AY 21-22 STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT & SUCCESS REPORT   OPTION A: TABLE FORMAT

Academic Program:	Psy.D. Program in Clinical Psychology	Date:	
Author(s):	Liz O'Laughlin		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu. **Sent updated learning outcomes, curriculum map and assessment plan on 9/2/22.**		__x_ Learning Outcomes __x_ Curriculum Map __x_ Assessment Plan	
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.		___ Yes _X__ No ___ Hybrid	

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	Assessment Strategies Used			Established Benchmark for Proficiency	Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark	Prior Results for Comparison (if applicable)
	Course	Assignment/Activity	Evaluation Tool i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
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.	Psy 602 Psy 604 Psy 680	Dissertation proposal and final defense (direct)	Dissertation Proposal Defense Rubric; Dissertation Final Defense rubric (DFDR)	Mean rating of 3 (4-point scale) or higher on Dissertation Proposal Evaluation Rubric (DPER)	7/7 students defended their proposals successfully with mean ratings between 3 and 4 (4 pt. scale) on the DPER 10/10 students defended their final dissertations successfully with mean ratings between 3 and 4 (4 pt. scale) on the DFDR	100% met minimum levels of achievement (MLA) in 2020-2021
2. Students will demonstrate the ability	Psy 690J Psy 663	Oral preliminary Exam (Ethics Case Study)	Prelim Performance Form (PPF)	Mean rating of 2.75 or higher on PPF	7/7 students successfully passed oral prelims	100% met minimum levels of

				(Ethics)		achievement (MLA) in 2020-2021
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.						
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).	Psy 696 Psy 627 Psy 663 Psy 668 Psy 690J	Clinical work in ISU Psychology Clinic (2-3rd year) Clinical work at practicum (3-4th year) Cultural Formulation interview (1st year students)	Semester Evaluation Form (direct) Practicum Progress Report (direct) Cultural Formulation Report rubric	Rating of meets or exceeds (Cultural and individual Diversity items) Ratings of meets or exceeds (Cultural and Individual Diversity items) Score of 80% or higher	100% of students met or exceeded expectations on items related to diversity 100% met or exceeded expectations on items related to diversity 4. 7/7 first year students obtained scores of 80% or high	100% met minimum levels of achievement (MLA) in 2020-2021
4. Students will produce and comprehend oral, nonverbal, and **written communication**s that are informative and well-integrated.		Written and verbal communication across academic and clinical work.	Semester Evaluation Form (4 items specific to written/oral communication).	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).	100% of 2nd-4th year students rated as meeting or exceeding expectations on items assessing written/oral communication at the end of the Spring 2022 semester.	100% met minimum levels of achievement I 2020-2021

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).	Psy 664 Psy 666 Psy 696	Clinical work in ISU Psychology clinic and/or external practicum	Semester evaluation form (direct) Practicum Progress Report (each semester; direct) Oral Preliminary Exam	Rating of meets or exceeds on semester evaluation form (assessment, Report writing skills) Ratings of acceptable performance on External Practicum evaluation (items related to assessment, diagnosis and report writing) Mean of 2.75 or higher (Assessment case study).		
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).	Psy 665 Psy 650 Psy 676 Psy 696	Clinical work in ISU Psychology clinic and/or external practicum	Master's Portfolio Form (direct) Semester Evaluation Form (direct)	Portfolio with documentation of proficiency (endorsement by faculty member) and work samples as necessary for each of 14 Clinical skills. Rating of meets or exceeds on student evaluation form (therapy items,	8/8 2nd year portfolios endorsed by faculty (using checklist of competencies) 93% of 2-3rd year students rated as meets or exceeds for therapy items.	

GSLO: Mastery of Knowledge. Mastery of Skills)				2, 3rd year students)		
			Practicum Progress Report (direct)	Ratings of acceptable performance on Practicum evaluation form (therapy, professionalism)	100% of 3rd/4th year students rated as meeting or exceeding expectations on practicum evaluation form	

