</p> <p>2017-2018 (n = 29): M = 4.21, SD = 0.77, 79.3%</p> <p>2018-2019 (n = 23): M = 4.39, SD = 0.84, 87%</p> <p>2019-2020 (n=20); M =4.25, SD =1.02, 85%</p> <p>Students thus exceeded acceptable levels of performance on the indirect GSS measure of Oral Communication.</p>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define the acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?</i>	Result <i>Did you meet your target? What was the result?</i>
Indirect Measure: Marymount Alumni Survey – Psychology Program. There is one item on the Alumni Survey relevant to assessing Oral Communication (<i>How well your education prepared you to deliver a coherent oral presentation</i>). All items assessed via self-report.	With a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 = <i>Poor</i> to 5 = <i>Excellent</i> , an acceptable level of performance is at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students reporting ratings of 4.0 or above (very good or excellent). (No means were reported for this item.)	The Alumni Survey was administered and analyzed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. In total 63 Psychology majors responded to the GSS in 2017 (data from 2011-12 and 2015-16), 2018 (data from 2012-13 and 2016-17), and 2019 (data from 2008-09, 2013-14, 2017-18).	The sample size (n) and % reporting 4.0 or above are as follows: 2017 (n = 20): 84.2% 2018 (n = 18): 83.3% 2019 (n = 25): 68% Students thus exceeded acceptable levels of performance on the indirect GSS measure of Oral Communication.

Interpretation of Results

Analysis and Implications: *What does this result tell you about the extent to which your students achieved this outcome? What are the strengths and weaknesses that this result highlights, and what are the implications for your curriculum or your program?*

The results reported in the table above tell us that we have achieved this outcome. Strengths that this assessment highlights are: 1) the presentation rubric we use to directly measure students’ oral presentation skills is internally consistent and has a high degree of interrater reliability, 2) the use of multiple methods to determine whether we are achieving our goals, and 3) we use this same rubric throughout the curriculum, which has helped to strengthen students’ oral communication skills (they understand the 10 factors that make a good oral presentation). A weakness is the lower percentage of students rating that they felt well-prepared to deliver a coherent oral presentation in the latest Alumni Survey. In Fall 2015, we modified the response scale to be more consistent with the scales used to assess our other outcomes (*i.e.*, 5-point scales). We think student ratings on the most recent Alumni Survey were lower because this report included data for 2 cohorts prior to our revision of the oral presentation rubric in 2015, but data are aggregated in the Alumni Survey, so we are not able to determine definitively if this is the case. An implication of these results for the curriculum is that we will continue to encourage all PSY faculty (FT and adjuncts) to use this presentation rubric when they assign oral presentations in their classes, and we will distribute this rubric to students as they prepare their presentations, so that they clearly know and understand the components of a good presentation. An implication of this result for the assessment process is that we will reword the anchor items on the oral presentation rubric so that they more clearly specify that 1=below standard, 3=meets standard, and 5=exceeds standard. This change will help the new Director to assess this measure in the future, and more clearly show students what is expected.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Planned curricular improvements include continuing to encourage all faculty teaching psychology courses to use our Oral Communication rubric to grade presentations in their classes. By using this scoring rubric repeatedly throughout students’ careers, we aim to foster the skills necessary for strong oral presentations. The department will also discuss the possibility of collecting assessment data on presentations in lower-level courses to serve as a basis for comparison to the senior-level presentations already being assessed. Finally, as discussed above, we plan to change the labels of the anchoring items on the scale to make them more clear to students, raters, and assessors.

