

Student Learning Outcome 1

Student Learning Outcome	Function as competent behavioral health practitioners, skilled in developing, implementing, and evaluating evidence-based practices, particularly for rural and other under-served populations, in their chosen area of concentration.		
Measurement Instrument 1	Students complete a Qualifying Examination that is based, in part, on the Oral Examination for doctoral-level practice in Psychology in the Commonwealth of Kentucky . This Qualifying Examination requires students to provide a diagnosis, assessment battery, and treatment plan for a fictional client. The first part is a written examination, and references for all materials are expected. The second part is an oral examination, where students are quizzed to see how well they “think on their feet.”		
Criteria for Student Success	Students must pass both parts of the Qualifying Examination at an 80% level.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	80% of the students who take the Qualifying Examination will pass it.	Percent of Program Achieving Target	75%
Methods	There were 4 students who took the Qualifying Examination in 2019. 3 of the 4 passed the examination.		
Measurement Instrument 2	Students are rated on their clinical abilities while completing practicum hours. Supervisors rate students’ abilities to select appropriate interventions, provide therapy and assessment services, work with diverse clients, and perform in an ethical manner.		
Criteria for Student Success	Students must, on average, be functioning at their grade level. That is, if the student is a third-year doctoral student, that student would be expected to be rated, on average, as a third-year student.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	80% of students will be at level or higher.	Percent of Program Achieving Target	100%
Methods	6 students returned practicum evaluations. All 6 were rated, on average, at grade level or higher.		
Measurement Instrument 3			
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement		Percent of Program Achieving Target	
Methods			

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.	Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)		
We are in the process of APA accreditation. We will not make any program changes until after the APA Council on Accreditation meets in March 2020. Based on the feedback from that review, we will make specific requested changes by the end of the Spring 2020 semester.		
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)		
We will review program progress at least yearly.		

Student Learning Outcome 2

Student Learning Outcome			
Measurement Instrument 1	NOTE: Each student learning outcome should have at least one direct measure of student learning . Indirect measures are not required.		
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement		Percent of Program Achieving Target	
Methods			
Measurement Instrument 2			
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement		Percent of Program Achieving Target	
Methods			
Measurement Instrument 3			
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement		Percent of Program Achieving Target	
Methods			
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.			
			Met
			Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
We are in the process of APA accreditation. We will not make any program changes until after the APA Council on Accreditation meets in March 2020. Based on the feedback from that review, we will make specific requested changes by the end of the Spring 2020 semester.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
We will review program progress at least yearly.			

--

Student Learning Outcome 3			
Student Learning Outcome	Contribute to the practice and scholarship of psychology consistent with the practitioner/scholar model with the capacity to review the scholarly literature, effectively integrate it with practice considerations, and evaluate outcomes.		
Measurement Instrument 1	As part of the Doctor of Psychology in Applied Psychology program, students must complete a Dissertation. A major step in this process is proposing a dissertation.		
Criteria for Student Success	The Dissertation Committee agreeing that the student passed the Dissertation Proposal.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	60% of the students who take Dissertation I Class will propose by the end of the year.	Percent of Program Achieving Target	66%
Methods	3 students took Dissertation I class and there were 2 successful proposals.		
Measurement Instrument 2	As part of the Doctor of Psychology in Applied Psychology program, students must complete a Dissertation. One of the last major steps in this process is orally defending the final dissertation project.		
Criteria for Student Success	The Dissertation Committee agrees that the student passes the defense.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	60% of students who take Dissertation II class will defend by the end of the year.	Percent of Program Achieving Target	100%
Methods	5 students took Dissertation II class and there were 5 successful defenses.		
Measurement Instrument 3	Students are rated on their ability to use and conduct research while completing practicum hours. Supervisors rate students' abilities to select and apply appropriate research with their clients.		
Criteria for Student Success	Students must, on average, be functioning at their grade level. That is, if the student is a third-year doctoral student, that student would be expected to be rated, on average, as a third-year student.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	80% of students will be rated at grade level or higher.	Percent of Program Achieving Target	100%
Methods	6 students returned practicum evaluations. All 6 were rated, on average, at grade level or higher.		
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.			Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
We are in the process of APA accreditation. We will not make any program changes until after the APA Council on Accreditation meets in March 2020. Based on the feedback from that review, we will make specific requested changes by the end of the Spring 2020 semester.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			

We will review program progress at least yearly.

