

Degree Program Name: Ph.D. Guidance & Psychological Services, 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. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

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? Green – 100%, or exceeded target Yellow – at target, below 100% Red – below target</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, Simulated Case, 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>Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of “meets expectations” or higher.</p> <p>Simulated Case: 70% of candidates earn a rating of “Meets Expectations” or higher on at least 4/6 items assessing this domain.</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</p>	<p>Annual Student Evaluation: 93% (15/15) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Simulated Case: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>No doctoral candidates completed practicum during this assessment cycle.</p> <p>No doctoral candidates completed the Master’s case presentation during this assessment cycle.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of</p>	<p>(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis</p> <p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee.</p>

		<p>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>candidates (3/3) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (2/2) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (7/7) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	
<p>2. Consultation and Collaboration: Demonstrate knowledge of consultation and collaboration strategies and of cultural and contextual factors impacting communication, and skills to effectively apply evidence-based strategies for enhancing students' academic, social, emotional, and behavioral development within and beyond the school setting. *G1, G2, G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Annual Student Evaluation, 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>Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of "meets expectations" or higher on both items assessing this domain.</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>Annual Student Evaluation: 100% (15/15) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>No doctoral candidates completed practicum during this assessment cycle.</p> <p>No doctoral candidates completed the Master's case presentation during this assessment cycle.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (3/3) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (2/2) 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>Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0 or higher on 90% of rated items in this domain.</p>	<p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (7/7) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	
<p>3. Intervention: Demonstrate knowledge of biological, social, cultural, and developmental influences on academic, 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, Simulated Case, 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>Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of "meets expectations" or higher.</p> <p>Simulated Case: 70% of candidates earn a rating of "Meets Expectations" or higher on at least 3/4 items assessing this domain.</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>Annual Student Evaluation: 93% (14/15) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Simulated Case: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>No doctoral candidates completed practicum during this assessment cycle.</p> <p>No doctoral candidates completed the Master's case presentation during this assessment cycle.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (3/3) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (2/2) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (7/7) 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>4. Schoolwide Practices to Promote Learning:</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Practicum Evaluation, Advanced</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of 2.0</p>	<p>No doctoral candidates completed practicum during</p>	<p>(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis</p>

<p>Demonstrate knowledge of school systems, structure, organization, and theory and evidence-based strategies to create and maintain supportive learning environments, promote schoolwide learning, and enhance student health, safety, and well-being through preventive strategies and effective crisis preparation and response. *G2, G4, G5</p>	<p>Practicum Evaluation, Preliminary Exam, Internship Evaluation</p> <p>(2) Experiences: Practicum (SPSY 686), Advanced Practicum (SPSY 793), Preliminary Exam, Internship (SPSY 891)</p>	<p>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>this assessment cycle.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (3/3) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (2/2) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (7/7) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	<p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee</p>
<p>5. 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</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Annual Student Evaluation, Simulated Case, 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>Annual Student Evaluation: (a) 90% of active candidates earn ratings of "meets expectations" or higher. (b) 50% of ABD candidates earn ratings of "meets expectations" or higher.</p> <p>Simulated Case: 70% of candidates earn a rating of "Meets Expectations" or higher on at least 2/3 items assessing this domain.</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>Annual Student Evaluation: (a) 87% (13/15) candidates met minimum criteria. (b) 60% (3/5) ABD candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Simulated Case: 100% (2/2) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>No doctoral candidates completed practicum during this assessment cycle.</p> <p>No doctoral candidates completed the Master's case presentation during this assessment cycle.</p>	<p>(1) Carrie Ball, Leah Nellis</p> <p>(2) Results are shared electronically and reviewed annually by program faculty committee</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 eligible candidates complete the research proficiency tool on schedule and 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>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (3/3) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (2/2) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (7/7) candidates met minimum criteria.</p>	
<p>6. Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice: Demonstrate knowledge of psychological and educational history, systems, and theory; knowledge of individual, social, cultural, contextual, and role differences; and legal, ethical, and professional guidelines and standards. Demonstrate skills to work effectively with diverse populations and to provide integrated and comprehensive services in keeping with legal, ethical, and professional standards. *G1, G2, G3, G4, G5</p>	<p>(1) Methods: Annual Student Evaluation, 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>Annual Student Evaluation: 90% of candidates earn ratings of “meets expectations” or higher on 4/5 items assessing this domain.</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>Annual Student Evaluation: 100% (15/15) candidates met minimum criteria.</p> <p>No doctoral candidates completed practicum during this assessment cycle.</p> <p>No doctoral candidates completed the Master’s case presentation during this assessment cycle.</p> <p>Advanced Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (3/3) 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>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>Preliminary Exam: 100% of candidates (2/2) met minimum criteria.</p> <p>Internship Evaluation: 100% (7/7) candidates met minimum criteria.</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

- 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 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).
- e. 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.

