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: __Psychology: Psy.D. Clinical Psychology   **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Liz O'Laughlin (lizo@indstate.edu)

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

NOTE: If data 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.

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.	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?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	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.*
Students will demonstrate the independent ability to formulate research that is of sufficient quality and rigor needed to contribute to the scientific, psychological, or professional knowledge base. (GSLO:Mastery of Knowledge)	Dissertation proposal and final defense (direct)	Mean rating of 3 (4-point scale) or higher on Dissertation Proposal Evaluation Rubric (DPER)	Ten students defended their proposals successfully with mean ratings between 3 and 4 (4 pt. scale) on the DPER Seven students in 5th year cohort successfully defended their final dissertation with mean ratings between 3 and 4 on final defense rubric.	
	Semester Evaluation form completed by faculty (direct)	Ratings of acceptable performance (3 or higher on 5 pt. scale) on semester evaluation (dissertation items)	Three students were rated as "needs improvement" on items assessing progress on dissertation proposal.	Starting in 2021-2022, 3rd year students will enroll for an independent study in fall semester and develop a specific timeline for completion of proposal.
	Masters Portfolio form (research skills; direct)	Portfolio with documentation of proficiency (i.e., endorsement by faculty member for each of 7 research skills.	7/7 second year students completed portfolios that were endorsed/approved by faculty.	

2. Students will demonstrate the ability to recognize ethical and legal dilemmas as they arise and apply ethical decision-making processes in order to resolve the dilemmas in all professional activities. GSLO: Professional and Ethical Challenges, Mastery of knowledge and skills)	Semester Evaluation form completed by faculty (direct) Oral Preliminary Exam (ethics case study)	Ratings of acceptable performance (3 or higher on 5 pt. scale) on semester evaluation. (Ethics items) Rating of 3 or higher (5 pt. scale) on Prelim Performance Form (dissertation committee members)	100% of students rated as meeting or exceeding expectations. 9/9 students taking oral prelims rated 3 or higher on PPF for ethics case study	None- results meet/exceed expectations
3. Students will demonstrate the ability to integrate awareness and knowledge of individual and cultural differences in the conduct of professional roles (e.g., research, services, and other professional activities). GSLO: Contribute to diverse and complex communities; Mastery of knowledge and skills	Semester Evaluation Form (direct) Placement Progress Report (direct) Cultural Formulation report rubric	Rating of meets or exceeds on Semester Evaluation Form (Cultural and individual Diversity items) Ratings of meets or exceeds on Placement Progress report (Cultural and Individual Diversity items) Score of 80% or higher	100% of students met or exceeded expectations on items related to diversity (32/32) 100% met or exceeded expectations on items related to diversity (17/17) 8/8 first year students obtained scores of 80% or high	None- results meet/exceed expectations
4. Students will produce and comprehend oral, nonverbal, and written communications that are informative and well-integrated. GSLO: Professional Communication; Mastery of Skills	Semester Evaluation Form (direct) 4 Academic Performance items specific to written/oral communication, overall academic performance rating.	Rating of meets or exceeds on items specific to written/oral communication for 100% of 2nd-4th year students (3 or higher on 5 pt. scale). Rating of meets or exceeds for overall academic performance for 100% of students.	100% of 2nd-4th year students rated as meeting or exceeding expectations on items assessing written/oral communication and overall academic performance. One student rated as below expectations for overall academic performance.	Remediation plan developed for student rated below expectations in overall academic performance (with emphasis on written communication).