Student Success Activities

Use the "Academic Chair" tab in Blue Reports to view your program's data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe current student success activities that are working well.	Many doctoral programs in Clinical psychology solicit faculty and practicum ratings once a year--at the end of the academic year. We have solicited faculty and external practicum supervisor ratings at the end of each semester for many years. This works well for identifying potential areas of concern mid-way through the academic year, allowing opportunity to develop a plan to address the concern and evaluate change at the end of the academic year. The oral preliminary exam has also worked well as a culminating evaluation of the student's ability to integrate information, present their impressions, and respond to questions about an assessment and ethics case studies. Students have reported that their experience in the oral preliminary exam has been very helpful in preparing them for internship interviews (which occur approximately 4 months after the oral preliminary exam).
Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?	Blue report data isn't really that helpful. We noted that the number of applications has decreased over the past 2 years, likely because the Psy.D. program continues to require that GRE (and many other doctoral programs no longer require GRE). Our faculty feel that we get higher quality applicants by requiring the GRE and since we continue to get well over 100 applications for 6-8 positions, we have not been overly concerned

	about the decrease in total number of applicants. We are, however, implementing interventions to potentially increase the number of diverse applicants to the program.

If you don't have a Blue Reports account, you can request one using the webpage link, or your Department Chair, Associate Dean, or College Assessment Director can assist you.

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*	Program outcomes for 2021-2022 are very similar to 2020-2021--with most students meeting MLA in all areas. When a student is rated below expectations in a key areas (i.e., therapy skills), a remediation plan is generally developed with the intent or providing more guidance and supervision to get that student back on track, generally resulting in that student meeting expectations and being taken off remediation within the next 1-2 semesters. Over the past few years, we have incorporated more performance based assessments intended to assess student ability to integrate knowledge and skills in multiple areas. For example, 2nd year students are evaluated through a case study presentation on their knowledge and skills in assessment, therapy, case conceptualization, cultural competence, and several other areas. In the 3rd year of the program, those same skills are evaluated through a Case Study written report. Through these types of performance-based activities, we are able to assess skills in several areas as well as student ability to integrate different types of skills through an activity that is typical of real-world professional activities. (i.e., case presentation).
What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	Some of the planned changes in our assessment process were delayed due to losing two faculty members mid-way through the 2021-2022 academic year. We will implement the Case Presentation rubric in the spring of 2023. As planned, we administered a Program Satisfaction Survey in the Spring of 2022 and found that student ratings pertaining to overall climate/environment were lower than they were in 2019, likely due in part to many changes occurring over the three- year period (i.e., faculty leaving the program, COVID-19 stress). We hired a consultant who examined the survey data to determine if lower ratings were more likely for any underrepresented groups of students. The consultant reported that there was no clear evidence of any systemic issues that affected solely or disproportionately

	minority/marginalized respondents. We held a program-wide meeting in August of 2022 and have implemented some interventions and continue to discussion additional plans to address areas of concern and will have a follow-up meeting in February of 2023.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	We will continue to evaluate the impact of changes in our research course sequence. It has only been two years since we implemented this change and students write their dissertation proposal in the 3rd of the program, thus we will be better able to evaluate the possible impact of this change in the Spring of 2023. We will also continue to focus on program climate and inclusiveness. Although program climate ratings were somewhat lower than in past years, means were above a 3.0 (on a 1-5 scale with 5 being "very satisfied") for most items. Changes to our assessment plan include reducing the number of items on the semester evaluation form, implementing the Case Presentation rubric, and evaluating data from a Case Study report/rubric that was implemented in the Spring of 2022.
Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?	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 is currently preparing a detailed self-study in preparation for an upcoming accreditation site-visit in 2023.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 21-22

Program: PsyD Clinical Psychology
Evaluation: Exemplary

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)		Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on some related tenants and strategies.	Excellent use of a mix of significant displays of student learning from across the curriculum to demonstrate student mastery. Clear descriptions of analytical rubrics and tools used for evaluation of student mastery designed to yield accurate data on individual LOs.	Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and/or relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are clearly described when necessary (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)		Exemplary

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to thresholds of proficiency, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.	Thorough discussion of findings and assessment strategies utilized to provide formative and summative feedback to students in support of learning mastery is included.	The threshold for proficiency for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The threshold for proficiency reflects reasonably high expectations for the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the stated threshold for proficiency and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Thoughtful discussion of faculty insights gained from findings is included When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described		Exemplary
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.	All discussion of continuous improvement and success strategies is tied directly to findings, both current and historical. It is clear that faculty are engaged in the assessment process and that the focus of the process is to ensure strong student learning outcomes.	Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly driven by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty If data from prior assessments is provided, reflection on changes over time and the possible impact any prior interventions is discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders		Exemplary

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.