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**1. What learning Outcome(s) did you assess this year?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Learning Outcome 1: Learning Outcome 2:  | Students can evaluate the appropriate use of various data analytic techniques for addressing different types of questions and hypotheses.Students can enter and analyze data using a computer statistical package and interpret basic descriptive and inferential statistics.  |
| Learning Outcome 3:  | Students can use the library, data-bases, and the internet to locate relevant research, theory, and information necessary to interpret results of research studies and plan research and interventions.  |
| Learning Outcome 4:  | Students can produce well-organized papers and essays without grammatical errors.  |
| Learning Outcome 5: Learning Outcome 6:   | Students will demonstrate industry, punctuality, and responsibility in fieldwork.Students can show understanding of, respect for, and responsiveness to cultural and individual differences by describing the perspectives of those of other ages, abilities, gender, or ethnicities. |
| Learning Outcome 7:Learning Outcome 8: | Students will demonstrate empirically based skills in assessment, intervention, counseling, and prevention/intervention.Students will demonstrate knowledge of professional practice, educational systems, and direct and indirect services (e.g.,, assessment, intervention, counseling, and prevention/intervention). |

**2. What instruments did you use to assess them?**

Embedded Questions

To assess learning Outcomes 1 and 2, we used embedded questions in the final exam given in Measurement, Research Design, and Statistics (Psychology 244A), a course required for all first year graduate students. The ‘Selecting Statistics’ questions ask students to read a number of research scenarios and select the appropriate statistic to match the research scenario. This question addresses Learning Outcome 1. The ‘Interpreting SPSS Output’ questions ask students to inspect a SPSS output and answer a number of questions regarding the substantive meaning of the output. This question addresses Learning Outcome 2. A third question requires the students to develop an APA table of the results. **Although no standards for these assessments are outlined in the current SOAP, it is generally expected that students will get 75% of these questions correct.** Outcome 2 is also evaluated by the ratings for Methods and Results on the thesis and project rubric (see below).

Thesis/Project Evaluation Rubric

To assess learning Outcomes 3 and 4, we use a rubric that is filled out by all members of a thesis/project committee upon successful defense of that thesis/project. The rubric asks raters to rank the various components (i.e., Introduction, Literature Review, Method, etc.) on a 4-point scale (1 = Inadequate; 2 = Adequate; 3 = Good; 4 = Excellent). Learning Outcome 3 is assessed by thesis evaluation rubric questions 1, 2, & 5 (pertaining to the Introduction, Literature Review, and Discussion, respectively). Learning Outcome 2 is addressed by questions 3 & 4 (Methods and Results). Learning Outcome 4 is assessed by the evaluation rubric question 6 on Mechanics (pertaining to the overall mechanics of writing throughout the thesis/project). **The standard is all theses and projects will be rated with 3s on each of the rubric questions, for a mean of 3.0.**

Field Evaluations

Learning Outcomes 5, 6, and 7 are evaluated via field evaluations. Practicum and internship skills and dispositions are rated each semester by field supervisors. There are items and categories on the evaluations to match the Outcomes listed. Learning Outcome 5 is aligned with Professional Characteristics. Learning Outcome 6 is addressed through items on diversity and the section on legal issues and ethics. Learning Outcome 7 is addressed through the sections on Consultation, Academics, and Therapy. Ratings for skills (e.g., consultation, academic, therapy, legal/ethics) for practicum (Years 1 and 2 are on a scale of 1 to 3 with 1 = Not met, 2 = Emerging, and 3 = Accomplished. **The skills standard is 2 (Emerging) for practicum.** Interns have a 4 points scale with 4 = Exemplary. **For interns the skills goal is 3 (Accomplished).**  For all cohorts the section on Professional Characteristics is a 1-4 rating with 1 = Unacceptable, 2 = Needs Improvement, 3 = Average, and 4 = Exemplary. **The Professional Characteristics standard is a rating of 3 (Average).** All practicum and internship evaluation forms were revised in 2015 to coordinate with NASP Domains.

