

<b>Academic Program:</b>	School Psychology Ed.S.	<b>Date:</b>	10/23/2022
<b>Author(s):</b>	Alyce Hopple, Carrie Ball		
<b>Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the <a href="#">ISU Assessment Results Webpage</a> by marking with an "X."</b> Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at <a href="mailto:kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu">kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu</a> .			___ Learning Outcomes ___ Curriculum Map ___ Assessment Plan
<b>Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.</b>			___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No ___ Hybrid

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment** Expand table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	Assessment Strategies Used			Established Benchmark for Proficiency	Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark	Prior Results for Comparison (if applicable)*
	Course	Assignment/Activity	Evaluation Tool i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
1. Data-based Decision-Making: Candidates apply various assessment methods and interpret results to recommend, design, and evaluate responsive services and programs.	SPSY 686	Practicum Evaluation  Master's Case	Field Supervisor Report Rubric	Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.  Master's Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher.	Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (9/9) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.  Master's Case: 100% of candidates (9/9) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.	Practicum Evaluation: 75% of candidates (3/4) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.  Master's Case: 100% of candidates (4/4) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.
	SPSY 791	Internship Evaluation  Ed.S. Project  PRAXIS II	Field Supervisor Report Rubric  Licensure Exam	Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.  Ed.S. Project: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 2.0 or higher.	Internship Evaluation: 75% (3/4) candidates earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.  Ed.S. Project: 100% (4/4) of candidates earned average ratings of 2.0 or higher.	Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.  Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned average ratings of 2.0 or higher.



				PRAXIS II: 67% of candidates score in Average range or above for the identified domain.	PRAXIS II: 75% (3/4) or candidates scored in the Average range or above for the identified domain.	PRAXIS II: 83% of candidates (5/6) met minimum criteria.
2. Consultation and Collaboration: Candidates understand and apply effective strategies for working collaboratively with others.	SPSY 686	Practicum Evaluation Master's Case	Field Supervisor Report Rubric	Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.  Master's Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher.	Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (9/9) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.  Master's Case: 100% of candidates (9/9) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.	Practicum Evaluation: 75% of candidates (3/4) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.  Master's Case: 100% of candidates (4/4) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.
	SPSY 791	Internship Evaluation Ed.S. Project PRAXIS II	Field Supervisor Report Rubric  Licensure Exam	Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.  Ed.S. Project: 75% 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.	Internship Evaluation: 100% (4/4) candidates earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.  Ed.S. Project: 100% (4/4) of candidates earned average ratings of 2.0 or higher.  PRAXIS II: 75% (3/4) or candidates scored in the Average range or above for the identified domain.	Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.  Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned ratings of 2.0 or higher.  PRAXIS II: 83% of candidates (5/6) met minimum criteria.
3. Research and Program Evaluation: Candidates apply research to practice and use sound research design to guide, monitor, and evaluate their practice.	SPSY 686	Practicum Evaluation Master's Case	Field Supervisor Report Rubric	Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.	Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (9/9) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.	Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (3/3) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 50% of rated items.



				Master's Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher.	Master's Case: 100% of candidates (9/9) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.	<i>Note: data in this domain are unavailable for one student, as the supervisor was unable to comment on research and program evaluation.</i>  Master's Case: 100% of candidates (4/4) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.
	SPSY 791	Internship Evaluation  Ed.S. Project  PRAXIS II	Field Supervisor Report Rubric  Licensure Exam	Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.  Ed.S. Project: 75% 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.	Internship Evaluation: 100% (4/4) candidates earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.  Ed.S. Project: 100% (4/4) of candidates earned average ratings of 2.0 or higher.  PRAXIS II: 100% (4/4) or candidates scored in the Average range or above for the identified domain.	Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on all rated items.  Ed.S. Project: 100% of candidates (6/6) earned average ratings of 2.0 or higher.  PRAXIS II: 100% of candidates (6/6) met minimum criteria.
4. Intervention: Candidates design, implement and evaluate evidence-based services to support socialization, learning, and mental health, as appropriate for the needs of their clients.	SPSY 686	Practicum Evaluation  Master's Case	Field Supervisor Report Rubric	Practicum Evaluation: 80% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.  Master's Case: 75% of candidates earn average ratings of 1.75 or higher.	Practicum Evaluation: 100% of candidates (9/9) earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on at least 80% of rated items.  Master's Case: 100% of candidates (9/9) earned average ratings of 1.75 or higher.	N/A



	SPSY 791	Internship Evaluation Ed.S. Project PRAXIS II	Field Supervisor Report Rubric Licensure Exam	Internship Evaluation: 100% of candidates earn ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.  Ed.S. Project: 75% 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.	Internship Evaluation: 100% (4/4) candidates earned ratings of "Satisfactory" or higher on 80% of rated items in this domain.  Ed.S. Project: 100% (4/4) of candidates earned average ratings of 2.0 or higher.  PRAXIS II: 100% (4/4) or candidates scored in the Average range or above for the identified domain.	N/A
--	----------	---	--	---	---	-----

\* Prior data are from 2020-2021.