Qualifying Examination Rubric

Paper Number: _____

CATEGORY	4 Extraordinary	3 Average	2 Low	1 Simplistic
1. Diagnosis <hr/>	<p>The student obtains the correct diagnosis for the case vignette with the correct specifiers.</p> <p>The student considers a number of signs and symptoms of the disorder and correctly interprets them.</p> <p>There is clear evidence of doctoral-level processing of information.</p>	<p>The student obtains the correct diagnosis for the case vignette.</p> <p>The student considers some signs and symptoms of the disorder and mostly correctly interprets them.</p> <p>There is evidence of doctoral-level processing of information.</p>	<p>The student obtains an appropriate diagnosis for the case vignette.</p> <p>The student considers some signs and symptoms of the disorder and sometimes correctly interprets them.</p> <p>There is some evidence of doctoral-level processing of information.</p>	<p>The student obtains a diagnosis that is inappropriate for the case vignette.</p> <p>The student does not appear to consider signs and symptoms of the disorder.</p> <p>There is a lack of doctoral-level processing of information.</p>
2. Differential Diagnoses <hr/>	<p>The student reviews all of the possible differential diagnoses and provides rationale for why these are not applicable to this case vignette.</p> <p>There is clear evidence of doctoral-level processing of information.</p>	<p>The student reviews some of the differential diagnoses and provides rationale for why these are not applicable to this case vignette.</p> <p>There is evidence of doctoral-level processing of information.</p>	<p>The student reviews one possible differential diagnosis and provides rationale for why this are not applicable to this case vignette.</p> <p>There is some evidence of doctoral-level processing of information.</p>	<p>The student does not evaluate differential diagnoses.</p> <p>There is a lack of doctoral-level processing of information.</p>
3. Assessment <hr/>	<p>The student provides an assessment battery that addresses the issues raised by the vignette and correctly assesses the diagnostic issues presented in the vignette.</p>	<p>The student provides an assessment battery that generally addresses the issues raised by the vignette and generally assesses the diagnostic issues presented in the vignette.</p>	<p>The student provides an assessment battery that somewhat addresses the issues raised by the vignette and somewhat assesses the diagnostic issues presented in the vignette.</p>	<p>The student provides an assessment battery that does not address the issues raised by the vignette and does not assesses the diagnostic issues presented in the vignette.</p>

	Psychometric data are presented for each test and demonstrates the appropriateness of each instrument for the assessment. There is clear evidence of doctoral-level processing of information.	Psychometric data are presented for most of the tests and generally demonstrates the appropriateness of each instrument for the assessment. There is evidence of doctoral-level processing of information.	Psychometric data are presented for at least one test and generally demonstrates the appropriateness of the instrument for the assessment. There is some evidence of doctoral-level processing of information.	Psychometric data are not presented. There is a lack of doctoral-level processing of information.
Page 1 Subtotal:	_____ (out of 12)			
CATEGORY	4 Extraordinary	3 Average	2 Low	1 Simplistic
4. Etiology	The student provides a biopsychosocial rationale for the disorder that correctly and completely addresses the client's issues.	The student provides a biopsychosocial rationale for the disorder that mostly addresses the client's issues.	The student provides a biopsychosocial rationale for the disorder that somewhat addresses the client's issues. However, there are some areas that are incorrect or demonstrate faulty assertions about the disorder.	The student provides a biopsychosocial rationale for the disorder that is incorrect or has a number of faulty assertions about the disorder.
5. Treatment Plan _____	The student provides a 6-month treatment plan that correctly and completely addresses the client's issues. The student provides empirical evidence that directly supports the efficacy of the treatment with the diagnosed disorder There is clear evidence of doctoral-level processing of information.	The student provides a 6-month treatment plan that generally addresses the client's issues. The student provides some empirical evidence that supports the efficacy of the treatment with the diagnosed disorder There is evidence of doctoral-level processing of information.	The student provides a 6-month treatment plan that somewhat addresses the client's issues. The student provides a little empirical evidence that supports the efficacy of the treatment with the diagnosed disorder There is some evidence of doctoral-level processing of information.	The student provides a 6-month treatment plan that does not address the client's issues. The student does not provide empirical evidence that supports the efficacy of the treatment with the diagnosed disorder There is a lack of doctoral-level processing of information.