Case Study Percent of Non-overlapping Data (PND)

Learning Outcome 7 is directly measured through analysis of intervention data from case studies designed, implemented, and evaluated by students at their practicum and internship sites. The interventions are applications of coursework. The first year students complete a consultation project in Psych 279; the second year students a behavior intervention in fall (Psych 278) and academic intervention in spring (Psych 286), and interns conduct an intervention each semester (Psych 267). Data compare intervention data points to baseline and are reported as PND;

90 is considered highly effective

70–90 moderately effective

50–70 questionably effective

50 ineffective

**The goal is 70%.**

Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA)

Learning Outcome 7 is also assessed through a professional rating rubric of their Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) and develop a Behavior Support Plan BSP). This is part of Psych 278. The rubric is rated on a scale is 1 – 24

**Professional passing standard is 17.**

PRAXIS

Learning Outcome 8, professional knowledge, is assessed through the PRAXIS II, an ETS measure for school psychology. The national passing score is 147 to obtain the National Certification in School Psychology (NCSP). All second year students are required to take the exam and score at or above the national prior to beginning internship. **The program goal is 100% pass rate.**

**3. What did you discover from these data?**

Embedded Questions

Learning Outcomes 1&2: The final exam for Psych 244 included 21 embedded items testing students' statistical skills. The mean number correct was 18.63 (89%) for all Psych graduate students (N = 24). The EdS students obtained a mean of 18.7, for 89% correct. The items were broken down in 6 points for selecting the correct statistical test, 9 points for interpretation, and 6 points for developing an APA table. Therefore they surpassed the expectation of 75% correct.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Embedded Items | All (N=24)Mean | % Correct | EdS (N=9)Mean | % Correct |
| Statistical test (6 points) | 5.60 (.47) | 93% | 5.59 (.22) | 98% |
| Interpretation (9 points) | 7.56 (.79) | 83% | 7.47 (.74) | 83% |
| APA table (6 points) | 5.57 (.82) | 93% | 5.50 (.61) | 92% |

The results were stronger than last year when the total percent correct was 78%. Clearly the school psychology students performed as well as students in the other programs, Applied Behavior Analysis and General Experimental. Many in the G.E. will pursue a research career. Those in the EdS program are expected to interpret and apply research. The school psych program also emphasizes case studies and single subject design. Those were evaluated via the PND in case studies (See section on PND). We believe these data demonstrate that the Department is successfully meeting Learning Outcomes 1 and 2.

Thesis/Project Rubric Evaluation

Learning Outcomes 3-6: 5 Ed.S. theses and 7 projects were evaluated using the rubric. Each thesis and project is associated with a committee of three members, each of whom is responsible for evaluating the thesis or project using the rubric. Fifteen evaluations were received for theses and 21 for projects, demonstrating 100% submission compliance rate for committee members. The following table outlines the proportion of each response for each of the evaluation questions relevant to the current assessment report. It should be noted that Learning Outcomes 3 and 5 each incorporate data from 2 questions, and thus have double N.

Thesis (299) (N = 15 reviewers for 5 theses)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Learning Outcome | Mean\* | Excellent | Good | Adequate |
| 3 (Intro & Lit Review) | 3.50 | 15 (50%) | 15 (50%) |  |
| 4 (Method) | 3.13 |  1 (7%) | 14 (93%) |  |
| 5 (Results & Discussion) | 3.20 |  6 (20%) | 24 (80%) |  |
| 6 (Mechanics) | 3.40 |  8 (53%) |  5 (33%) | 2 (13%) |

Project (298) (N = 21 reviewers for 7 projects)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Learning Outcome | Mean\* | Excellent | Good | Adequate |
| 3 (Intro & Lit Review) | 3.40 | 18 (43%) | 23 (55%) | 1 (2%) |
| 4 (Method) | 3.38 |  11 (52%) |  7 (33%) | 3 (14%) |
| 5 (Results) | 3.33 |  7 (33%) | 14 (67%) |  |
| 6 (Mechanics) | 3.62 | 14 (67%) |  6 (29%) | 1 (4%) |

\*Scoring: Excellent=4; Good = 3; Adequate = 2; Inadequate=1

The data are very positive, both in terms of responses from committee members and in the distribution of responses. Ratings were above the standard of 3.0 in all areas for both theses and projects. The writing (Intro, Lit Review, Mechanics) were very strong for both culminating events. Students have been encouraged to take advantage of the University Graduate Writing Studio and it appears to be beneficial. Competency in statistics / results and discussion are areas for growth. The rubric has been adapted for the project and could be revised to include a rating for creativity to better reflect the effort and goal of a project.

