

**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:** Ph.D. School Psychology **Contact Name and Email** Leah Nellis, leah.nellis@indstate.edu

**Part One**

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</b></p> <p><b>If this is a graduate program, indicate the <a href="#">Graduate Student Learning Outcome*</a> each outcome aligns with.</b></p>	<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</b></p>
<p>1: Assessment and Data-based Decision Making: Demonstrate knowledge and skills concerning fundamentals of measurement and assessment, and the use of assessment measures in a non-biased, reliable and valid manner. *G4, G5</p>	<p>(1 ) Methods: Annual Performance Evaluation;  Practicum Evaluation: Assessment &amp; DBDM Domain;  Internship Evaluation: Assessment &amp; DBDM Domain; Preliminary Examinations</p> <p>(2) Course/Experience: Practicum; Internship; Preliminary Examination</p>	<p>Annual Performance Evaluation: 85% of students received Basic rating or above on overall performance indicator</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 85% of students receive an average overall rating of 2.0 or above for each rated domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 85% of students receive an average overall rating of 2.0 or above for each rated domain.</p> <p>Preliminary Examination: 85% of students receive a rating of 2.0 or above for each of the rated areas.</p>	<p>Annual Performance Evaluation: 24/25 students, (96%) met the benchmark.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 7/7 students (100%) met the benchmark for the Assessment &amp; DBDM domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 5/5 students (100%) met the benchmark for the Assessment &amp; DBDM domain.</p> <p>Preliminary Examination: 3/3 students (100%) met the benchmark.</p>	<p>(1 ) Leah Nellis, Carrie Ball</p> <p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee</p>
<p>2: Prevention and Intervention: Demonstrate knowledge and skills concerning the theories and strategies used to guide the design and implementation of effective interventions for children and adolescents.</p>	<p>(1 ) Methods: Annual Performance Evaluation;  Practicum Evaluation: Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills</p>	<p>Same as above</p>	<p>Annual Performance Evaluation: 24/25 students, (96%) met the benchmark.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 7/7 students (100%) met the benchmark for the three domains.</p>	<p>(1 ) Leah Nellis, Carrie Ball</p> <p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee</p>

<p>*G4, G5</p>	<p>Domain, Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills Domain, School-wide Practices to Promote Learning Domain;</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills Domain, Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills Domain, School-wide Practices to Promote Learning Domain;</p> <p>Preliminary Examinations</p> <p>(2) Course/Experience: Practicum, Internship, Preliminary Examination</p>		<p>Internship Evaluation: 5/5 students (100%) met the benchmark for the three domains.</p> <p>Preliminary Examination: 3/3 students (100%) met the benchmark.</p>	
<p>3: Consultation and Collaboration: Demonstrate the ability to apply theoretical knowledge and skills when consulting with educators, school administrators, family members, and other professionals. *G1, G2</p>	<p>(1 ) Methods: Annual Performance Evaluation;</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: Consultation and Collaboration Domain;</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: Consultation and Collaboration Domain;</p> <p>Preliminary Examinations</p> <p>(2) Course/Experience: Practicum, Internship, Preliminary Examination</p>	<p>Same as above</p>	<p>Annual Performance Evaluation: 24/25 students, (96%) met the benchmark.</p> <p>Practicum Evaluation: 7/7 students (100%) met the benchmark for the Consultation and Collaboration domain.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 5/5 students (100%) met the benchmark for the Consultation and Collaboration domain.</p> <p>Preliminary Examination: 3/3 students (100%) met the</p>	<p>(1 ) Leah Nellis, Carrie Ball</p> <p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee</p>

			benchmark.	
4: Research and Evaluation: Demonstrate knowledge and skills pertaining to research methodology and design, the evaluation of treatment effects, and the communication of findings. *G5	(1 ) Methods: Grades  (2) Course/Experience: EPSY 620, ESPY 710, EPSY 712, SPSY 695	85% of students earn a grade of B or higher in the specified courses	3/3 (100%) of the students met the benchmark.	(1 ) Leah Nellis, Carrie Ball  (2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee
5: Professional Practice and Standards: Demonstrate skills required for appropriate professional practice, legal and ethical decision-making, and sensitivity to individual and cultural differences. *G2, G3	(1 ) Methods: Annual Performance Evaluation;  Practicum Evaluation: Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice Domain;  Internship Evaluation: Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice Domain;  Preliminary Examinations  (2) Course/Experience: Practicum, Internship, Preliminary Examination	Annual Performance Evaluation: 85% of students received Basic rating or above on overall performance indicator  Practicum Evaluation: 85% of students receive an average overall rating of 2.0 or above for each rated domain.  Internship Evaluation: 85% of students receive an average overall rating of 2.0 or above for each rated domain.  Preliminary Examination: 85% of students receive a rating of 2.0 or above for each of the rated areas.	Annual Performance Evaluation: 24/25 students, (96%) met the benchmark.  Practicum Evaluation: 7/7 students (100%) met the benchmark for the Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice Domain.  Internship Evaluation: 5/5 students (100%) met the benchmark for the Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice Domain.  Preliminary Examination: 3/3 students (100%) met the benchmark.	(1 ) Leah Nellis, Carrie Ball  (2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee

## 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.

- (1) Review of assessment results for the above outcomes indicate that students are meeting the program identified learning goals. Annual student evaluations indicate satisfactory performance by all doctoral students enrolled in the program, including those enrolled in years 1-5+. Qualitative analysis of practicum evaluations continue to indicate that some activities and opportunities are not being made available to students in select placement sites. These activities are rated as "no basis to evaluate" and do not negatively impact overall rating results. During internship, students were rated highly by field based supervisors indicating that students have appropriate discipline knowledge and

skills for various clinical placement sites. Performance on preliminary examinations during the 2015-16 year was improved, in comparison to previous years.

- (2) Opportunities to engage in activities that are not being provided in all practicum sites have been incorporated into the campus-based clinic or other faculty-organized experiences. Additionally, more specific requirements will be communicated to field placement sites to ensure that the desired activities are completed. The frequency of “no basis to evaluate” ratings on practicum evaluation methods will be monitored to the comprehensiveness of the field-based practicum experiences. Preliminary examination results will continue to be monitored as the current process and format has only been in place for two cycles. Minor edits to program provided study materials are being implemented July 2016, thus January 2017 results will be important for feedback and evaluation purposes.
- (3) The assessment plan for the 2016-17 year will continue to focus on the five learning outcomes. Program faculty will monitor the breadth of experiences provided during practica to ensure all objectives are being met through a combination of field-based experiences, on-campus clinic experiences, and coursework. Select practicum and internship evaluation items will also be reviewed to ensure that students are developing and demonstrating satisfactory competencies in the area of assessing positive impact on P-12 student outcomes. This is a key area for external program accreditation and approval.

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

Degree Program: PhD in School Psychology Date: 7.21.16

	<b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<b>Level 1 – Developing</b>	<b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>
<b>1. Student Learning Outcomes</b>	<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 checked="" 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 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.
<b>2. Measures &amp; Performance Goals</b>	<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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 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 <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (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 checked="" 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><b>3. Results</b></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 checked="" 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 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 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><b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b></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 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 type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 1 - Developing</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>



## COMMENTS

### Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

The program's outcomes are clear, measurable, and student-centered, and they appear to reflect knowledge and skills deemed crucial by accreditors. But the curriculum map is incomplete: It lists no courses in which outcomes are addressed, only the experiences used to assess them. Three fieldwork-related measures and one course grade were used to assess outcomes this past year. For the former, you provide some information to indicate that using them to measure multiple outcomes is appropriate (that is, you identified the specific domains each one focuses on), but I would appreciate some additional information so that I can easily see the alignment. Just what concepts does the "DBDM Domain" address, for example? Are you using rubrics to assess students' attainment and provide them with detailed feedback? If so, please make them available the next time as links to a website or documents posted in an accessible Blackboard site. I would not consider a course grade an assessment method, though it may be a measure if it can be shown to correlate clearly to the outcome being assessed. Is that the case here? Last, performance expectations appear appropriate, given the actual results. But again, the results would be more meaningful if I knew more about the measures and measurement instruments. Two individuals are responsible for collecting and analyzing data, which they share with the larger faculty annually.

Part Two provides a general overview of the results and an area of improvement (the prelims), but I would appreciate more specific details about the areas in which students perform well/less well (as they relate to the outcomes you assessed this year). As you look back, are you seeing consistent improvement in students' achievement of the outcomes? Why or why not? This section also underscores the program's proactive approach: When assessment identifies a problem, you find a solution, as you did with the practicum site opportunities. Last, I see that your program website includes an outcomes document focused on to time-to-degree, costs, licensure rates, and so on. Good for you! Can you include student learning outcomes here, too?