

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2020-21 Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.

Unit/Program Name: School Psychology Ed.S. Program Contact Name(s) and Email(s) Carrie Ball (carrie.ball@indstate.edu)

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

NOTE: If data from Spring 2020 is missing due to COVID-19 transition issues, please describe these issues, their impact on your ability to assess student learning, and what, if anything, will change as a result.

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? Can expand on this in Part 2.</p>
<p>1. Data-based Decision-Making: Candidates apply various assessment methods and interpret results to recommend, design, and evaluate responsive services and programs. *G4, G5</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation (SPSY 686)</p> <p>Master's Case (SPSY 686)</p> <p>Internship Evaluation (SPSY 791)</p> <p>Ed.S. Project (SPSY 791)</p> <p>PRAXIS II (SPSY 791)</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Master's Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 75% of candidates (3/4) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.</p> <p>Master's Case: 100% of candidates (4/4) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned average ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 83% of candidates (5/6) met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Based on previous data (i.e., 2018-2019) we planned to provide additional supervisor communication and support with respect to completing evaluation forms, among other supports. Increased communication with supervisors proved beneficial in determining and preventing adverse impacts from COVID (e.g., lack of diverse exposure to psychoeducational assessment). Similarly, this allowed us to determine student competency when reported skills were lower than expectations for performance (i.e., all supervisors endorsed the advancement of all students, even though COVID restrictions prevented some "Satisfactory" ratings on the evaluation form).</p> <p>2020-2021 data suggest strong candidate outcomes across indicators, with no patterns of systematic concerns. To support continued success in this area,</p>

				we have adjusted the expectations and description of the Master's Case project to better highlight expectations and criteria needed for successful project completion. Further, we plan to adjust the Master's Case project – along with other summative components in SPSY 686 – to provide more purposeful and diverse experiences to students in the areas of data-based decision making and consultation.
2. Consultation and Collaboration: Candidates understand and apply effective strategies for working collaboratively with others. *G1, G2, G4, G5	Practicum Evaluation (SPSY 686) Master's Case (SPSY 686) Internship Evaluation (SPSY 791) Ed.S. Project (SPSY 791) PRAXIS II (SPSY 791)	Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain. Master's Case: 75% of candidates earn rating of 2.0 or higher. Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain. Ed.S. Project: 75% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher. PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.	Practicum Evaluation: 75% of candidates (3/4) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items. Master's Case: 100% of candidates (4/4) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher. Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items. Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned ratings of 2.0 or higher. PRAXIS II: 83% of candidates (5/6) met minimum criteria.	See note above.
3. Research and Program Evaluation: Candidates apply research to practice and use sound research design to guide, monitor, and evaluate their practice.*G4, G5	Practicum Evaluation (SPSY 686) Master's Case (SPSY 686) Internship Evaluation (SPSY 791) Ed.S. Project (SPSY 791) PRAXIS II (SPSY 791)	Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 50% of rated items in this domain. Master's Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher.	Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (3/3) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 50% of rated items. <i>Note: data in this domain are unavailable for one student, as the supervisor was unable to</i>	Previously (i.e., 2018-2019), we noted an emerging concern in this domain on the Master's Case. We planned to address this with supplemental instruction and review of content. These instructional efforts were successful as all students have met the minimum expectation

		<p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on all rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p><i>comment on research and program evaluation.</i></p> <p>Master’s Case: 100% of candidates (4/4) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on all rated items.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned average ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% of candidates (6/6) met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>for the Master’s Case for the past two academic years.</p> <p>To continue to provide support in this area, we have adjusted the expectations and description of the Master’s Case project to better highlight evaluation expectations and criteria needed for successful project completion. Further, we plan to adjust the Master’s Case project – along with other summative components in SPSY 686 – to explore student competency in research and program evaluation across activities (e.g., academic intervention and psychoeducational case conceptualization).</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

- Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
- Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
- Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities

Use [Blue Reports](#) to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you). A dashboard has been created in the Chairs view:

- Cohort Sizes
- Year-to-Year Retention
- 5-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate); Average time to completion (graduate)

	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022
New Enrollment	5	12	12
Continuing in EdS	15	11	15
Total Enrollment	20	23	27
Continuing in PhD	3	0	2
Retention from Previous Year	95%	85%	100%
Completers	7	6	

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

- Establishing a consistent schedule (i.e., all classes occur one day each week) allowed us to recruit students who might otherwise experience a barrier to beginning graduate education. Additionally, this serves to continue the trend of a streamlined process for course scheduling, which decreases the likelihood of miscommunications or unexpected surprises concerning program requirements.
- Individualized advising, mentoring, and flexibility to the extent possible continue to serve as critical factors in supporting student persistence and completion.
- Strong community partnerships have allowed us to continue supporting field-based training during the COVID-19 pandemic. Frequent and ongoing communication and strong collaborative relationships with field supervisors was instrumental in supporting students' completion of field experiences during Spring 2021, and in securing placements for Fall 2021. This latter point is especially notable, as we expanded our community partnerships to allow us to successfully place into fieldwork our largest cohort in the last ten years.
- We created recruitment materials to highlight the unique aspects of our program. These were dispersed to universities, HBCU's, and school districts and appeared to generate a larger pool of potential applicants.
- To support successful recruitment, we have individually followed-up with each admission offer that is made. In the short-term, this individualized, timely approach to communication has appeared to be positively impactful in recruiting larger cohorts.
- Finally, we have maintained communication with applicants, employers, and prospective field supervisors regarding program requirements, which has allowed applicants and their employers to more realistically consider the feasibility of completing our program prior to making an enrollment decision. This approach appears successful in maintaining year-to-year retention.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