Field Evaluations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Year 1 (N = 9) | Year 2 (N = 11) | Year 3/Interns (N = 9) |
| AREA | FALL | SPRING | FALL | SPRING | FALL | SPRING |
| Consultation | 2.73 | 3.02 | 2.59 | 2.79 | 3.40 | 3.90 |
| Academic | 2.38 | 2.81 | 2.56 | 2.79 | 3.42 | 3.91 |
| Therapy |  |  | 2.60 | 2.74 | 3.34 | 3.85 |
| Legal/Ethics | 2.36 | 2.69 | 2.66 | 2.77 | 3.38 | 3.88 |
| Professional Characteristics | 3.81 | 3.87 | 3.32 | 3.43 | 3.67 | 3.96 |

Field evaluations are considered critical evidence that students can apply knowledge and skills in the field. These also reflect dispositions and interpersonal skills. The field evaluation forms assess more areas each year as student progress through the program and are completed by different field supervisors each semester. All means were above the desired standard. Growth was seen between Fall and Spring on skills for each cohort. Intern evaluations reflected excellent skills. All cohorts surpassed the standard of average in Professional Characteristics. No areas of concern were noted.

PND

The first year cohort (N = 9) completed a consultation project in the spring; the average percent of non-overlapping data points (PND) was 73% (SD = 31). The second year students (N = 11) had two intervention projects. For their behavior intervention project in the fall they obtained 48% (34) PND; for their academic intervention in the spring the PND was 71% (20). The third year cohort (interns) (N = 9) had 48% (42) (PND for their projects in the fall and 60% (46) spring. The very large SDs indicate great variation. The intervention case studies are also real cases carried out in schools; we consider the intervention strand of our program a strength and evaluate all case studies in 5 courses by the PND. The PND for 279 and 286 were in the highly effective size range. Interns obtained a moderately effective PND in spring semester. In some cases the interventions were much more successful than indicated by PND due to one high or low baseline data point. Students are encouraged to include alternative analyses (means, graphics) to examine effects of their interventions.

FBA

Mean for second year students = 20.09 (N=11) All met and surpassed the minimum standard. These are real cases, not vignettes as some programs use, so the fact second year students can meet this criteria is excellent. No changes are indicated.

PRAXIS

The current second year cohort (N = 11) averaged 172.3. All students obtained the NCSP standard (147).

Subcategories:

Professional Practice = 25.6 (Avg. range is 21 to 26 on norms)

Direct/Indirect Services = 20.2 (Avg. range is 18 to 22 on norms)

Systems = 14.7 (Avg. range is 12 to 15 on norms)

Foundations = 23.6 (Avg. range is 21 to 26 on norms)

The PRAXIS is a rigorous exam for professionals; however it is required for all NASP approved programs as well and data are posted on the national website. We use the national standard and have the goal that all second year students will pass before beginning internship. This year all 11 students passed on the first attempt. We analyze the data by area (e.g., Professional practice, Foundations) each year in order to determine curricular needs. The average scores were in the average range re the norms on all domains. No weaknesses were noted.

**4. What changes did you make as a result of the findings?**

The results of the embedded questions in Psych 244 area reviewed by the Psych Department Graduate Committee. The current data indicate students are mastering basic statistical knowledge. This was an improvement over last year, possibly due to increased emphasis and repetition in the Psych 244 class. Students are also encouraged to take advantage of the Graduate Statistics Studio. Group statistics taught in Psych 244 are augmented in the School Psychology program by single subject design introduced in Psych 288 and implemented in 5 courses through the program. No further changes were indicated for the statistical outcomes; the Graduate Committee recommends continued emphasis in Psych 244.

