

**Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18** *Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.*

**Unit/Program Name:** Ph.D. Guidance & Psychological Services, School Psychology  
**Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Carrie Ball – carrie.ball@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

**Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities**

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the <a href="#">Graduate Student Learning Outcome</a> each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual data/results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year’s report?</b></p>
<p><i>Please Note: An alignment supplement is provided on the college assessment Blackboard page to describe in detail how each SLO is assessed by the various measures.</i></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>(1) Methods: Practicum Evaluation, Master’s Case, Advanced Practicum Evaluation, Preliminary Exam, Internship Evaluation</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum (SPSY 686), Advanced Practicum (SPSY 793), Preliminary Exam, Internship (SPSY 891)</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 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>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates exceed an average rating of 1.5.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. No changes are indicated specific to this domain.</p>

<p>2. Consultation and Collaboration: Candidates understand and apply effective strategies for working collaboratively with others. *G1, G2, G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Practicum Evaluation, Master’s Case, Advanced Practicum Evaluation, Preliminary Exam, Internship Evaluation</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum (SPSY 686), Advanced Practicum (SPSY 793), Preliminary Exam, Internship (SPSY 891)</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 75% of candidates earn rating of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates exceed an average rating of 1.5.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. No changes are indicated specific to this domain.</p>
<p>3. Intervention: Candidates design, implement and evaluate evidence-based services to support socialization, learning, and mental health, as appropriate for the needs of their clients. *G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Practicum Evaluation, Master’s Case, Advanced Practicum Evaluation, Preliminary Exam, Internship Evaluation</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum (SPSY 686), Advanced Practicum (SPSY 793), Preliminary Exam, Internship (SPSY 891)</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 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>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates exceed an average rating of 1.5.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. No changes are indicated specific to this domain.</p>

<p>4. Schoolwide Practices to Promote Learning: Candidates understand and work effectively within educational systems to create and maintain safe and supportive learning environments. *G2, G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Practicum Evaluation, Advanced Practicum Evaluation, Preliminary Exam, Internship Evaluation</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum (SPSY 686), Advanced Practicum (SPSY 793), Preliminary Exam, Internship (SPSY 891)</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates exceed an average rating of 1.5.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills.</p> <p>We continue to have concerns that there are limited direct measures of this domain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A line item was added to the Ed.S Project rubric during 2017-2018; that item will be reviewed, revised as needed, and also added to the Master's Case Presentation rubric to ensure we are directly assessing candidates' knowledge and skills in this area at multiple time points.</li> </ul>
<p>5. Diversity in Development and Learning: Candidates apply evidence-based strategies for working effectively with diverse individuals and groups and advocating for social justice.</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Practicum Evaluation, Master's Case, Advanced Practicum Evaluation, Preliminary Exam, Internship Evaluation</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum (SPSY 686), Advanced Practicum (SPSY 793), Preliminary Exam, Internship (SPSY 891)</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 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>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates who take the exam exceed an average rating of 1.5.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master's Case: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. No changes are indicated specific to this domain.</p>

<p>6. 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>(1) Methods: Practicum Evaluation, Master’s Case, Advanced Practicum Evaluation, Preliminary Exam, Internship Evaluation</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum (SPSY 686), Advanced Practicum (SPSY 793), Preliminary Exam, Internship (SPSY 891)</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 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>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates exceed an average rating of 1.5.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria. One candidate received a “No Basis” rating for all items.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>The candidate who completed this experience received “No Basis” ratings for all items.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data from this domain for candidates in the Ph.D. program reflect a high level of “No Basis” ratings during some field experiences. We plan to work with our field supervisors to ensure this item is appropriately evaluated in the practicum and internship setting, and that candidates have the opportunity to demonstrate applied knowledge in this domain.</li> </ul>
<p>7. Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice: Candidates provide integrated and comprehensive services in keeping with legal, ethical, and professional standards.*G1, G2, G3, G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Practicum Evaluation, Master’s Case, Advanced Practicum Evaluation, Preliminary Exam, Internship Evaluation</p> <p>(2) Experiences: SPSY 670, Practicum (SPSY 686), Advanced Practicum (SPSY 793), Preliminary Exam, Internship (SPSY 891)</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 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>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates exceed an average rating of 1.5 across the domains assessing this SLO.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (1/1) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. No changes are indicated specific to this domain.</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.

## Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must 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 must 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.
- 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: Continuous Quality Improvement

**In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?**

### Discoveries:

- Our candidates perform consistently well and routinely exceed expectations in the areas of Data-based Decision-making, Consultation and Collaboration, and Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice.
- In the areas of Intervention, Schoolwide Practices to Promote Learning, and Diversity in Development and Learning, candidates also consistently meet expectations, but it is unclear that their practicum and internship experiences include significant opportunities to demonstrate these skills. Many evaluation items are rated as "No Basis." In addition, we previously identified a lack of direct performance indicators (i.e., faculty-evaluated knowledge and skill) in the area of Schoolwide Practices to Promote Learning during earlier assessment cycles.
- In the area of Research and Program Evaluation, candidates historically have demonstrated more difficulty acquiring relevant field experiences.
- Although the program officially requires candidates to complete the PRAXIS-II licensure exam for school psychology, we do not currently have a structured way in which to require and collect these data from candidates as an additional direct measure of content knowledge.

### Evidence of Improvement:

- During 2017-2018, we worked collaboratively with a team of candidates, faculty, and field supervisors to revise and pilot a new field evaluation form. This demonstrates our response to concerns that the items previously being evaluated in the field were not reflective of the experiences candidates were having and therefore did not accurately reflect their demonstrated knowledge and skills in applied settings. Pilot data and feedback from supervisors reflect a positive response to the revised form (i.e., more relevant, more user-friendly). More information has been provided on the College Assessment Blackboard site.

### Focus of Assessment Plan:

- During 2017-2018, we developed and added a "Systems Analysis" element to our Ed.S. project rubric to increase faculty evaluation of candidate knowledge and skill in the area of Schoolwide Practices to Promote Learning. This year we plan to the "Systems Analysis" element, revise if needed, and also add it to our Master's Case Presentation rubric, to ensure we are assessing this outcome at multiple time points.
- We plan to implement the new field evaluation form in the coming year and examine the data we receive with respect to its consistency with our campus-based assessments and the percentage of "No Basis" ratings. We hope to see an increase in the percentage of items rated and improved consistency in ratings.
- We will also discuss an appropriate time and method for requiring and collecting results from candidates' completion of the PRAXIS-II licensure exam, to supply an additional direct measure of candidate content knowledge.

### Stakeholder Communication:

- Candidates and supervisors were actively involved in developing the new field evaluation form. A meeting with practicum supervisors is planned for November 2018 to share the new assessment form and pilot data.
- At the same meeting, we plan to collaboratively discuss experiences supervisors and faculty expect candidates to have as part of the practicum experience, and how activities might be crafted to cover a broader range of SLO's. We hope this will partially address our concern about the breadth of field-based experiences.

- We solicit candidate feedback annually through a candidate survey; information is also communicated from faculty to candidates through our student organization (Student Affiliates in School Psychology) and through a student liaison who attends and participates in program area meetings.

### Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

*The table below reflects our goals for the upcoming year, as our program has not previously participated in this planning process.*

a. What goals/objectives <b>have been established</b> to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps <b>will be</b> taken to make progress on each goal and who <b>will be</b> responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?
1. Improve persistence and completion for ABD Candidates.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enforce existing requirement that students defend dissertation proposal prior to accepting pre-doctoral internship (program coordinator)</li> <li>2. Increase communication with students who are currently ABD (at least once per semester) to inform them of their progress and timeline (program coordinator)</li> <li>3. Revise annual student review policy to incorporate a more detailed completion timeline for ABD students (program faculty and dissertation chairs)</li> <li>4. Explore the possibility of assigning “U” grades for SPSY 899 when candidates register but make no dissertation progress (program area faculty)</li> </ol>	Presently, our greatest difficulty with candidate persistence and completion revolves around dissertation completion. In particular, students who have not proposed their dissertation prior to beginning their pre-doctoral internship exhibit significant difficulty completing the dissertation requirement. We will monitor objective metrics, including the number of candidates who complete the program each year, and the number of candidates who are ABD (currently 10 of 19 enrolled candidates are ABD). We will also consider input from dissertation chairs regarding the amount of communication with candidates and the amount of progress candidates are making on dissertations as indicators of progress.
2. Improve online course experience.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collect additional feedback from candidates about their experience with online coursework; use suggestions for strategic course improvement (Alyce Hopple)</li> <li>2. Program faculty complete ISU-offered Online Instructor Certificate Course (Chavez Phelps)</li> </ol>	Our most recent annual candidate survey indicated candidates are less satisfied with online courses. These comprise a large number of our research and statistics courses, which cover content our Student Learning Outcome Summary report has historically indicated as an area for improvement. Therefore, we would like to do more investigation. We will ensure our junior faculty work to build their skills in online instruction and will use the additional feedback collected to make more strategic improvement decisions. We will examine annual candidate survey data again next year to assess for progress.

