

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: Ed.S. School Psychology **Contact Name and Email** Carrie Ball - carrie.ball@instate.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.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) 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 expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>1. Data-based Decision Making and Accountability: Demonstrate knowledge of various assessment methods and skills to interpret and apply assessment results to design, implement, and evaluate responsive services and programs. *G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Annual Student Evaluation, Practicum Evaluation, Internship Evaluation, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of "meets expectations" or higher.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn average ratings of "meets expectations" or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn average ratings of "meets expectations" or higher.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of "meets expectations" or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 75% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 100% (13/13) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis</p> <p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee.</p>
<p>2. Consultation and</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Annual Student</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation:</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation:</p>	<p>(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis</p>

<p>Collaboration: Demonstrate knowledge of consultation, collaboration, and communication methods, and skills to apply effective strategies during the design, implementation, and evaluation of services and programs. *G1, G2, G4, G5</p>	<p>Evaluation, Practicum Evaluation, Internship Evaluation, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>90% of candidates earn ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 75% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>100% (13/13) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee</p>
<p>3. Academic Skills: Demonstrate knowledge of biological, social, cultural, and developmental influences on academic skills, and skills to implement and evaluate evidence-based services that support cognitive and academic skills. *G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Annual Student Evaluation, Practicum Evaluation, Internship Evaluation, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 92% (12/13) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 80% (4/5) candidates met minimum</p>	<p>(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis</p> <p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee</p>

		<p>expectations” or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 75% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>criteria.</p>	
<p>4.Social and Life Skills: Demonstrate knowledge of biological, social, cultural, and developmental influences on social and behavioral functioning, and skills to implement and evaluate evidence-based services that support socialization, learning, and mental health. *G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Annual Student Evaluation, Practicum Evaluation, Internship Evaluation, Ed.S. Project, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 75% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 92% (12/13) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Ed.S. Project: 67% (2/3) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 80% (4/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis</p> <p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee</p>
<p>5. Schoolwide Practices to Promote Learning: Demonstrate knowledge of school systems, structure, organization, and theory and evidence-based strategies to promote schoolwide learning, social development, and mental health, and skills to apply strategies that create and maintain supportive</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Annual Student Evaluation, Practicum Evaluation, Internship Evaluation, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100%</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 92% (12/13) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis</p> <p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee</p>

<p>learning environments. *G2, G4, G5</p>		<p>of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 75% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>PRAXIS II: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	
<p>6. Preventive and Responsive Services: Demonstrate knowledge of principles of risk and resilience, multi-tiered support systems, and effective crisis response, and skills to promote evidence-based services that enhance student health, safety, and well-being through preventive strategies and effective crisis preparation and response. *G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Annual Student Evaluation, Practicum Evaluation, Internship Evaluation, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 75% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 92% (12/13) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis</p> <p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee</p>
<p>7. Family-School Collaboration: Demonstrate knowledge of research and principles of family systems, structure, and culture, and skills to apply evidence-based strategies for responding to family culture and context, supporting connections with community agencies, and encouraging family involvement in enhancing students’ academic, social, emotional, and behavioral</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Annual Student Evaluation, Practicum Evaluation, Internship Evaluation, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 92% (12/13) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum</p>	<p>(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis</p> <p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee</p>

development. *G1, G2, G4, G5		PRAXIS II: 75% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.	criteria.	
8. Diversity in Development and Learning: Demonstrate knowledge of individual, social, cultural, contextual, and role differences, and skills to apply evidence-based strategies, work effectively with students, families, and colleagues from a variety of backgrounds, exhibit understanding and respect for diverse populations, and advocate for social justice. *G1, G2, G4, G5	(1) Methods: Annual Student Evaluation, Practicum Evaluation, Internship Evaluation, PRAXIS II (2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship	Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of “meets expectations” or higher. Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher. Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher. PRAXIS II: 75% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.	Annual Student Evaluation: 92% (12/13) candidates met minimum criteria. Practicum Evaluation: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria. Internship Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria. PRAXIS II: 80% (4/5) candidates met minimum criteria.	(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis (2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee
9. Research and Program Evaluation: Demonstrate knowledge of various methods of research design, data analysis, and program evaluation, and skills to apply research to practice and to use sound research design to implement, monitor, and evaluate practices at the individual and program levels. *G4, G5	(1) Methods: Annual Student Evaluation, Practicum Evaluation, Internship Evaluation, Ed.S. Project (2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship	Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of “meets expectations” or higher. Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher. Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher. Ed.S. Project: 75% of candidates earn average	Annual Student Evaluation: 92% (12/13) candidates met minimum criteria. Practicum Evaluation: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria. Internship Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria. Ed.S. Project: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria. PRAXIS II: 100% (5/5)	(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis (2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee

		ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.	candidates met minimum criteria.	
<p>10. Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice: Demonstrate knowledge of history and systems, psychological and educational theory, legal and ethical guidelines, and professional standards, and skills to provide integrated and comprehensive services in keeping with legal, ethical, and professional standards. *G2, G3, G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Annual Student Evaluation, Practicum Evaluation, Internship Evaluation, PRAXIS II</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum, Internship</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn average ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 75% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 100% (13/13) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (5/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: 80% (4/5) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis</p> <p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee</p>

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

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

- Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- 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 outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- 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).
- This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

NOTE: Because annual program data for all assessment measures are compiled and evaluated after June 1, the data provided above and analyzed below are from the 2014-2015 academic year; none of the assessments used to demonstrate student learning outcomes were complete and available for the 2015-2016 reporting cycle.

