

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2019-20 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: 83% of candidates (5/6) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.</p> <p>Master's Case: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (7/7) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (7/7) earned average ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 86% of candidates (6/7) met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Based on 2018-2019 data, we planned to: (a) monitor PRAXIS scores in this area to ensure no pattern of concerns with candidate performance; (b) provide individualized remediation for one candidate, and (c) provide additional supervisor communication and support with respect to completing practicum and internship evaluation forms correctly.</p> <p>2019-2020 data indicate strong candidate outcomes across all indicators, with no ongoing patterns of concern with PRAXIS performance, and no need for systematic changes at this time.</p>
<p>2. Consultation and Collaboration: Candidates understand and apply effective strategies for working collaboratively with others. *G1, G2, 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>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 83% of candidates (5/6) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.</p>	<p>See note above.</p>

	PRAXIS II (SPSY 791)	<p>Master’s Case: 75% of candidates earn rating of 2.0 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 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>Master’s Case: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (7/7) earned ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on at least 80% of rated items.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (7/7) earned ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 86% of candidates (6/7) met minimum criteria.</p>	
<p>3. Research and Program Evaluation: Candidates apply research to practice and use sound research design to guide, monitor, and evaluate their practice.*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 50% 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 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>Practicum Evaluation: 83% of candidates (5/6) earned ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on at least 50% of rated items.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (7/7) earned ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on all rated items.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (7/7) earned average ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>In 2018-2019 we noted an emerging concern in this domain on the Master’s Case. We planned to implement supplemental instruction and review the content of the Master’s Case.</p> <p>2019-2020 data indicate that instructional efforts were successful. All students met the minimum expectation for the Master’s Case, and the students who struggled with the Master’s Case in 2018-2019 met similar expectations for the Ed.S. project in 2019-2020. We have decided to continue offering instructional support for students completing the Master’s Case and will also be modifying the Master’s Case expectations beginning in 2021-2022.</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

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.

- b. 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.
- c. 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.)
- d. 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:

- 1) Cohort Sizes
- 2) Year-to-Year Retention
- 3) 5-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate); Average time to completion (graduate)

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

- We continue to find that individualized advising, mentoring, and flexibility to the extent possible are the most 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. Early and ongoing communication and strong collaborative relationships with field supervisors was instrumental in supporting students' completion of field experiences during Spring 2020 and securing placements for Fall 2020.
- We have continued with a more transparent and streamlined process for course scheduling, thus decreasing the likelihood of miscommunications or unexpected surprises concerning program requirements.
- 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. In the short-term, 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 will be marketing a new graduate certificate program in Psychoeducational Assessment as a potential stepping stone for students who ultimately wish to become school psychologists. This will be marketed simultaneously with "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:

- 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**

Discoveries & Action Plan: This year's data demonstrate a recovery in student learning outcomes from areas of concern noted in the previous report (i.e., Part 1 PRAXIS scores, research scores on the Master's Case). Candidates met SLO expectations across all domains and measurements, indicating that our efforts to address previous areas of concern were successful. We plan to continue instruction as usual for the upcoming year.

Despite the COVID-19 pandemic, all candidates successfully completed practicum, internship, and culminating experience requirements. Completers had a 100% post-graduation employment rate. Year-to-year retention was over 90% and the incoming Fall 2020 cohort of 10 was the largest in over five years. This suggests highly successful recruitment and student support efforts, which we plan to continue for 2020-2021.

Assessment Plan: For 2020-2021, we will plan to implement our full assessment plan. We are, however, preparing to implement a revised program curriculum in Fall 2021. In addition, the National Association of School Psychologists released updated professional standards during Summer 2020. Therefore, we will be devoting a significant effort this year to (a) aligning our new curriculum to the updated professional standards and (b) reviewing and revising our key assessments to align with both the curriculum and the standards. We anticipate that our assessment plan will be revised for the 2021-2022 academic year.

Stakeholder Involvement: We have plans to begin a stakeholder newsletter to be released 1-2 times per year. We will include in this newsletter a summary of program successes, outcomes, and plans. In addition, we plan to involve field supervisors in our efforts to review and revise key assessments, including any potential changes to field evaluation forms, the master's case requirements, and the Ed.S. project.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2019-20 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: Ed.S. School Psychology	Overall Rating: Mature (2.94/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning outcomes are clear, measureable, and aligned with graduate student learning outcomes. • Clear information is provided and multiple measures are used to generate student performance data for analysis. Measures include evaluation of high impact practices and student performance on licensure exams. • Expected and actual student performance data are clearly reported, and evaluation of performance is domain-specific to align with each intended outcome (see first recommendation for comment on an exception). • Excellent information on changes made due to prior findings and the positive impact seen in this year's performance. • Clear information is provided about areas for further investigation, as well as the important focus on adapting the assessment plan to revised standards in the coming year. • Faculty are clearly involved in the assessment process and the sharing and use of results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was unclear from the expected and actual performance descriptions for the Ed.S. Project (SPSY 791) and Master's Case (SPSY 686) whether rubrics were used and whether reported data referred to a comprehensive score or domain scores. Since these measures were used for all three outcomes and performance was consistent across the outcomes, it is helpful to clarify as was done with the other measures.

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	<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, and rationale is provided for why it was selected for assessment.</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 (program) learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).</p>
Performance Goals & Measures	<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>

Analysis & Results	<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>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<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 is 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 is provided.</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Please see reviewer notes for more details.