6. References 	The student provides more than sufficient references to support the assertions in the examination. The references are all appropriately cited in APA 6 th Edition style.	The student provides sufficient references to support the assertions in the examination. The references are generally appropriately cited in APA 6 th Edition style.	The student provides adequate references to support the assertions in the examination. The references have some APA 6 th Edition style errors.	The student provides insufficient references to support the assertions in the examination. The references have significant APA 6 th Edition style errors.
7. Writing Style 	The student clearly uses doctoral-level writing to convey information.	The student sometimes uses doctoral-level writing to convey information.	The student generally writes at a level below doctoral level to convey information.	The student's writing style is well below the doctoral level.
Page 2 Subtotal:	_____ (out of 16)			

CATEGORY	4 Extraordinary	3 Average	2 Low	1 Simplistic
8. Vocabulary and grammar 	<p>The student uses effective vocabulary to convey the information at a doctoral level.</p> <p>Information is communicated clearly using appropriate psychological conventions.</p> <p>There are very few grammatical issues.</p>	<p>The student uses appropriate vocabulary to convey the information at a doctoral level.</p> <p>Information is mostly communicated clearly with some confusion.</p> <p>There may be some words used inappropriately.</p> <p>There are a few grammatical issues.</p>	<p>The student uses inappropriate vocabulary to convey the information at a doctoral level.</p> <p>Information is presented in a manner that is 50% clear and 50% confusing.</p> <p>Many words are used inappropriately.</p> <p>There are some grammatical issues.</p>	<p>The student uses inappropriate vocabulary to convey the information at a doctoral level.</p> <p>Information is presented in a manner that is very difficult to understand.</p> <p>Many words are used inappropriately.</p> <p>There are a number of grammatical issues.</p>
9. APA Style 	<p>There are only one or two APA style errors present in the entire manuscript.</p>	<p>There are a few consistent APA style errors present in the manuscript.</p>	<p>There are a number of consistent APA style errors present in the manuscript.</p>	<p>The manuscript is completely at odds with APA style, as if the student never even consulted the guide.</p>
Page 3 Subtotal: _____ (out of 8)	Page 2 Subtotal: _____ (out of 16)	Page 1 Subtotal: _____ (out of 12)	Qualifying Exam Total: _____ (out of 36)	

Review Committee Rating

Check all that apply:

- Pass with distinction (score of 32 or higher, three of the five core areas [first five areas rated] must be rated at 4)
- Pass (score of 25 or better, with no individual rating of 1, and Category 1 must be rated no lower than 3)
- Revise and resubmit (score no lower than 20 with scores in one or two areas that are low but are presumed to be able to be improved).
Instances of apparently accidental plagiarism will be offered an opportunity to revise and resubmit their work.
Areas of revision: _____

- Fail. Instances of blatant plagiarism will earn a failing score.

Evaluation of Clinical Competency Development	
Student Name: _____ Placement: _____ Supervisor: _____	Semester, Year: _____ Year in Program: 1 st Year Master 2 nd Year Master 3 rd Year PsyD 4 th Year PsyD 5 th Year PsyD Doctoral Internship

This evaluation form is designed to evaluate practicum students' level of competency in the program's domains of training. In addition, students' dispositions necessary for effective collaborative functioning as a psychologist are assessed.

Supervisors:

1. Please rate each item twice, once for **competency** and once for **acceptability**.
2. If the student has not yet had the opportunity to experience an activity or you have no basis for appraisal, check the "No Opportunity" box and leave the "Competency" and "Acceptability" boxes blank.
3. First, indicate the extent to which the practicum student demonstrates competency for each item using the scale described below.
4. Second, indicate the acceptability of the level of competency demonstrated using the scale below.
5. As appropriate, provide comments in support of your ratings, for both strengths and concerns. *(Note: If the student receives a rating of 1 in the "Acceptability" column, comments are necessary to explain the concern.)*
6. At the end of the evaluation form, provide a recommendation for a course grade.

