

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2018-19 *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: Ed.S., School Psychology **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Carrie Ball, carrie.ball@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

| <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>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.</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 & Internship Evaluation, Master's Case, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p> | <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Master's Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 67% 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) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master's Case: 86% of candidates (6/7) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 40% of candidates (2/5) met minimum criteria.</p> | <p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are generally meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual follow-up is described in Part 2 for the one candidate who did not meet minimum criteria for practicum evaluations in several domains and for the candidate who did not meet minimum expectations for the Master's Case Presentation in several domains All candidates who did not meet PRAXIS-II expectations scored below the average range of performance by only one item, and all scored well above the overall score required for national certification. We will monitor these data in future cohorts to look for patterns. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| <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 & Internship Evaluation, Master’s Case, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p> | <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 75% of candidates earn rating of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 67% 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>Practicum Evaluation: 83% of candidates (5/6) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 100% of candidates (7/7) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 40% of candidates (2/5) met minimum criteria.</p> | <p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. See previous note regarding PRAXIS-II scores and follow-up for individual candidates.</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 & Internship Evaluation, Master’s Case, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p> | <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 67% 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) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 86% of candidates (6/7) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% (3/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria.</p> | <p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. See previous note regarding follow-up for individual candidates.</p> |
| <p>4. Schoolwide Practices to Promote Learning: Candidates understand and work effectively within educational systems to</p> | <p>(1) Methods: Practicum & Internship Evaluation, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</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: 100% of candidates (6/6) met minimum criteria.</p> | <p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>create and maintain safe and supportive learning environments. *G2, G4, G5</p> | <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p> | <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 67% 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>Internship Evaluation: 80% of candidates (4/5) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria.</p> | <p>With the revision of a new field evaluation form, there was a drop in “No Basis” ratings compared to previous years.</p> |
| <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 & Internship Evaluation, Master’s Case, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p> | <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 75% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 67% 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>Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (6/6) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 86% of candidates (6/7) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria.</p> | <p>Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. See previous notes.</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 & Internship Evaluation, Master’s Case, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p> | <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of “Satisfactory” or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher.</p> | <p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (6/6) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 80% of candidates (4/5) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Master’s Case: 71% of candidates (5/7) met minimum criteria.</p> | <p>Data in this domain show a re-emergence of concern with candidate performance in this domain on the Master’s Case, despite formative experiences that are included in multiple introductory courses. We plan to address this by offering increased instruction and individual consultation and support with the specific research and evaluation skills candidates are expected to</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | Ed.S. Project: 67% of candidates earn average ratings of 2.0 or higher. PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain. | Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria. PRAXIS II: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria. | demonstrate with this project. At the same time, we will be evaluating whether the current format of the Master's Case is the most effective method for assessing candidate knowledge and skills in this domain. |
| 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 | (1) Methods: Practicum & Internship Evaluation, Master's Case, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II (2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship | Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain. Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain. Master's Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher. Ed.S. Project: 67% of candidates earn average ratings of 2.0 or higher. PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain. | Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (6/6) met minimum criteria. Internship Evaluation: 80% of candidates (4/5) met minimum criteria. Master's Case: 86% of candidates (6/7) met minimum criteria. Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria. PRAXIS II: 100% of candidates (5/5) met minimum criteria. | Data in this domain reflect candidates are meeting or exceeding program expectations for knowledge and skills. No changes are indicated specific to this domain. |

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

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

- Cohort Sizes – 20
- Year-to-Year Retention – 100%
- 5-Year Graduation Rate

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.
- Early and supportive remediation efforts have been critical to addressing concerns with candidate performance. This relies upon open communication and collaboration among program faculty and between faculty and partnering field supervisors.
- We have also worked toward improved transparency and a more streamlined process for course scheduling, and have sought partnerships at a greater distance from campus. These adjustments have allowed some candidates to study from greater distances that better accommodate their personal needs.
- Finally, we have improved communication with applicants 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. We hope that this will reduce one identifiable source of attrition.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