5. Students will demonstrate competence in conducting evidence-based assessment consistent with the scope of Health Service Psychology (specific objectives cover knowledge/skills in diagnosis, test administration, interpretation and report writing). GSLO: Mastery of Knowledge. Mastery of Skills)	Semester evaluation form (direct)	Rating of meets or exceeds on semester evaluation form (assessment, Report writing skills)	97% of 1st, 2nd & 3rd year students met criteria (21/22)	Student rated as not meeting overall assessment/diagnosis skills is being provided with additional support focused on writing skills.
	Master's Portfolio form (Direct)	Portfolio with documentation of 14 Clinical skills, endorsed by at least one faculty member.	2nd year (7/7) portfolios endorsed by faculty	
	Placement Progress Report (each semester; direct)	Ratings of acceptable performance on External Practicum evaluation (items related to assessment, diagnosis and report writing)	100% of students on external practicum rated as meets or exceed expectations for assessment /diagnosis. (17/17))	
	Preliminary Exams (written and oral)	Mean of 2.75 or higher(passing score) across raters for both written and oral prelims.	9/9 students passed written and oral prelims	
6. Students will demonstrate competence in the delivery of evidence-based interventions consistent with the scope of Health Service Psychology. (specific objectives cover therapy skills, treatment planning, selecting and implementing evidence-based interventions and evaluating outcomes). GSLO: Mastery of Knowledge. Mastery of Skills)	Master's Portfolio Form (direct)	Portfolio with documentation of proficiency (e.g., endorsement by faculty member) and work samples as necessary for each of 14 Clinical skills.	7/7 2nd year portfolios endorsed by faculty (using checklist of competencies)	None- results meet/exceed expectations
	Semester Evaluation Form (direct)	Rating of meets or exceeds on student evaluation form (therapy items, 2, 3rd year students)	94% rated as meets or exceeds for therapy items (16/17). One student rated as needing improvement for F20 semester, rated as meeting expectations in spring 21 semester.	
	Placement Progress Report (direct)	Ratings of acceptable performance on Placement evaluation form (therapy, professionalism)	17/17 rated as meeting or exceeding expectations on placement evaluation form	

(Cohort size/retention, graduation rate. What worked well in supporting student success this year? What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?)

The Psy.D. program accepts between 7-9 students a year. We had 32 students on campus and seven additional students on internship (off-campus) during the 2020-2021 academic year. There were no significant change to our cohort size in 2020-2021. Six of the students on internship (i.e., 5th year students) graduated in August of 2021. The seventh student recently finished her internship (and all other requirements for the Psy.D. degree) and will graduate in December of 2021. Information on student admissions, outcomes and other data (updated with 2020-2021 data) can be found on the [Psy.D. program website](#): The mean number of years to complete the program has increased slightly from 5 to 5.3 due to a few students that elected to stay on campus for a 5th year in order to complete their dissertations prior to leaving for internship (generally in 5th year). This slight increase is not a concern, as many doctoral programs in psychology (nationwide) require five years on campus prior to internship (i.e., 6 years minimum).

The program implemented a rubric to provide feedback to first year students on writing skills in courses that require significant written work (i.e., Ability Assessment, Foundations of Psychotherapy, Advanced Psychopathology). We have found that the majority of our students demonstrate improvements in their technical writing skills through experience and feedback across courses and supervisors. For example, it is common for several 1st year students to be rated as "needs improvement" in written expression during the first year, however it is uncommon for a student to be rated below expectation in writing skills past the first year of the program.   The program focused on increasing multicultural competence among both students and clinical faculty during the 2020-2021 academic year. This goal was prompted by nationwide events (i.e., Black Lives Matter) as well as a request from students that the program provide more opportunity for discussion of racial inequality and social justice issues. For the first time in more than 20 years, we offered a course in the department on Cultural Diversity in Clinical Psychology (Psy 627), rather than having students take a diversity focused course in another department. The course was very well-received and students commented that they learned a great deal and experienced growth both personally and professionally. We also made changes to our faculty evaluations (i.e., supervision evaluation) to gather data on student perceptions of supervisor multicultural competence.