The thesis and project ratings were also very positive. These are also reviewed by the Psychology Department Graduate Committee. We will continue to refer students to the Graduate Writing and Statistics Studios for support. After gathering extensive data on outcomes utilized by other school psychology programs, and discussion with the Psychology faculty, the school psychology program has adopted the comprehensive exam as an additional culminating event in the future. Therefore it is expected fewer students will be conducting theses and projects after 2017-2018; however, the emphasis on understanding statistics, implementing individual and group interventions in the schools, and clear and grammatically correct writing will continue.

The field evaluations were revised by the School Psychology Faculty in 2015-16 to reflect new national (NASP) standards. These are rigorous standards and hence, stringent field evaluation instruments. The ratings from the supervising practitioners on the field evaluations are reviewed by the School Psychology Faculty with each individual student in the program each semester at one-on-one evaluation meetings and recommendations made on any areas they need additional practice or services they might access (e.g., student counseling). The overall means are further examined by the faculty to note any programmatic areas that should be strengthened. For example, increased emphasis on involving families in intervention design and implementation has been added.

The case studies are a critical component of our program. Students are challenged to conduct consultation with teachers and parents, to design an empirically based intervention, supervise implementation and data collection, and evaluate the results. PND is not a perfect way to examine results, as it can be skewed by one high or low baseline point. However, it is a convenient way to aggregate group intervention data for reporting purposes (e.g., annual report and accreditations). Students are also taught to report their results via visual analysis, trend lines, and comparison of means. Evaluation of individual interventions and program evaluation is a vital role for school psychologists in the field. The PND data are reviewed by course instructors and the program coordinator. Changes that have been made as a result of data analysis are emphasis on students finding a target student earlier in the semester, obtaining appropriate permissions quickly, and planning for the possibility that the child might move! Increased communication between instructors and field supervisors to support the students on practicum has been initiated.

The FBA is one component in our Intervention and Prevention class. The class included functional behavior assessment and the development of a behavior intervention plan that are then evaluated by the professional standards for assessment of problem behavior, and designing a behavior support plan. The data are evaluated by the course instructor and program coordinator. Second year students are meeting this at a high level; we are proud of this outcome and no changes are planned.

The PRAXIS exam is the professional ETS exam for school psychologists. It was designed for practitioners to demonstrate advanced knowledge necessary to earn the NCSP – National Certification in School Psychology. It has been adopted by NASP approved programs at part of our outcome measures. California does not recognize the NCSP with additional stipends as some states do and has no cutting point for passing. Programs can set their own criteria; we have always chosen to use the NASP standard and require our 2nd year students to pass at that level prior to internship. Program faculty analyze the data by area to determine any gaps in curriculum. All students passed on the first attempt and scores were in the average range for all domains; therefore we believe the program curriculum is current and comprehensive.

**5. What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2017-18 academic year?**

It is expected that all assessment activities reported for the 2016-17 year will be conducted in the 2017-18 year. The alumni/employer survey will also be administered.

**6. What Progress Have You Made on Items From Your Last Program Review Action Plan?**

The following goals are listed in our 2014-2018 Action Plan:

*Revise our Ed.S. SOAP*

The primary action item assigned to the Ed.S. Program at the Program Review Action Plan meeting was the revision and simplification of the SOAP. This was been accomplished. The SOAP was recently revised to further simply the goals and objectives and better align with our measures. Updated measures were included.

*Increase number of tenure-track faculty*

Hiring a new faculty was part of our action plan; that was completed with the arrival of Dr. Carlos Calderon in August 2014.

*Other*

We have obtained new assessment materials each year so our library is up to date. A concern of the review team was the sharing of assessment materials by the students; while this is the typical situation in the “real world,” we have obtained some additional materials making it easier for the students to coordinate assignments. This summer we were able to add a dozen iPads that will be used to transition students to tablet administration of some critical assessment measures. This was necessary due to changes made by Pearson/Psych Corp, who publish the tests, and adoption of the electronic versions in some districts where students are placed.

We continue to work with the ABA faculty to incorporate as much of the BCBA coursework as feasible into our curriculum. This has been complicated by changes in the national BCBA requirements making even more coursework necessary. We have added more coursework on mental health into our curriculum. Thus we are accomplishing the planned activities.