Level of Competency

Rating	Descriptor	Definition
0	Novice	Beginning to show this knowledge/skill.
1	First Year Master's Student	Demonstrates a consistent basic understanding of concepts/skills. Beginning-level therapist
2	Second Year Master's Student	Demonstrates a consistent competent understanding of concepts/skills.
3	Third Year PsyD Student	Demonstrates a consistent advanced understanding of concepts/skills. Capable of practice with supervision.
4	Fourth Year PsyD Student	Demonstrates consistent proficient understanding of concepts/skills.
5.	Doctoral Internship Ready	Can practice independently with structure.
6.	Private Practice Ready	Can practice independently without supervision.

Acceptability of Student's Level of Competency

Rating	Descriptor	Definition
1	Not Acceptable	Needs further skill development and/or close supervision.
2	Marginally Acceptable	Inconsistent performance or still some gaps in skills.
3	Acceptable/Expected	Development consistent with expectations at this stage.
4	Exceeds Expectations	Above and beyond expectations at this stage.

Competency Scale

0 = Novice
1 = First Year Student
2 = Second Year Student
3 = Third Year Student
4 = Fourth Year Student
5 = Internship Ready
6 = Private Practice Ready

Acceptability Scale

1 = Not Acceptable
2 = Marginally Acceptable
3 = Acceptable/Expected
4 = Exceeds Expectations

Competency Scale

0 = Novice
1 = First Year Student
2 = Second Year Student
3 = Third Year Student
4 = Fourth Year Student
5 = Internship Ready
6 = Private Practice Ready

Acceptability Scale

1 = Not Acceptable
2 = Marginally Acceptable
3 = Acceptable/Expected
4 = Exceeds Expectations

Domain 1.1. Synthesize principles from the science of psychology and apply them to behavioral health problems in a variety of settings, adapting to issues of cultural and individual diversity, including socioeconomic status and the rural environment.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
Competency 1.1.1: Able to prepare an assessment report with a client who is diverse from the therapist, taking into consideration appropriate concerns for that individual.			
Competency 1.1.2: Able to conceptualize psychotherapy/assessment cases with a population diverse from the therapist.			

Comments:

Domain 1.2. Describe the theories, methods, measurement tools, data analysis, results and development of scientific psychology by studying the subfields that explore human behavior, affect, and cognition and the influences of biology and society.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
Competency 1.2.1: Demonstrates an understanding of the influence of current basic research findings that apply to the student's area of study.			

Comments:

Domain 1.3. Apply to evidence-based practice their knowledge derived from the study of human development, individual differences, maladaptive behavior, and pathology.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
Competency 1.3.1: Creates a culturally sensitive treatment plan to address clients' presenting concerns.			
Competency 1.3.2: Demonstrates an understanding of different appropriate interventions relative to the client's cognitive and developmental levels.			

Comments:



Competency Scale

0 = Novice
1 = First Year Student
2 = Second Year Student
3 = Third Year Student
4 = Fourth Year Student
5 = Internship Ready
6 = Private Practice Ready

Acceptability Scale

1 = Not Acceptable
2 = Marginally Acceptable
3 = Acceptable/Expected
4 = Exceeds Expectations

Competency Scale

0 = Novice
1 = First Year Student
2 = Second Year Student
3 = Third Year Student
4 = Fourth Year Student
5 = Internship Ready
6 = Private Practice Ready

Acceptability Scale

1 = Not Acceptable
2 = Marginally Acceptable
3 = Acceptable/Expected
4 = Exceeds Expectations

Domain 1.4. Apply legislative, ethical and professional standards to legal and ethical issues of practice such as those involving insurance, technology, and privacy.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
Competency 1.4.1: Creates legally-defensible documents for the practice of psychology.			

Comments:

Domain 1.5. Apply evidence-based practice to assess and define problems and to develop and implement interventions relying on their knowledge of theories and methods.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
Competency 1.5.1: Demonstrates an understanding of more than one evidence-based treatment/intervention and discuss the specific mechanisms of change that are responsible for their efficacy.			
Competency 1.5.2: Creates a plan for intervention/treatment that appropriately incorporates evidence-based treatments that have been selected for their efficacy.			

