

Academic Program:	School Psychology Ph.D.	Date:	10/23/2022
Author(s):	Alyce Hopple, Carrie Ball		
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 .			___ Learning Outcomes ___ Curriculum Map ___ Assessment Plan
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.			___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.			
1. Data-based Decision-Making: Candidates apply various assessment methods and interpret results to recommend, design, and evaluate responsive services and programs.	SPSY 686	Practicum Evaluation Master's Case	Field Supervisor Report Rubric	Practicum Evaluation: 75% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% 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 (1/1) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items. Master's Case: no doctoral student completed a master's case for the 21/22 academic year.	Practicum Evaluation: 67% of candidates (2/3) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items. Master's Case: 67% of candidates (2/3) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.
	SPSY 793	Advanced Practicum	Field Supervisor Report	Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (1/1) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (4/4) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.
	SPSY 891	Doctoral Internship	Field Supervisor Report	Doctoral Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of	Doctoral Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (3/3) earned	Doctoral Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (2/2) earned



				“Satisfactory” or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on at least 80% of rated items.
2. Intervention: Candidates design, implement and evaluate evidence-based services to support socialization, learning, and mental health, as appropriate for the needs of their clients.	SPSY 686	Practicum Evaluation Master’s Case	Field Supervisor Report Rubric	Practicum Evaluation: 75% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 80% 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 (1/1) earned ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on at least 80% of rated items. Master’s Case: no doctoral student completed a master’s case for the 21/22 academic year.	Practicum Evaluation: 67% of candidates (2/3) earned ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on at least 80% of rated items. Master’s Case: 67% of candidates (2/3) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.
	SPSY 793	Advanced Practicum	Field Supervisor Report	Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (1/1) earned ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (4/4) earned ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on at least 80% of rated items.
	SPSY 891	Doctoral Internship	Field Supervisor Report	Doctoral Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Doctoral Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (3/3) earned ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Doctoral Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (2/2) earned ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on at least 80% of rated items.
3. Research and Program Evaluation: Candidates apply research to practice and use sound research design to guide, monitor, and evaluate their practice.	SPSY 686	Practicum Evaluation Master’s Case	Field Supervisor Report Rubric	Practicum Evaluation: 75% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 80% 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 (1/1) earned ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on at least 80% of rated items. Master’s Case: no doctoral student completed a master’s	Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (2/2) 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 comment</i>



					case for the 21/22 academic year.	<i>on research and program evaluation.</i> Master's Case: 67% of candidates (2/3) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.
	SPSY 793	Advanced Practicum	Field Supervisor Report	Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (1/1) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (4/4) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on all rated items.
	SPSY 891	Doctoral Internship	Field Supervisor Report	Doctoral Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Doctoral Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (3/3) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Doctoral Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (2/2) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.
4. Consultation and Collaboration: Candidates understand and apply effective strategies for working collaboratively with others.	SPSY 686	Practicum Evaluation Master's Case	Field Supervisor Report Rubric	Practicum Evaluation: 75% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% 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 (1/1) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items. Master's Case: no doctoral student completed a master's case for the 21/22 academic year.	N/A
	SPSY 793	Advanced Practicum	Field Supervisor Report	Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (1/1) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	N/A



	SPSY 891	Doctoral Internship	Field Supervisor Report	Doctoral Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Doctoral Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (3/3) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	N/A
--	----------	---------------------	-------------------------	---	---	-----

* Prior data are from 2020-2021.

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.

	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023
New Enrollment	1	3	2 (PsyD)*	3 (PsyD)*
Continuing from EdS	3	0	2 (PhD), 1 (PsyD)	1 (PsyD)
Continuing in PhD	15	15	13	10
Total PhD Enrollment	19	18	15	10
Retention from Previous Year	89%	89%	89%	87%
Completers	2	3	3	

* PsyD enrollments for 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 not included in total PhD enrollment

Describe current student success activities that are working well.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individualized advising and mentoring continued to be our strongest predictor of year-to-year retention and completion. Enforcing the program requirement that candidates complete their dissertation proposals prior to internship has demonstrated a positive impact on retention and timely completion. In addition, new requirements for "ABD" candidates, combined with intensive dissertation advising and support was successful in graduating a number of "ABD" students and moving others closer to completion. Based on a multi-year analysis of applications and cohort sizes, we decided to shift our Ph.D. program to a Psy.D. We are hoping this will have a positive impact on recruitment and increase cohort sizes in the future. Because of this transition (effective Fall 2021), we did not recruit or admit Ph.D. students for the Fall 2022 semester.
Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We continue to examine strategies for reducing time-to-completion by improved support for students in the dissertation process. We have implemented a new research mentoring program for incoming doctoral students



Office of Assessment
and Accreditation

and hope this will result in students being better prepared for developing and completing their dissertations.

- We have been directing several activities aimed at recruiting larger cohorts to our Psy.D. program. We have dispersed recruitment materials to universities, HBCU's, and school districts. Additionally, we are pursuing accreditation with the American Psychological Association for our Psy.D. program, which will serve to attract a larger number of interested applicants.

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

<p>Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. <i>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?</i></p>	<p>Outcome data for the 2021-2022 academic year suggest that candidates consistently met learning expectations across time and outcomes. We plan to continue with instruction as usual for the upcoming year. We have observed that our year-to-year retention remains strong, and, though timely completion is still something we work toward improving, our new policies surrounding ABD students have been successful in graduating many more students since implementation than previous years. We plan to continue with these newly implemented ABD policies, as they seem to be supportive of student retention and completion.</p>
<p>What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?</p>	<p>Initial enrollment data are promising concerning the new Psy.D. program. We have three Psy.D. students this year, with several other students identified for the next academic year (i.e., current Ed.S. students). Once we have secured accreditation with the American Psychological Association (APA) for this new program, we believe the novelty and flexibility of the degree type and program will serve to address and alleviate the difficulties observed with the Ph.D. program. We anticipate seeing an increase in our enrollments and cohort sizes over the next few years.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>For 2022-2023, we plan to adjust our assessment plan to better align with both the National Association of School Psychologists professional standards (revised Summer 2020) and our adjusted summative requirements. All adjusted summative projects will be implemented in coursework for the 2023-2024 academic year.</p> <p>Other efforts will be directed at continuing recruitment for the Psy.D. program. We have adjusted our recruitment materials to highlight the unique aspects of our program and degree type. These have been dispersed to universities, HBCU's, and school districts in effort to generate larger pools of potential applicants. We anticipate that these efforts – combined with a continuation of our ABD policies – will produce</p>



	<p>increases in cohort size, stable year-to-year retention, and reduce time-to-completion statistics within the next five years.</p>
<p>Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?</p>	<p>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., adjusted summative requirements). 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). We plan to continue this practice as we revise and adjust our materials going forward.</p>



Office of Assessment
and Accreditation

Updated July 2022



Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 21-22

Program: PsyD School 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
<p>Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.</p>		<p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle</p> <p>Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning</p> <p>Outcome(s) is measurable</p> <p>Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)</p>		Mature
<p>Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understand 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.</p>	<p>Rich, relevant experiences are used for assessments of student learning, including in coursework and in the clinical setting.</p>	<p>Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s)</p> <p>Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s)</p> <p>Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives</p> <p>Assessment data comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum</p> <p>Assessment measures include rich and/or relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.)</p> <p>Tools for evaluating student achievement are clearly described when necessary (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)</p>	<p>Consider whether it is helpful to have additional measures in years when no master's cases will be completed to supplement the other forms of data collection. It may or may not be – just something to think about.</p>	Exemplary

<p>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.</p>		<p>The threshold for proficiency for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used</p> <p>The threshold for proficiency reflects reasonably high expectations for the program</p> <p>Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the stated threshold for proficiency and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used</p> <p>Thoughtful discussion of faculty insights gained from findings is included</p> <p>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)</p> <p>When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described</p>		Mature
<p>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.</p>	<p>Inclusion of faculty and other stakeholders, such as field supervisors, in assessment process and sharing of findings.</p>	<p>Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly driven by assessment findings</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty</p> <p>If data from prior assessments is provided, reflection on changes over time and the possible impact any prior interventions is discussed</p> <p>A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment</p> <p>Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders</p>		Exemplary

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