Learning Outcome 2: Professional Development

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define the acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?</i></p>	<p>Result <i>Did you meet your target? What was the result?</i></p>
<p>Direct Measure: Internship site supervisors evaluated MU psychology interns on their performance. Relevant survey items assessed knowledge and learning, work quality, ethics, and client interaction (see highlighted items of Appendix C). These ratings were provided in PSY 400 (Internship) from fall 2016- spring 2019 including summer sessions.</p>	<p>With a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 = <i>Poor</i> to 5 = <i>Excellent</i>, an acceptable level of performance is a mean of at least 3.0 and at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students earning ratings of 4.0 or above.</p>	<p>Internship site supervisors evaluated 73 PSY interns in 6 sections of PSY 400 from 2016-2019</p> <p>6 evaluation items were examined (Ethics, Beginning Knowledge, Ending Knowledge, Work Quality, Client Rapport, and Cultural Sensitivity)</p> <p>Each item was rated on a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 = <i>Poor</i> to 5 = <i>Excellent</i>.</p> <p>The survey administered to the site supervisors in fall 2019 was different from surveys administered during previous years. Also, we were unable to collect data in spring 2020 because of COVID shut down.</p>	<p>Data for the 6 relevant items on the site supervisor evaluation were entered into SPSS for each of the 73 students. Descriptive statistics were calculated for each relevant item. The sample size (n), M, SD, and % reporting 4.0 or above are as follows:</p> <p><u>Item #6: Adheres to ethical guidelines</u> (n=73) M=4.8, SD=.44, 99%</p> <p><u>Item #8a: Knowledge level of site at beginning</u> (n=73) M=3.6, SD=1.04, 56%</p> <p><u>Item #8b: Knowledge level of site at end</u> (n=73) M= 4.6, SD=.61, 96%</p> <p><u>Item #10: Work quality— Written or verbal reports are accurate</u> (n=73) M= 4.5, SD=.71, 93%</p> <p><u>Item #14a: Builds rapport and communicates effectively with clients</u> (n=71) M=4.4, SD=1.0, 93%</p> <p><u>Item #14b: Is responsive and culturally sensitive to clients’ needs</u> (n=70) M=4.5, SD=1.1, 90%</p> <p>These data indicated that students exceeded acceptable levels of performance for each item, except for <i>Beginning Knowledge</i>, which is understandable. A paired sample t-test indicated a statistically significant</p>

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define the acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?</i></p>	<p>Result <i>Did you meet your target? What was the result?</i></p>
			<p>difference between students' levels knowledge at the beginning and end of their internships.</p>
<p>Indirect Measure: Marymount Graduating Student Survey – Psychology Program (2016-2017, 2017-2018, and 2018-2019). Assessed items relevant to Career Preparation (when defined as “applying specialized psychological knowledge in an internship setting”). All items rated via self-report.</p>	<p>With a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 = <i>Poor</i> to 5 = <i>Excellent</i>, an acceptable level of performance is a mean of at least 3.0 and at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students with ratings of 4.0 or above.</p>	<p>The GSS was administered and analyzed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.</p> <p>Two relevant items (Quality of preparation in program to a) <i>solve problems in field using knowledge and skills</i> and b) <i>apply knowledge and skills to new situations</i>) were scored on a 5-point scale.</p> <p>One relevant item (<i>The internship experience allowed you to apply critical thinking skills</i>) was answered in a Yes/No format.</p>	<p>The sample size (n), <i>M</i>, <i>SD</i>, and % reporting 4.0 or above are as follows:</p> <p>Item: <i>Solve problems in field using knowledge and skills.</i> <u>2016-2017</u>: n=43, M=3.60, SD = 1.09, 76.7% <u>2017-2018</u>: n=29, M=4.17, SD=0.76, 79% <u>2018-2019</u>: n=23, M=4.48, SD=0.65, 96% <u>2019-2020</u>: n=20, M=4.25, SD=1.12, 85%</p> <p>Item: <i>Apply knowledge and skills to new situations.</i> <u>2016-2017</u>: n=43, M = 4.12, SD = 1.00, 76.7% <u>2017-2018</u>: n=30, M=4.17, SD=0.75, 80% <u>2018-2019</u>: n=23, M=4.35, SD=0.65, 91% <u>2019-2020</u>: n=20, M=4.30, SD=1.13, 85%</p> <p>Item: <i>Internship allowed you to apply critical thinking skills</i> <u>2016-2017</u>: n=31, 72% “yes” <u>2017-2018</u>: n=21, 70% “yes” <u>2018-2019</u>: n=18, 78% “yes”</p> <p>Students exceeded acceptable levels of performance on the indirect GSS measure of professional development.</p>
<p>Indirect Measure: Marymount Alumni Survey – Psychology Program (2017, 2018, and 2019). Assessed items relevant to Career Preparation (when defined as “applying specialized psychological knowledge in an internship</p>	<p>With a 5-point response scale, ranging from 1 = <i>Poor</i> to 5 = <i>Excellent</i>, an acceptable level of performance is at least 66% (2/3 majority) of students reporting ratings of 4.0 or above.</p>	<p>The Alumni Survey was administered and analyzed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.</p> <p>The two relevant items (How well your</p>	<p>The sample size (n), and % reporting 4.0 or above are as follows:</p> <p>Item: <i>Apply knowledge and skills to new situations</i> <u>2017</u>: n=19, 79% <u>2018</u>: n=18, 83%</p>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define the acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?</i>	Result <i>Did you meet your target? What was the result?</i>
<i>setting”). All items rated via self-report.</i>	(No means were reported for this item.)	education prepared you to a) <i>apply knowledge and skills to new situations</i> and b) <i>solve problems in your field</i>) were scored on a 5-point scale.	<p> <u>2019</u>: n=26, 68% Item: <i>Solve problems in your field</i> <u>2017</u>: n=19, 68% <u>2018</u>: n=18, 83% <u>2019</u>: n=25, 72% </p> <p>Students exceeded acceptable levels of performance on the indirect AS measure of professional development.</p>