Comments:

Domain 1.6. Effectively communicate their assessment and conceptualization to consumers and other professionals.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
Competency 1.6.1: Demonstrates clear diagnostic formulations in progress notes and evaluation reports.			
Competency 1.6.2: Modifies writing styles in reports so that the intended audience of the report can clearly understand and utilize the information.			

Comments:

Domain 1.7. Evaluate the outcomes of treatments and practices and modify their practice based on that evaluation.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
Competency 1.7.1: Appropriately tailors therapeutic interventions and techniques to specific clients and the clients' presenting concerns			
Competency 1.7.2: Utilizes an outcome measure to track therapy progress across session and can describe the benefits of that measure.			



Competency Scale

0 = Novice
1 = First Year Student
2 = Second Year Student
3 = Third Year Student
4 = Fourth Year Student
5 = Internship Ready
6 = Private Practice Ready

Acceptability Scale

1 = Not Acceptable
2 = Marginally Acceptable
3 = Acceptable/Expected
4 = Exceeds Expectations

Comments:

Domain 2.1. Describe the research and theories of supervision as well as professional standards for competence.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
Competency 2.1.1: Describes a supervision case that incorporates the research, multiple theories of supervision and illustrates an understanding of professional standards from the appropriate state licensing board and professional associations.			

Comments:

Domain 2.2. Evaluate the developmental level of a supervisee and appropriately structure a response to enable supervisee growth, based on their knowledge of the research and theories of supervision and sensitivity to cultural and individual differences.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
Competency 2.2.1: Writes a supervision plan that includes assessment of the developmental level of a supervisee and a professional growth plan that incorporates knowledge of the research and theories of supervision and sensitivity to cultural and individual differences.			

Comments:

Domain 2.3. Behave in a professional manner toward supervisees, supervisors and colleagues and with respect for professional boundaries.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
Competency 2.3.1: Completes supervision notes and sign-offs/reports within 7 days and appropriately refers supervisees when boundary issues occur. Discusses issues with supervisees and supervisors as they occur.			

Comments:

Domain 3.1. Demonstrate command of contemporary advances in the field with regard to scientific and theoretical advancements in general and those affecting their realm of practice in particular.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
---	------------	---------------	----------------



Competency Scale

0 = Novice
1 = First Year Student
2 = Second Year Student
3 = Third Year Student
4 = Fourth Year Student
5 = Internship Ready
6 = Private Practice Ready

Acceptability Scale

1 = Not Acceptable
2 = Marginally Acceptable
3 = Acceptable/Expected
4 = Exceeds Expectations

Competency 3.1.1: The student selects and integrates the current scientific literature and appropriate methods related to their area of practice and be able to describe the theoretical underpinings.			
---	--	--	--

Comments:

Competency Scale

0 = Novice
1 = First Year Student
2 = Second Year Student
3 = Third Year Student

4 = Fourth Year Student
5 = Internship Ready
6 = Private Practice Ready

Acceptability Scale

1 = Not Acceptable
2 = Marginally Acceptable

3 = Acceptable/Expected
4 = Exceeds Expectations

Domain 3.2. Engage in data-based problem-solving when dealing with issues in their respective practice settings, including adherence to American Psychological Association standards for the conduct of research and sensitivity to cultural and individual differences in the formulation of research questions, design, and implementation.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
Competency 3.2.1: In their practice, students are able to demonstrate a positive impact on clients and/or programs. They can select an area and design a research plan for outcome-based practice or program evaluation based on scholarly references.			