Our overarching goal is to grow enrollment in this program while maintaining quality outcomes and employability of our graduates. To this end:

- We will focus on continuing to expand and foster our partnerships with districts at greater distances from campus and working individually with both traditional and non-traditional candidates.
- We will also begin developing a marketing strategy that targets special education directors and teachers, encouraging a “Grow Your Own” model of training school psychologists. Our goal is to maintain our individualized focus and quality outcomes while expanding enrollments across a larger geographic area.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities (OPTIONAL FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS)

Please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. The template was sent to you with this form via email.

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: Many of the areas in which the achievement of outcomes fell below 100% were due to individually identifiable issues:

- One practicum candidate and one intern received evaluation ratings below the stated program threshold. On follow-up, supervisors had no significant concerns and both candidates remained in the same placements for 2019-2020.
- One candidate struggled both in practicum and with the Master's Case. She will repeat both experiences in 2019-2020, with the support of additional individual consultation with faculty and field supervisors.

At the program level, we noted unexpected drops in Section 1 of the PRAXIS-II exam, as well as in the domain of Research and Program Evaluation on the Master's Case. These are isolated data points, however, against a backdrop of overall solid performance. We have also drawn upon formative and qualitative data sources to plan short-term adjustments in our curriculum that we hope will better meet candidate needs.

Findings-based Plans: We plan to take several steps in 2019-2020 to maximize student learning outcomes and student success:

- We will develop and implement training for supervisors who complete practicum and internship forms, and we hope this will result in ratings more reflective of program expectations.
- We plan to monitor PRAXIS-II scores in part 1 and ensure a trend is not observed for next year. We have also implemented a formative "Skills Assessment" for practicum candidates, which we believe will support their review and practice of several skills required in this domain to ensure they have retained key information from their foundational coursework.

Assessment Plans: We will continue to monitor Master's Case performance in the area of Research & Program Evaluation, so we are prepared to address any emerging trends. At the same time, we plan to re-examine and possibly revise the Master's Case to better reflect the knowledge and skills most critical for success at the master's level.

Sharing with Stakeholders: Program plans and outcomes are regularly shared with program faculty, administrators, and candidates. We will discuss appropriate mechanisms for sharing these data with other relevant stakeholders, including field supervisors, alumni, potential employers, and prospective applicants.

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 2018-19 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 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: EdS School Psychology | Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00) |
|--|--|
| Strengths | Recommendations |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learning outcomes are clear and measurable. They are aligned to the Graduate Student Learning Outcomes.• Assessment methods and courses are clearly noted. A diverse array of student performances are captured for each outcome, giving faculty an opportunity to triangulate assumptions about performance. The use of a nationally-normed and professionally relevant instrument lends additional quality to overall inferences.• Clear information about expected and actual student outcomes, including clear information about factors in the data (individual student factors).• Addendum provided great information on the assignments and evaluation tools. Seeing the rubrics helped to confirm learning outcomes were specifically measured within larger assignments.• Excellent discussion of what was learned from findings, targeted areas for improvement, areas to monitor, and strategies for improvement.• Clear information provided about how findings are shared, including sharing with candidates. Plans to potentially expand sharing in the future. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Great note about the importance of qualitative and formative findings and their impact on identification of issues/planning for success. Feel free to include any of these measures in overall reporting if appropriate. The form doesn't lend itself well to such findings, but we will be revising in Fall 2020 – please keep a lookout for a call for input!• Consider adding a note about whether these outcomes were assessed on a cycle or in response to a finding/intervention from prior year. Not having this doesn't affect the quality of this report, but it is a helpful note for future reference. |

| Evaluation Criteria | Exemplary | Mature | Developing | Undeveloped |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <p>Student Learning Outcomes</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>Performance Goals & Measures</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> |

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