### Student Success Activities

Use the "Academic Chair" tab in [Blue Reports](#) to view your program's data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023
New Enrollment	5	13	12	10
Continuing in EdS	15	11	14	15
Total Enrollment	20	24	26	25
Continuing in PhD/PsyD	3	0	3	1
Retention from Previous Year	95%	85%	96%	77%
Completers	7	6	4	

Describe current student success activities that are working well.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We established and maintained a consistent schedule (i.e., all classes occur one day each week), which has allowed us to recruit students who might otherwise experience a barrier to beginning graduate education. Additionally, this serves to continue the trend of a streamlined process for course scheduling, which decreases the likelihood of miscommunications or unexpected surprises concerning program requirements (e.g., greater on-campus requirements for summer courses).</li> <li>Individualized advising, mentoring, and flexibility to the extent possible continue to serve as critical factors in supporting student persistence and completion.</li> </ul>
--	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finally, we have maintained communication with applicants, employers, and prospective field supervisors regarding program requirements and adjustments, which has allowed applicants and their employers to more realistically consider the feasibility of completing our program prior to making an enrollment decision.</li> </ul>
<p>Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This past academic year, we experienced a lower than typical retention rate. Most students who withdrew from the program did so because they were both (a) interested in pursuing a different profession and (b) performing poorly in coursework. Based on data from prior years, it seems likely that these data represent an outlier; however, program faculty have discussed how we might (a) better balance applicant goodness-of-fit for the program and cohort size and (b) better divide advising and instructional activities across program faculty. Adjustments to program directorship and adding to our core program faculty will hopefully allow for earlier intervention and advisement for students who struggle with first-semester coursework or fieldwork.</li> <li>We continue to market a new graduate certificate program in Psychoeducational Assessment as a potential stepping stone for students who ultimately wish to become school psychologists; we present this alongside the “grow your own” model, and students from the certificate program will generate a larger pool of prospective Ed.S. candidates who are familiar with the field upon program entry.</li> </ul>

If you don't have a Blue Reports account, you can request one using the webpage link, or your Department Chair, Associate Dean, or College Assessment Director can assist you.

### Continuous Quality Improvement

<p>Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. <i>What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?</i></p>	<p>This year's data provide strong support that students are consistency meeting learning outcomes across domains. One benchmark (SLO 1 – Internship Evaluation) was not met; however, when following up with the field supervisor who assigned the rating, she noted, “Student may continue to have some higher-level questions, but we feel confident that she will be able to conduct thorough assessments independently as a school psychologist next year.” We generally plan to continue instruction as usual for the upcoming year, though we will be utilizing adjusted summative projects in fieldwork components (i.e., SPSY 686, SPSY 791) starting in 23/34 to organize assessment experiences which are increasingly diverse and purposefully scaffolded.</p>
<p>What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?</p>	<p>All candidates successfully completed practicum, internship, and culminating experience requirements. Completers had a 100% post-graduation employment rate. Our incoming cohort remains consistent with prior years and marked larger than trends</p>



Office of Assessment  
and Accreditation

	<p>several years past. We believe this positive shift in our enrollment is largely impacted by the increased organization and clarity of requirements that comes from our adjusted course schedule and curriculum. These data are highly suggestive of successful recruitment and student support efforts, which we plan to continue for 2022-2023.</p>
<p>What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?</p>	<p>For 2022-2023, we plan to adjust our assessment plan to better align with both the National Association of School Psychologists professional standards (revised Summer 2020) and our adjusted summative requirements. All adjusted summative projects will be implemented in coursework for the 2023-2024 academic year.</p>
<p>Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?</p>	<p>We regularly communicate with our stakeholders through a newsletter (released 1-2 times per year) and more frequently via email for those stakeholders who are also supervisors. The communications include a summary of program successes, outcomes, and plans (e.g., adjusted summative requirements). In addition, we have involved field supervisors in our efforts to review and revise key assessments (e.g., changes to evaluation forms, master's case requirements, Ed.S. project). We plan to continue this practice as we revise and adjust our materials going forward.</p>

Updated July 2022



## Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 21-22

## Program: EdS School Psychology Evaluation: Exemplary

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

**Evaluation Key:** Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
<p><b>Learning Outcomes</b> Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.</p>		<p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle</p> <p>Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning</p> <p>Outcome(s) is measurable</p> <p>Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)</p>		Mature
<p><b>Assessment Strategies</b> Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understand student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on some related tenants and strategies.</p>	<p>Strong use of a mix of measures, including professional practice, licensure exams, and rich, relevant course assignments.</p> <p>Great use of multiple points of assessment across the curriculum for each outcome to provide richer insight into student learning.</p>	<p>Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s)</p> <p>Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s)</p> <p>Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives</p> <p>Assessment data comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum</p> <p>Assessment measures include rich and/or relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.)</p> <p>Tools for evaluating student achievement are clearly described when necessary (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)</p>		Exemplary



<p><b>Results &amp; Analysis</b> Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to thresholds of proficiency, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.</p>		<p>The threshold for proficiency for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used</p> <p>The threshold for proficiency reflects reasonably high expectations for the program</p> <p>Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the stated threshold for proficiency and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used</p> <p>Thoughtful discussion of faculty insights gained from findings is included</p> <p>When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus &amp; distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery)</p> <p>When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described</p>		Mature
<p><b>Continuous Improvement</b> Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.</p>	<p>Strong collaboration with faculty and relevant stakeholders, including field supervisors, to support the assessment process and give insight into data analysis.</p> <p>Good plans to align with NASP.</p>	<p>Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly driven by assessment findings</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty</p> <p>If data from prior assessments is provided, reflection on changes over time and the possible impact any prior interventions is discussed</p> <p>A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment</p> <p>Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders</p>		Exemplary

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at [kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu](mailto:kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu) or x7975 with questions or for support.