- We continue to focus on recruitment efforts as a means to stabilize our cohort sizes. We will continue recruiting from traditional pools of undergraduate students and will also increase efforts to recruit from school districts through contact with practicing school psychologists and special education directors. We hope to encourage a "grow your own" model for school districts to support employees who wish to pursue a school psychology degree.
- We continue to market a new graduate certificate program in Psychoeducational Assessment as a potential stepping stone for students who ultimately wish to become school psychologists. We will continue to present this alongside the "grow your own" model, and students from the certificate program will generate an additional pool of prospective Ed.S. candidates.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities – required for undergraduate programs; optional for graduate programs

If you submitted a report last year, you only need to resubmit if there are changes to your current career readiness competencies map.

If you have not previously done so, please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. You can find the template here: <https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components>

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

- **the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)**
- **findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**
- **what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**

- **how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

Discoveries & Action Plan: This year's data provide strong support that students are consistently meeting learning outcomes across domains (when accounting for an outlier, which was the result of COVID-related restrictions). We generally plan to continue instruction as usual for the upcoming year, though we will be altering and adjusting some summative projects in fieldwork components (i.e., SPSY 686, SPSY 791) in effort to organize assessment experiences which are increasingly diverse and purposefully scaffolded.

Despite the COVID-19 pandemic, all candidates successfully completed practicum, internship, and culminating experience requirements. Completers had a 100% post-graduation employment rate and year-to-year retention was over 90%. The incoming Fall 2021 cohort of 13 is the largest in ten years. We believe this positive shift in our enrollment is largely impacted by the increased organization and clarity of requirements that comes from our adjusted course schedule and curriculum. These data are highly suggestive of successful recruitment and student support efforts, which we plan to continue for 2021-2022.

Assessment Plan: For 2021-2022, we will plan to implement our full assessment plan. We will, however, be implementing new summative assessments (put into effect this academic year, to be completed by this year's cohort when they reach the second and third years of their training) over the next two years. In addition, the National Association of School Psychologists released updated professional standards during Summer 2020. We have spent significant effort to revise our curriculum and key assessments to align with these new standards. We will revise our assessment plan for the 2022-2023 academic year, as students complete these new or adjusted key assessments.

Stakeholder Involvement: We regularly communicate with our stakeholders through a newsletter (released 1-2 times per year) and more frequently via email for those stakeholders who are also supervisors. The communications include a summary of program successes, outcomes, and plans (e.g., new certificate program). In addition, we have involved field supervisors in our efforts to review and revise key assessments (e.g., changes to evaluation forms, master's case requirements, Ed.S. project). We plan to continue this practice as we revise and adjust our materials going forward.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2020-21 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment practice and use in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: School Psychology Ed.S.	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning outcomes are clear, measurable, and aligned to institutional outcomes (GSLOs). • Assessment data is taken from multiple measures across the curriculum, including high impact performances such as an internship and useful data from the PRAXIS II. • Expectations for student performance are clear and reasonable. Actual performance data is reported in relation to expectations and clearly indicates level of mastery. • Thoughtful discussion is provided about past observations and changes made and how those may be influencing strong student achievement in the current cohort. Notes are also provided about the influence of covid protocols and limitations on certain activities. • While performance is strong across all outcomes, faculty are actively engaged in developing strategies for improving the breadth, depth, and diversity of learning relative to each outcome. • It is clear that information is shared, discussed, and applied by faculty to support ongoing success in the program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can't tell for certain from the way the expected and actual data are presented in cases where scores are consistent across outcomes – are the data reported differentiated by outcome rather than representative of a composite score of multiple outcomes? Be sure that precise alignment between data and outcome are presented to ensure the accuracy of the data.

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle.</p>	<p>Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and rationale and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). Most are direct measures, and their design enhances the validity of findings.</p> <p>Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). At least one direct measure is included.</p>	<p>Performance goals are identified with little rationale or clarity.</p> <p>Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

<p>Analysis & Results</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality.</p> <p>Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description.</p> <p>Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
<p>Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information and included program faculty and appropriate staff in discussion and planning is detailed and enacted. Outcomes and results are easily accessible on the program website or other appropriate designated area.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection if offered about results or plans moving forward, and compares prior year plans to current outcomes in an effort to foster continuous improvement as a result of assessment process.</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results.</p> <p>Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results in provided.</p>
<p>Overall Rating</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Mature</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Developing</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped</p>