During the 2021-2022 academic year, we will continue to focus on supporting students in timely completion of their dissertation proposals. In order to go on internship in the 5th year of the program, students must defend their proposal in the fall of the 4th year. Completing the proposal by the spring or early summer of the 3rd year facilitates meeting this deadline. We moved our research focused coursework from 2nd and 3rd year of the program to 1st and 2nd year, to prepare students to focus on developing their dissertation proposals in the 3rd year of the program. Students are encouraged to enroll in an independent study in the fall and/or spring of the 3rd year and to set specific deadlines with their dissertation chair in order to complete the proposal by the spring or early summer of the 3rd year. The current 3rd year cohort is the first to experience this change in course sequencing, thus we will evaluate the impact of this change (i.e., number of students who complete their proposal by early summer) during this academic year.

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:

1) **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?)
2) **findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**
3) **what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**
4) **how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

The Psy.D. faculty met on 6/9/21 to review program goals, objective and outcomes for 2020-2021. Student outcomes were found to meet or exceed expectations for all goals/objectives evaluated. With the exception of several first year students rated as "needs improvement" in writing skills, the only area in which more than one student was rated as below expectations was in regard to progress on the dissertation proposal. As noted above, we recently implemented changes in the research course sequence intended to support students in timely completion of the dissertation proposal (i.e., by the spring/early summer of the 3rd year).

We will have several additional sources of data to consider at the end of the 2021-2022 academic. We will be implementing our Program Satisfaction Survey in the Spring of 2022. We will also be implementing a Diversity Training Survey (in Spring 2022). We will be able to use information from the Diversity Training Survey and Program Satisfaction survey to determine if the increased focus on multicultural competence, initiated in the 2020-2021 academic year, has resulted in student perceptions of greater knowledge, competence or skills associated with multicultural competence. We will also be implementing two new outcome measures in 2021-2022: a rubric based evaluation of a case presentation (required as part of a course that all 2nd year students take), and a rubric-based evaluation of student performance during a simulation (with an actor playing a client). The case presentation assignment/rubric will allow us to assess students' ability to integrate assessment, intervention, case conceptualization, cultural diversity knowledge, and oral presentation skills. Students currently engage in a simulation activity in three core courses taught at different points in the program (Foundations of Psychotherapy, Ethics, Supervision/Consultation). By including one common rubric item, focused on professional values and attitudes (and responding in a professional and ethical manner in a complex situation), we will be able to evaluate growth in students' ability to respond to a complex (simulated) client-therapist interaction from 1st to 4th year of the program. (This will specifically address one of our objectives: 4.4: Students will respond professionally in increasingly complex situations with a greater degree of Independence as they progress across levels of training.).

As mentioned, program outcomes are discussed among the Clinical Faculty at a scheduled Program Evaluation meeting typically held in May or June. In addition, program outcomes are shared with students in the program during a program-wide meeting near the start of the fall semester. Program evaluation information is also shared with our accrediting body, American Psychological Association (Committee on Accreditation) through our annual report and annual update of required tables on Student admissions and outcomes (posted on program website). In addition, the program will be preparing a detailed self-study in preparation for an upcoming accreditation site-visit in 2023 (self-study due in August of 2022).

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: Doctor of Psychology, Clinical Psychology	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
- Learning outcomes are clear, specific, and measurable. Alignment to Graduate Student Learning Outcomes demonstrates alignment with CGPS expectations for graduate-level work. - Multiple forms of direct assessment are used to inform findings for each learning outcome, and evaluation measures for each are detailed (rubrics, portfolios, clinical evaluations, etc.) and aligned to specific outcomes. - Expectations for student performance are clear and reasonable, and actual student performance data is reported relative to these expectations. Clear contextual information is provided when useful to describe data. - Thoughtful, detailed discussion about findings, strategies for improving performance where necessary, thoughts on supporting areas of strength, and additional assessment measures to be implemented in the coming year are provided. - Detailed information about how faculty are involved in program assessment and how assessment results are shared with a wide audience are included.	

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

Analysis & Results	Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data. Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description. Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.	Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description. Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.	Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality. Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description. Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.	No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected. No results are provided.
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	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. 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. 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.	A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted. 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. Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.	Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content. Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results. Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.	No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No evidence of reflection on results in provided.
Overall Rating	□ **Exemplary**	□ **Mature**	□ **Developing**	□ **Undeveloped**