Comments:

Domain 3.3. Design action-research based on the literature that advances the needs of the practice community, and evaluate and communicate the results.	Competency	Acceptability	No Opportunity
Competency 3.3.1: Students will be able to craft a research study that addresses a clinical area.			
Competency 3.3.2: Students will be able to describe research findings to peers and other professionals			

Comments:

Competency Scale

0 = Novice
1 = First Year Student
2 = Second Year Student
3 = Third Year Student
4 = Fourth Year Student
5 = Internship Ready
6 = Private Practice Ready

Acceptability Scale

1 = Not Acceptable
2 = Marginally Acceptable
3 = Acceptable/Expected
4 = Exceeds Expectations

PROFESSIONAL INTERPERSONAL DISPOSITIONS

Please rate the student's professional and interpersonal dispositions using the following scale:

Ratings: 1 = Unacceptable
2 = Marginal
3 = Acceptable
4 = On Target
5 = Area of Strength
NA = Not Applicable or Not Observed

1. Demonstrates positive interpersonal skills.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
2. Establishes rapport and effectively communicates with clients.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
3. Establishes rapport and effectively communicates with co-workers.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
4. Exhibits punctuality.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
5. Able to organize own schedule and work assignments in an efficient manner.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
6. Uses sound, practical judgment.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
7. Personal appearance is appropriate and professional.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
8. Reacts appropriately to feedback or criticism.	1	2	3	4	5	NA



Competency Scale

0 = Novice
1 = First Year Student
2 = Second Year Student
3 = Third Year Student
4 = Fourth Year Student
5 = Internship Ready
6 = Private Practice Ready

Acceptability Scale

1 = Not Acceptable
2 = Marginally Acceptable
3 = Acceptable/Expected
4 = Exceeds Expectations

9. Learns from feedback or criticism.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
10. Willingness to learn or improve professional skills.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
11. Maintains positive outlook.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
12. Exhibits organizational skills.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
13. Uses appropriate grammar and vocabulary.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
14. Exhibits responsible behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
15. Exhibits self-direction.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
16. Exhibits personal and emotional stability.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
17. Accepts and respects individual differences.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
18. Accepts and respects cultural diversity.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
19. Assumes responsibility for personal/professional actions.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
20. Exhibits ethical behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
21. Uses supervision time well.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

TOTAL PRACTICUM HOURS: _____

INTERVENTION HOURS: _____



Competency Scale

0 = Novice
1 = First Year Student
2 = Second Year Student
3 = Third Year Student
4 = Fourth Year Student
5 = Internship Ready
6 = Private Practice Ready

Acceptability Scale

1 = Not Acceptable
2 = Marginally Acceptable
3 = Acceptable/Expected
4 = Exceeds Expectations

DATE(S) OF DIRECT OBSERVATION:

AREAS OF STRENGTH:

AREAS FOR FUTURE GROWTH:

COURSE GRADE

As the practicum supervisor, I would recommend this graduate student receive a grade of:

A+ A A- B+ B B- C+ C C- F

Clinical Supervisor

Date



Competency Scale

Acceptability Scale

0 = Novice 4 = Fourth Year Student 1 = Not Acceptable 3 = Acceptable/Expected
1 = First Year Student 5 = Internship Ready 2 = Marginally Acceptable 4 = Exceeds Expectations
2 = Second Year Student 6 = Private Practice Ready
3 = Third Year Student

Graduate Student

Date

Signature indicates only that the student has reviewed and discussed the evaluation with the supervisor. It does not necessarily indicate agreement with the evaluation.



PsyD Dissertation Proposal Rubric

	Unsatisfactory	Acceptable	Exemplary	
INTRODUCTION				
Introductory Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Argument or logic for the study is unclear or ambiguous. ○ Literature review does not provide context for the study or is far too detailed for the introductory section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ General argument and logic for the study is present. ○ Brief literature review provides context for the study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Argument and logic for the study is compelling. ○ Cited literature provides succinctly the necessary context to augment the reasoning behind the study and demonstrates how the current study extends understanding of the area. 	
Literature Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope of review is missing key elements. ○ Critical and foundational citations are present briefly. ○ Review contains elements that are not related to the argument of the study. ○ Demonstrates cursory or no understanding of topic area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope of literature review is appropriate for the study. ○ Critical and foundational citations are present and discussed. ○ Elements of review generally lead to a coherent argument for the study. ○ Demonstrates emerging area of expertise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope of review is provided in depth and with relevance. ○ Citations range from historical to contemporary direction in the area. ○ All elements of the review are synthesized to a coherent and compelling argument for the study. ○ Demonstrates early mastery of area. 	

