2014-2015 Annual Assessment Report Template v16

FOR GRADUATE AND CREDENTIAL PROGRAMS: THIS TEMPLATE REFERS TO SAC STATE BACCALAUREATE LEARNING GOALS. PLEASE IGNORE THESE REFERENCES IN YOUR REPORT. **Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes** Q1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university? Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) did you assess in 2014-2015? [Check all ີ 2. No 3. Don't know that apply] 1. Critical thinking 2. Information literacy Q1.4. Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC)? 3. Written communication X 1. Yes 4. Oral communication 2. No (Go to **Q1.5**) 5. Quantitative literacy 3. Don't know (Go to **Q1.5**) 6. Inquiry and analysis 7. Creative thinking Q1.4.1. If the answer to Q1.4 is yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the 8. Reading mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency? 9. Team work 1. Yes 10 Problem solving 2. No 11. Civic knowledge and engagement 3. Don't know 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency 13. Ethical reasoning Q1.5. Did your program use the Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) to 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning develop your PLO(s)? 15. Global learning 1. Yes 16. Integrative and applied learning 2. No, but I know what the DQP is. 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is. 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline 4. Don't know 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above: Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable (See a. Attachment I)? b. c. 2. No 3. Don't know

Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about EACH PLO you checked above and	Q1.2.1. Do you have
other information such as how your specific PLOs were explicitly linked to the Sac State BLGs:	rubrics for your PLOs?
School Psychology Program assesses the following PLO's each year:	1. Yes, for all PLOs
School rsychology rrogram assesses the following r LO 3 each year.	2. Yes, but for some PLOs
3. Written Communication: Via rubrics completed by supervisors for writing ability in EDS 243 (year	3. No rubrics for PLOs
long advanced assessment practica); rubrics completed by internship supervisors (psychoeducational	=
evaluation skills); and our case study exam rubric (our master's qualifying exam given to the 2 nd years at	4. N/A, other (please
the end of the year).	specify):
the end of the year).	
4. Oral Communication: Via rubrics completed by supervisors for "Ability to Provide Feedback in an	
Understandable Manner" and "Effective Response to Questions" in EDS 243; and, rubrics for "Team	
Skills" in both Fieldwork (2 nd years) and Internship (3 rd years) which emphasize effective oral	
communication. Formal oral presentation of literature review and project in EDS 239. Portfolios contain	
various work samples, along with internship evaluation (which includes oral communication	
components).	
components).	
6. Inquiry and Analysis: Via rubrics completed by supervisors for analysis and synthesis of findings in	
EDS 243 (year long advanced assessment practica); rubrics completed by internship supervisors (use of	
data in decision making); and our case study exam requiring analysis and synthesis of case findings (our	
master's qualifying exam given to the 2 nd years at the end of the year).	
, , , ,	
13. Ethical Reasoning: Via rubrics completed by supervisors by fieldwork supervisors (Legal and Ethical	
Issues) and internship supervisors (Legal and Ethical Practice) and our case study exam rubric (our	
master's qualifying exam given to the 2 nd years at the end of the year) that examines aspects of ethical	
practice.	
18. Overall Competencies in the major/discipline: our case study exam rubric (our master's qualifying	
exam given to the 2 nd years at the end of the year) which examines overall competency of core skills;	
and, scores obtained on the PRAXIS exam (the Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP) exam)	
from our 2 nd year students.	
See Assessing Other PLO's Section for more information on each of these.	
SELECTED PLO FOR THIS ASSESSMENT REPORT: ORAL COMMUNICATION	
School Psychology Graduate Students are able to demonstrate effective oral communication skills:	
They will:	
1) Knowledge : Orally identify, describe and define areas of concern as they relate to either clinical	
or assessment work (e.g., actual work with children in the schools; consultative skills with	
parents and teachers; etc.) or a problem in the field (e.g., thesis topic)	
2) Comprehension : Summarize findings orally (e.g., the oral presentation of assessment report	
findings to parents and to IEP teams).	
3) Application : Orally illustrate these findings and interpret them for the audience (e.g., eliminate	
jargon, ensure understanding).	
4) Analysis: Orally question and examine evidence, analyzing it for the team	
5) Synthesis : Orally devise and formulate plans for intervention (e.g., IEP teams or orally	
presenting their thesis topic in 239).	
6) Evaluation : Assess outcomes, orally articulate the information and support findings and	
interventions via continued consultation and collaboration with others.	