1) Discoveries: Data indicated that most student learning outcomes are consistently achieved by candidates at the practicum and internship levels, with 100% of candidates earning average ratings of "meets expectations" or higher based on field supervisors' ratings during practicum and internship experiences. Annual student evaluations of all students, which are completed annually by program faculty, reflected that students consistently make expected academic and professional gains throughout their time in the program; noted deficiencies are remediated on a case-by-case basis in accordance with program policies and procedures. PRAXIS-II results reflected acceptable levels of achievement; areas related to principles of evidence-based intervention (Goals 3 & 4) and psychological foundations (e.g., history and systems, theory; Goal 10) showed that 80% of students met benchmark, compared to an overall goal of 75%. Within Goal 4 (Social and Life Skills), students did not meet the minimum level of achievement identified on the Ed.S. Project (67% met benchmark in comparison to the goal of 75%). Low sample sizes were noted to significantly impact decisions regarding whether or not minimum levels of achievement were met; therefore, areas in which minimum levels were not met may reflect actual program weaknesses or anomalies produced by occasional outliers.

2) Due to the sample-size concern noted above, major program changes are approached with caution until trends in the data are observed. Moreover, the data collected for 2014-2015 are for interns who completed a previous iteration of the School Psychology Ed.S. program; a substantial program revision was implemented in Fall 2013 and expected improvements in several areas specifically related to Goals 1, 3, 4, and 10 are expected to appear in the PRAXIS II, Ed.S Project, and Internship Evaluations collected in 2015-2016. Therefore, at this time data will be carefully monitored to ensure outcomes reflect the intended improvements in curriculum and subsequent student outcomes. In addition, faculty noted that not all interns were completing Ed.S. projects that included both academic (Goal 3) and social/emotional/behavioral (Goal 4) interventions; in response, rubrics and expectations for the Ed.S. project have been revised to ensure students' culminating projects allow for outcome evaluation in both Goal 3 and Goal 4.

3) The 2015-2016 assessment plan is consistent with the 2014-2015 data. The same outcome measures will be used to evaluate student outcomes. The assessment plan will be adjusted to account for changes in the Ed.S. Project rubric and requirements. While technically still above the minimum level of achievement, areas in which PRAXIS II scores fell below 100% of students meeting benchmark will be closely monitored, with the hope that performance in domains that align with Goals 3, 4, and 10 will remain stable or improve as a result of recent program changes. Goal areas in which Ed.S Project performance and/or sample size were below expectations (particularly Goal 4) will also be closely monitored to ensure students are successfully completing both academic and behavioral cases (Goals 3 & 4) during internship.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: EdS in School Psychology Date: 7.22.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> An Outcomes Library was provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are student-centered. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, student-centered, and span multiple learning domains. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific.	<input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sufficient information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what

				<p>students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
<p>3. Results</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity of the assessment process.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
<p>4. Engagement & Improvement</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they do not clearly connect to the results or are too vague to implement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the</p>

		about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<p>history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.
				<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature +	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

Part One: Outcomes are clear, measurable, and student-centered, and the curriculum map demonstrates that they are amply addressed in the program's courses and related experiences. Multiple methods are used to assess each outcome, and they include high-impact practices such as internships and practica, as well as the Praxis II exam. The measures are not tied to any particular course, and all appear to be part of the fieldwork experience. Is this the only point at which assessment is conducted? Since the same measures assess each outcome, identifying the specific elements of the measures used to assess each outcome and providing me with access to the associated rubrics, checklists, assignments, etc. would further substantiate the measures' appropriateness. You can provide supplementary information as links to a website or post them on an accessible Blackboard site.

Performance standards and results are clearly aligned with the assessment methods; while each method is used multiple times, results are calibrated to the specific outcome, as is evident from the fact that results vary from outcome to outcome. Students are achieving all ten program outcomes overall (the one exception among 50 results reported was the Ed.S. project assessed for outcome 4). Two faculty members are responsible for collecting and analyzing results which are shared with the faculty as a whole. Are students or external stakeholders involved in the assessment process?

Part Two: This section offers an excellent summary and analysis of 2014-15 assessment efforts and results specifically tied to the identified outcomes, as well as identifying general plans for the coming year. I appreciate your cautious approach to making additional changes so soon after a significant program revision and based on such a small sample. Previous program improvements were made in regard to outcomes 1, 3, 4, and 10, though no details are provided. I look forward to seeing evidence of their impact as well as additional plans for improvement in a subsequent report.

I rated the report as "Mature," but it is on the border between "Mature" and "Exemplary." Good work!