PsyD Dissertation Proposal Rubric

Hypotheses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The need for the study is loosely or not based on any previous work. ○ Hypotheses are implied and loosely based on the literature review. ○ Research questions are weakly implied or not present at all. ○ Key concepts or terms have insufficient discussion and definitions are not operational. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The need for the study is presented based on previous work. ○ Hypotheses are explicitly stated and are logical results of the literature review argument. ○ Research questions are implied in the statement of purpose. ○ Key concepts or terms have sufficient operational definitions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The need for the study is based upon an expansion of contemporary work. ○ Hypotheses are compellingly presented as a result of the review. ○ Research questions are presented clearly (does not have to be explicitly stated). ○ Key concepts or terms have strong operational definitions. 	
METHOD				
Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participant selection is inappropriate for the goals of the study. ○ Recruitment is lacking rationale. ○ Little or no demographic data on the participants are present. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chosen participants are appropriate to the goals of the study. ○ Recruitment reflects scientific practices. ○ Some demographic information of the participants is present. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participants in the study are appropriate for the extension of previous work. ○ Recruitment information is discussed thoroughly and reflects scientific practices. ○ In depth demographic data is presented to provide thorough context of the participants. 	

PsyD Dissertation Proposal Rubric

Instruments [<i>e.g., measures, materials, etc.</i>]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instruments used cannot be easily traced to an evidence source (e.g., previous study). ○ Chosen instruments have questionable or ambiguous connections with the goals of the study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instruments used are evidence-based. ○ Chosen instruments align with the goals of the study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instruments used are documented as effective tools in previous studies. ○ Instrument decisions are the logical results of the study arguments and align with the goals of the study. 	
Procedure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procedures contain little or no information in obtaining consent. ○ Some steps or phases of the study are missing or lacking sufficient discussion. ○ Replicability is questionable by the author. ○ Design of project is questionable in light of the hypotheses. ○ Regulatory compliance is only briefly mentioned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procedures contain information regarding consent. ○ All of the steps or phases of the study are discussed. ○ The steps allow for the study to be replicated by the author and members of the committee. ○ Design of project is reasonable in light of the hypotheses. ○ Discusses regulatory compliance (e.g., IRB, if participant reports harm, etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Procedures contain detailed steps for obtaining consent. ○ All steps and phases of the study are detailed and comprehensive. ○ The study would be easily replicated by a competent member of the scientific community. ○ Design of the project is compelling and novel based upon the argument built in Introduction. ○ Regulatory compliance is discussed, including any expected anomalous 	

PsyD Dissertation Proposal Rubric

			events and how it could be addressed.	
RESULTS				
Proposed Data Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Data analysis proposal is questionable. ○ Analysis procedures are inappropriate for the study and there is no evidence that supports the use of it in this study. ○ Analysis procedure may tangentially address the hypotheses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Data analysis proposal is backed by common research practices (e.g., comparison of treatment and baseline). ○ Analysis procedures are appropriate in regards to the scope of the project and citations to support the proposal are present. ○ Analysis procedures would provide information to address the hypotheses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Data analysis proposal is backed by common research practices and detailed. ○ Analysis procedures are compelling in regards to the project and citations support the use in the study. ○ Analysis procedures are novel in addressing the hypotheses and research questions of this study. 	
MECHANICS				
Grammar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal contains many significant errors and detract from the content. ○ The proposal is difficult to understand due to a lack of flow and clarity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal contains few errors that may fall into any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Spelling ● Grammar ○ The proposal is clear and can generally be understood without 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal contains no or minor errors. ○ The clarity of the proposal allows for easy flow from section to section and within the sections. 	

PsyD Dissertation Proposal Rubric

		difficulty and flows from section to section.		
Formatting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ APA formatting conventions are either not used or the proposal contains multiple or significant errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ APA formatting conventions are used with few errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ APA formatting conventions are used with no or minor errors. 	
Plagiarism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Content of proposal is suspected of plagiarism. ○ The proposal has a lack of proper citations (e.g., incorrect or missing citations). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is not plagiarized. ○ Correct use of citations has been used throughout the proposal when discussing the ideas of other authors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is not plagiarized. ○ Correct use of citations has been used throughout the proposal when discussing the ideas of other authors. 	
TOTAL SCORE				_____/20

COMMENTS: