Please attach a narrative (not to exceed 4 pages, excluding appendices) addressing the following:

- What are the student learning outcomes? Please provide a numbered list.
- Which learning outcomes were assessed?
- How were they assessed? (Programs must use at least one direct assessment of student learning.)
- Undergraduate programs should assess at least one University Undergraduate Learning Outcome (UULO) each year, which may or may not overlap with a program learning outcome.
- Graduate programs should assess at least one outcome related to one of the following graduate level requirements each year:
  - student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression and/or appropriate high-level professional practice.
  - activities requiring originality, critical analysis and expertise.
  - the development of extensive knowledge in the field under study.
- What was learned from the assessment results?
- How did the program respond to what was learned?

Please limit the narrative portion of your report to no more than four pages. You may attach appendices with data, tables, charts, or other materials as needed. Please explain the relevant conclusions from any appendices in your narrative. Please contact the Office of Academic Assessment if you have questions or need assistance.
What are the student learning outcomes? Please provide a numbered list.

The central goal of our doctoral program is to train psychological scientist-practitioners who possess a broad foundation of psychological knowledge, the ability to design and implement scientific investigations, and the skills necessary to intervene in psychological concerns. We thus evaluate our students along the following areas of competence, which serve as student learning objective (SLOs):

SLO 1. **Scientific Approach**: Demonstration of knowledge, skills, and competence sufficient to produce new knowledge, to critically evaluate and use existing knowledge to solve problems, and to disseminate research.

SLO 2. **Ethical and Legal Standards**: Application of ethical concepts and awareness of relevant laws, regulations, rules, and policies governing professional activities at the organizational, local, state, regional and federal levels.

SLO 3. **Individual and Cultural Differences/Diversity**: Awareness, sensitivity and skills in working professionally with diverse individuals, groups and communities who represent various cultural and personal background and characteristics defined broadly and consistent with APA policy.

SLO 4. **Professional Values, Attitudes, and Behaviors**: Behavior and comportment that reflect the values and attitudes of psychology.

SLO 5. **Communication and Interpersonal Skills**: Relates effectively and meaningfully with individuals, groups, and/or communities.

SLO 6. **Assessment**: Competence in evidence-based assessment and diagnosis of problems, capabilities consistent with the scope of Health Service Psychology.

SLO 7. **Intervention**: Competence in evidence-based interventions consistent with the scope of Health Service Psychology, including but not limited to psychotherapy, directed at an individual, family, group, organization, community, population or other system.

SLO 8. **Supervision**: Supervision and training in the professional knowledge base of enhancing and monitoring the professional functioning of others.

SLO 9. **Consultation and Interprofessional/Interdisciplinary Skills**: The ability to collaborate intentionally with other individuals or groups to address a problem, seek or share knowledge, or promote effectiveness in professional activities.

SLO 10. **Research**: Demonstration of knowledge, skills, and competence sufficient to produce new knowledge, to critically evaluate and use existing knowledge to solve problems, and to disseminate research.

Which learning outcomes were assessed?

SLO’s 1-10 were assessed as a part of our ongoing internal evaluation procedures required for program accreditation by the American Psychological Association.

How were the learning outcomes assessed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Instrument</th>
<th>Indicator used to assess SLO outcome</th>
<th>SLO Assessed (listed by #)</th>
<th>Expected Results that indicate success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicum Supervisor Evaluations</td>
<td>Competency evaluation ratings for each SLO</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>No below expectations ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theses and dissertations</td>
<td>Thesis/Dissertation proposals and defenses</td>
<td>1, 4, 5, 10</td>
<td>Successful proposals and defenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive examination</td>
<td>Examination scores</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 10</td>
<td>Passing scores on questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate programs should assess at least one outcome related to one of the following graduate level requirements each year:

- Student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression and/or appropriate high-level professional practice.

**Student research and scholarship** was assessed by examining the number of professional publications and presentations made by the 50 students in the clinical doctoral program during the 2018 calendar year. These students were primary or secondary authors on 89 conference presentations/proceedings, 37 peer reviewed scientific journal articles, and 13 other professional publications (e.g., book chapters). Seven students did not have a conference presentation or publication and most of these were first year students who had been enrolled in the program for only one semester, or second year students. Student progress on formal program research requirements (Master's thesis, PhD dissertation) was also examined. Seven students proposed their theses and five students defended theses. An additional six students proposed their dissertations, and six others defended dissertations. These important program milestones were completed in a timely fashion by most students, although three students at the thesis level did not complete the milestones in the optimal timeframe.

**High level professional practice at student practicum sites** was also evaluated. During Spring 2018 and Fall 2018, 28 and 26 students, respectively, were placed in the community at 13 and 13 different practicum sites, respectively.

These included placements with private practitioners, government institutions (e.g., VA medical center), community agencies (e.g. DCFS, Children's Mobile Crisis, Volunteers In Medicine of Southern Nevada), hospital settings (e.g., Rawson Neal, Stein Forensic Hospital, Lou Ruvo Center for Brain health, Children's Heart Center, Children's Specialty Clinics), as well as our UNLV PRACTICE clinic. In these settings, students provided a broad range of evidence-based assessment and intervention services to diverse clientele (e.g., age, sex, race, sexual orientation, SES) who had a variety of presenting concerns (e.g., eating disorders, schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, depression, personality pathology, dementia and other neurological disorders, learning disability, and coping with chronic illnesses such as heart disease and cancer). At all practicum sites, students received weekly supervision from licensed doctoral level psychologists who directly observed and completed standardized evaluations for each students at least twice during the year.

Student evaluations were uniformly positive, with no student's performance falling below expected levels of practicum performance. All students are on track for meeting expected professional competencies for their level of training. As of the end of 2018, no students were on a formal remediation plan.

- Activities requiring originality, critical analysis and expertise.

Comprehensive examinations were successfully completed by all seven students who sat for the exam in 2018. The examination process requires critical analysis and written responses to broad integrative questions covering ethics, research design and statistics, psychopathology, intervention, assessment, and diversity issues. Students are also required to have extensive knowledge of these topics in order to successfully complete the examination process. For the exam, student select three out of four questions to answer. Answers consist of 10 type written
The development of extensive knowledge in the field under study

Review of annual evaluation materials, supervisor evaluations, thesis, dissertations and comprehensive examinations demonstrated that all students in the program progressed in their knowledge regarding critical areas of the field of clinical psychology. This knowledge development is clearly demonstrated through the successful application of classroom learning in real world clinical and research settings. These clinical and research settings provide practical learning environments where students acquire additional knowledge needed in order to address novel research and clinical challenges. Clinical practice settings allowed students to learn new intervention and assessment techniques as part of their clinical service provision, while scholarly and research activities increased their knowledge regarding research methodology, statistical analysis, and current discipline specific findings in the empirical literature.

What was learned from the assessment results?

Results suggest that the clinical program has generally met its SLO’s in this evaluation period. Students in the program demonstrate high levels of accomplishment in the critical program areas described in SLO’s 1-10. More focused efforts on ensuring students complete thesis requirements in optimal timeframe appear warranted and this topic is an ongoing discussion among faculty members at regularly scheduled program meetings. Also, continued monitoring of student performance at practicum placements in the community is important in meeting program training objectives. Overall, the current methods of program assessment are adequate for monitoring student progress through the program and our current SLO’s.

How did the program respond to what was learned?

As indicated in our new 3 year plan, this annual assessment report will be distributed to the clinical faculty and the results will be discussed at a clinical faculty meeting in February 2019 in order to identify areas of strength as well as areas where improvement or additional evaluation is necessary.

In April 2016, the clinical doctoral program was reaccredited for 7 years by the American Psychological Association (APA) after an extensive self-study and site visit by the APA. The APA also revised its Standards on Accreditation (SoA) in 2016 and so the clinical faculty had a program retreat in the fall of 2016 and met regularly over the course of the spring and fall semesters of 2018 to discuss changes to the current program requirements in order to meet the new SoA. We have nearly completed our rather extensive revisions to program to meet the new SoA, with the goal of having all revisions approved this semester so that they will be reflected in the Fall 2019 graduate catalog.

Four clinical faculty meetings have been scheduled in the spring 2019 semester to continue these discussions. Information gained during our 2018 Annual Academic Assessment will be considered in these discussions. Program changes made thus far include 1) revision of our student competence areas that we used as the basis of our SLO’s, 2) development of a new student competency evaluation form to track students’ progress with regard to each competency and SLO, 3) revision of program mission statement, 4) development of a new course of study, 5) development of new admissions criteria, 6) development of three new courses that will be required in the new curriculum, 7) revision of the program handbook, 8) revision of dissertation requirements (adopted three paper dissertation in addition to traditional dissertation format), and 9) review of programs of study for current students in order to determine how many will be able to adopt the new curriculum without increasing the number of credit hours they will need to complete.
their degrees. In the spring 2018 semester, we intend to continue our discussions about other program related issues, including thesis and comprehensive examination requirements. We will also revise the program subplans to be consistent with the new curriculum, evaluate our current practicum training model with the intent of improving the clinical training experiences for our students, and discuss student workload issues with the aim of striking a better balance among academic, research, and clinical training program requirements. We have received input from our Clinical Student Committee throughout this process, including formal surveys of our students, and we will continue to considered this feedback in our ongoing discussions.