## Notes

- a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
- c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See [Blue Reports](#) database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the [Office of Institutional Research](#) for ideas.

## Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

**In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?**

**Discoveries:** Attending specifically to candidate retention, persistence, and completion has allowed us to identify one salient issue we need to address – the number of candidates who are “ABD” and may eventually fail to complete the program. Our greatest source of attrition is for candidates who are unable or unwilling to complete the dissertation process at varying points. This is especially true for candidates who leave campus to complete their pre-doctoral internship prior to defending their dissertation proposals. We have further learned that (a) our existing policy that candidates must propose prior to accepting an internship has not been routinely enforced, (b) there has been limited regular follow-up or requirement for candidates to communicate with their chairpersons regularly, and (c) there has been limited regular communication from the program regarding candidates’ remaining timeline for completion. This will be our primary focus for programmatic improvements.

Reflecting upon student performance led to an interesting potential connection between students’ online course experience and their knowledge and skills in the area of Research and Program Evaluation. Given (a) nearly all research and stats courses are now delivered in online or hybrid format, (b) candidates recently reported concerns about their online learning experiences, and (c) Research and Program Evaluation has been an SLO in which we have historically identified as an area for growth, these potential connections will be a focus of further investigation. In addition, for Ph.D. candidates, a majority of their foundational behavioral sciences courses are delivered online. For the purposes of external accreditation, it will be critical to ensure the quality of these courses as part of our systematic improvement efforts.

**Impacts:** For ABD candidates, we hope enforcing our existing policies and modifying our process to include more support and accountability will result in more timely progress and program completion, before, during, and after internship. Supporting students to a more timely program completion will also accelerate their timeline for obtaining professional licensure as psychologists, which is a critical aspect of career-readiness for our doctoral graduates. Regarding online courses, we remain in a fact-finding and planning stage. Ultimately, we anticipate that our response to student feedback will result in improved online experiences, increased learning, and deeper knowledge that will advance students’ career readiness.

*Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific--assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college’s assessment site in Blackboard.*

Dear Carrie,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are 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 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)

<b>Program: PhD Guidance &amp; Psychological Services, School Psychology</b>	
<b>Assessment Practice Overall Rating:</b> Exemplary (3.00/3.00)	
<b>Student Success Practice Overall Rating:</b> Mature (2.00/3.00) <i>*see second rubric below</i>	
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clear outcomes specifically aligned with CGPS outcomes.</li><li>• Good description and samples of tools used to accompany measures of student learning. Excellent alignment between items in various tools to learning outcomes.</li><li>• Appropriate use of student N – provides indirect justification of variation in targets for success.</li><li>• Excellent description of use of prior and current results to influence measures/tools, curriculum, pedagogy, and work with evaluators. It is absolutely clear that findings are assessed to down to the level of student learning outcomes, and it's an advantage that outcomes are assessed across multiple opportunities for student performance.</li><li>• Fantastic sharing of results and inclusion of faculty and stakeholders in the assessment process.</li><li>• <b>Excellent first round of work on goal-setting for student success. Identified challenges are clear and action plans are reasonable and manageable for promoting improved student success in completion as well as in quality across delivery methods.</b></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• One opportunity for streamlining pairing this evidence with future CAEP accreditation is to note the alignment between outcomes and standards.</li></ul>

Scoring Rubric is included below.

Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.



Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p><b>Student Learning Outcomes</b></p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p><b>Performance Goals &amp; Measures</b></p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

<b>Analysis &amp; Results</b>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
<b>Sharing &amp; Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</b>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Exemplary</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Undeveloped</b>

**Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)Unit/Program: PhD School Psychology**

**Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:**

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>0 Undeveloped</b>	<b>1 Developing</b>	<b>2 Mature</b>	<b>3 Exemplary</b>
<b>Goals/ Objectives</b>	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.  Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.  Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.  Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
<b>Action Steps</b>	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives.  No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives.  Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives  Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
<b>Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective</b>	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
<b>Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement</b>	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Undeveloped</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Exemplary</b>