NOTE: A supplement accompanies this submission (uploaded to the BCOE Assessment Blackboard page) to show the alignment between outcome measures and the identified SLO's. Because not all 2016-2017 were complete at the time of this report, the following cycles are reported:

- **Annual Student Review, Advanced Practicum Evaluations, and Internship Evaluations data are reported for 2015-2016**
- **Simulated Case, Practicum Evaluation, Master's Case Presentation, and Preliminary Exam data are reported for 2016-2017**

1) Discoveries: All student learning outcomes (SLO's) are consistently achieved by candidates at all levels of study, as evidenced by data from the current assessment cycle. One area of persistent attention is in SLO 5, Research & Program Evaluation. SLO 5 is the only area in which candidates fell below the minimum target, which is primarily due to candidates who do not demonstrate consistent progress toward completing their dissertations. In addition, faculty noted that few outcome measures are available that specifically address candidate's knowledge and skills in SLO 4, Schoolwide Practices to Promote Learning.

2) In response to feedback on last year's report, significant adjustments have been made to the programs SLO Library and Curriculum Map, to ensure that the number and scope of SLO's is manageable and that the measures used to assess outcomes have adequate breadth, depth, relevance, and alignment to the SLO they are used to evaluate.

We are cognizant of the fact that our small sample sizes can easily yield anomalies in our outcome data. We have endeavored to partially account for sample sizes by adjusting the minimum thresholds and metrics used to evaluate acceptable levels of performance in a way that will be less affected by one candidate not meeting the target. We continue, however, to exercise caution with broad programmatic changes until clear patterns emerge. The data for SLO 5 will be closely monitored, as a program change in Fall 2013 now requires candidates to complete a dissertation proposal prior to applying for internships; we are hopeful that as these candidates matriculate through the program, we will see both improved progress in SLO 5 prior to and during the internship experience, as well as a decline in the number of candidates who are ABD. We will also continue to explore additional ways to provide experiences and evaluate outcomes relative to SLO 4, which is currently primarily evaluated via practicum and internship evaluations and routinely includes a number of "No Basis" ratings.

3) As the SLO library and curriculum map have been significantly revised for this cycle, no major changes are anticipated for 2017-2018. We will continue to track the same outcome measures, with adjustments as necessary to reflect changes to rubrics or evaluation forms or to incorporate the Assessment Coordinator's feedback from this cycle. An additional measure may be considered for SLO 4. We will continue to evaluate all outcomes to ensure any deficits are identified and remediated as soon as possible.

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

Degree Program: Ph.D. Guidance & Psychological Services, School Psychology Date: 10.29.17

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <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 type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <i>They could use some clarification/simplification.</i> <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map

				<p>identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p> <p><i>General rubric.</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to</p>

				<p>assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</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</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and 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 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 and meaningful.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous</p>

	standards set for them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	achieving the performance standards expected of them.	improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. <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.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <i>All?</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <i>They have in the past.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <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 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

The new libraries align your programs' outcomes with those of the Graduate School, and they clearly address key knowledge and skills. But I wonder if the outcomes could be recast for clarity? Each one begins "Demonstrate knowledge of," and then includes a fairly long list of expectations. What if you cut to the chase, so that the Ph.D.'s #7, for example, reads "Provide integrated and comprehensive services in keeping with legal, ethical, and professional standards." Then in your assessment of whether students met the outcome, you would look for evidence that they had knowledge of history and systems, psychological and educational theory, etc. Just a thought.

The alignment documents provide some additional information about the general categories of assessment measures (and there are several-grades, artifacts, instructor/supervisor feedback on practica, etc.), but I was hoping for a summary of the assignments so that I could see that they did indeed measure the related outcome. Also, what are your plans to develop an indirect measure? The alignment documents also include a general rubric, which defines expectations for some outcomes. But what constitutes "adequate" and "inadequate" performance? You know what I'm getting at: You need to know precisely what students did well and less well so that you can develop appropriate interventions. Results, which are quite positive (thanks for the color-coding, by the way) suggest that you do. But I don't yet don't have enough information to see this for myself. To keep it simple, perhaps next year you could pick one outcome and provide a really detailed explanation of the assignment and how you assess it?

Because we are gearing up for the Higher Learning Commission reaffirmation process, it is particularly important for us to be able to provide evidence that we are systematically assessing our curricular and co-curricular programs; using the information we derive from that process to develop actionable plans for improvement in student learning; and documenting the improvements that result. (I do, of course, appreciate your being cautious about making changes until clear patterns emerge.)

Thank you for completing your Student Learning Summary Report! If you have questions about my comments, please let me know.