Interpretation of Results

Analysis and Implications: *What does this result tell you about the extent to which your students achieved this outcome? What are the strengths and weaknesses that this result highlights, and what are the implications for your curriculum or your program?*

The results indicate that the Psychology students achieved the career preparation outcome. That is, they were able to apply specialized psychological knowledge in an internship setting. Students exceeded acceptable levels of performance on both direct (Site Supervisor Surveys) and indirect measures (Graduating Student Surveys and Alumni Surveys). There was one item from the Site Supervisor Survey on which 66% of the students did not score 4 or above. The item was “knowledge level of the site at the beginning”. Fifty-six percent (56%) of the respondents rated the students’ levels of knowledge at the beginning as “good” or “excellent” whereas 96% rated the students’ level of knowledge at the end as “good” or “excellent.”

On all other items on the Site Supervisor Survey 90% or more of the respondents rated the students as “good” or “excellent” and the mean scores on each item exceeded our performance standard of 3.0.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Students mentioned in their course feedback that the career preparation course offered as CCS 399 was not specific enough to Psychology. In the 2018-2019 academic year we made four changes to our career preparation course. Specifically, we went through the UCIC process to revise the content of PSY 200 “Careers in Psychology”, made it fully online, made it a prerequisite for PSY 400 Internship, and we now require all students to take PSY 200 (taught by same psychologist who teaches internship) and no longer accept CCS 399 (taught by the Career Center).

We also provide career development to our students through Careers Night in Psychology, which we hold every year and collaborate with the Counseling and FLP Programs to provide career development opportunities to our majors.

Planned improvements are working with the Career Center to revise the Site Supervisor Survey, or at least to receive the data in a more user-friendly way. Students are strong in several areas we emphasize in the major (e.g., ethics, cultural sensitivity, critical thinking, and problem-solving). The data do suggest that students may need additional information about their sites prior to beginning their internships. Finally, although not reported with these data, the Psychology program will need to revise the annual Careers and Internship event for the 2020-21 academic year. We plan to hold the event virtually, both in the fall and spring. Many students come to the event to meet professionals as well as to look for internships.

Appendices (please only include items that will help reviewers understand your process – for example, test questions, rubrics, survey questions, more detailed description of assessment measures, summary tables of survey results, etc.)

Appendix A

MU Psychology Department Oral Communication Skills Rubric

Standard 3: Students will demonstrate effective presentation skills within the discipline. Rate PSY 497 presentation.

Course:		SEM/YR:	
Student Name:		Rater:	

Category	Unsatisfactory (1)	(2)	Satisfactory (3)	(4)	Excellent (5)
Content					
Knowledge of Topic	Does not understand the topic very well.		Shows some understanding of the topic.		Shows a strong understanding of the topic.
Effective Support	Uses mostly inappropriate or irrelevant information and sources.		Uses mostly relevant information and sources to support central point.		Uses high-quality and relevant information and sources to support central point.
Level of Analysis	Describes topic and information without any analysis, evaluation, or application.		Presents topic and information with some degree of analysis, evaluation, or application (has room for improvement).		Presents topic and information with a high level of analysis, evaluation, or application.
Organization					
Central Focus	Does not provide a clear or relevant central question or thesis.		Provides a mostly clear and relevant central question or thesis.		Provides a clearly-defined, interesting, and relevant central question or thesis.
Structure	Does not include a logical structure (lacks a clear introduction, development, and conclusions).		Includes an introduction, development, and conclusions, but organization shows room for improvement.		Includes a strong introduction, development, and conclusions, with appropriate transitions.
Time Limit/ Flow	Inappropriate time management and flow; not well-paced.		Generally appropriate time management and flow; well-paced overall.		Very effective time management and flow; very well-paced.
Delivery					
Eye Contact/ Body Language/ Appearance	Establishes little-to-no eye contact. Facial expressions, body language, and/or appearance are inappropriate.		Sometimes establishes eye contact. Facial expressions, body language, and appearance are appropriate but show some room for improvement.		Establishes regular eye contact across the room. Displays appropriate facial expressions, body language, and appearance.
Audience Engagement	Does not generate much audience interest in topic. Does not ask questions, wait for answers, use active involvement activities, or solicit audience involvement.		Generates some audience interest in the topic. Attempts to engage the audience by asking questions, or attempts an active involvement activity.		Generates and maintains strong audience interest in the topic. Engages the audience by asking questions and waiting for answers, or uses active involvement activities.
Vocal Delivery	Speaks in manner that is difficult to understand. Inappropriate volume and/or tone. Excessive vocal fillers.		Speaks clearly overall but needs to clarify in places. Generally good volume and tone, with some vocal fillers.		Speaks clearly all or almost all of the time. Appropriate volume and tone, with almost no vocal fillers.
Technology					
Overall Use of Audio-visual technology	No technology used or audio-visuals have a non-aesthetical design (very text-heavy, little-to-no relevant images, distracting, disorganized).		Mostly effective use of technology. Audio-visuals have organized design with some relevant images (but are a bit too text-heavy).		Effective use of technology. Audio-visuals have well-organized design (aesthetically pleasing), engaging and relevant images; and appropriate amount of text.

Total Score (out of 50): _____

	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Fair	Poor
Adheres to ethical guidelines (and consults, if necessary)	Selected	-	-	-	-

7. Comments on intern's ethical behavior.

[Redacted]

8. Knowledge of internship site (e.g. client population, objectives, strategies)

	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Fair	Poor
Knowledge level of site at beginning of internship	-	Selected	-	-	-
Knowledge level of site at end of internship	Selected	-	-	-	-

9. Comments on intern's knowledge of internship site.

[Redacted]

10. Work Quality

	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Fair	Poor
Written or verbal reports are accurate and factually correct	Selected	-	-	-	-
Written or verbal reports are presented in a professional manner	Selected	-	-	-	-

11. Comments on intern's quality of work.

[Redacted]

12. Supervision

Excellent	Good	Neutral	Fair	Poor
-----------	------	---------	------	------

Receptive to feedback and suggestions from supervisor	Selected	-	-	-	-
Willingness to explore personal strengths and weaknesses	Selected	-	-	-	-

13. Comments on intern's ability to be supervised.

[Redacted]

14. Interaction with Clients

	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Fair	Poor	N/A
Builds rapport and communicates effectively with clients (if applicable)	Selected	-	-	-	-	-
Is responsive and culturally sensitive to clients' needs (if applicable)	Selected	-	-	-	-	-

15. Comments on intern's interactions with clients.

[Redacted]

16. Interactions with Coworkers

	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Fair	Poor
Communicates effectively with staff	Selected	-	-	-	-
Effectively receives information and opinions from others	Selected	-	-	-	-

17. Comments on intern's interaction with coworkers.

[Redacted]

18. Overall Performance Rating

Excellent	Good	Neutral	Fair	Poor
-----------	------	---------	------	------

Overall performance rating

Selected

- - - -

19. Comments on intern's overall performance.

[Redacted]

20. Student's general strengths.

[Redacted]

21. Student's general areas for improvement.

[Redacted]

22. Does the student need any additional training or specific skills to gain expertise for this career field?

[Redacted]

23. Have you offered (or do you plan to offer) this student a permanent or full-time job with your organization?

[Redacted]

24. Would you recommend this student for future employment in the field?

[Redacted]

25. Are you interested in receiving additional interns from Marymount University?

[Redacted]