In questions 2 through 5, report in detail on ONE PLO that you assessed in 2014-2015

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the selected PLO

- Q 2.1. Specify one PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you checked the correct box for this PLO in Q1.1):
- 4. Oral Communication: Via rubrics completed by supervisors for "Ability to Provide Feedback in an Understandable Manner" and "Effective Response to Questions" in EDS 243; rubrics for "Team Skills" in both Fieldwork (2nd years) and Internship (3rd years).; thesis presentation in 239; and, parts of these assessments are 3. Don't know included in the student's portfolios.

4. N/A

Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standard of performance that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix: [Word limit: 300]

See Below

EXAMPLE. FULL RUBRICS PROVIDED AS ATTACHMENTS AND ARE LISTED IN SECTION Q8

M/I = Missing/Incorrect NR = Needs Revision A = Acceptable

Evaluation Category/Item*	M/I	NR	\boldsymbol{A}
Rapport With Parents			
Introduction demonstrating professionalism and necessary detail.	0	2	3
Ability to present information in a way that reflects understanding of parent concerns	0	2	3
Ability to respond in an emotionally present manner to parent emotions.	0	2	3
Ability to Provide Feedback in an Understandable Manner			
Jargon-free, clear, and effective presentation of results.	0	2	3
Addressed referral question thoroughly	0	2	3
Discussion was concise and focused.	0	2	3
Clear explanation of recommendations.	0	2	3
Accurate explanation of test results and implications conveyed	0	2	3
Effective Response to Questions			
Responses to questions based on research/accepted body of knowledge.	0	2	3
Clear response to questions	0	2	3
Willing acknowledgement of limits of knowledge.	0	2	3
Provision of resources and/or suggestions where parents may find information	0	2	3
Total Test Administration Score	/	=_	%

^{*}Supervisors will not typically be able to observe students in each category every conference. Therefore, overall course grade contribution for Parent Conferences will be based on an average of the scores as determined by the supervisor

Q2.4. Please indicate the category in which the selected PLO falls into. 1. Critical thinking 2. Information literacy 3. Written communication 4. Oral communication 5. Quantitative literacy 6. Inquiry and analysis 7. Creative thinking 8. Reading 9. Team work 10. Problem solving 11. Civic knowledge and engagement 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency 13. Ethical reasoning 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning 15. Global learning 16. Integrative and applied learning 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline 19. Other PLO. Specify:				
Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and		Q2.5	Q2.6	Q2.7
the rubric that measures the PLO:		PLO	Standards of Performance	Rubrics
1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO		1.	2.	3.
2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO		1.	2. 🛛	3. 🔀
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook (In the CCCDS Handbook)		1.	2.	3. 🔀
4. In the university catalogue		1.	2.	3.
5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters		1.	2	3
6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources or activities		1. 🖂	2. 🖂	3.
7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university		1	2.	3.
8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents 9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents	sumonts	1 1	2	3. 3.
10. Other, specify:	cuments	±. []	2	J
10. Other, specify.				
Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Data Quality for the Selected		of		
∑ 1. Yes	Q3.2. If yes, was the for this PLO in 2014 \bowtie 1. Yes		ored/eval	uated
				

□ 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6) □ 2. No (Skip to Q6) □ 4. N/A (Skip to Q6) □ 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6) □ 4. N/A (Skip to Q6) □ 4. N/A (Skip to Q6)						
Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/m easures in total did you use to assess this PLO? EDS 243: See Q2.3 Field Work Supervision Rubric: Form completed by supervisors twice a year on 2 nd year students in the field formal meeting between field supervisor and university supervisors twice a year on 3 rd year students. Internship Supervision Rubric: Form completed by internship supervisors twice a year on 3 rd year students. formal meeting between intern supervisor and university supervisor is conducted to review the ratings. Ed.S. course: Formal oral presentation of literature review and project in EDS 239.						
	Q3A: Direct M	easures (key assignments, pr	oje	cts, portfolios)		
Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO? Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used? [Check all that is not the possible that is not t						
1. No rubric is us 2. Used rubric de 3. Used rubric de	eveloped/modified by a glot-tested and refined by oric(s) JE rubric(s)	ence (Go to Q3.4.3) e faculty who teaches the class group of faculty				
Q3.4.1. Was the dire assignment, thesis, of and explicitly with the second seco	etc.) aligned directly	Q3.4.2. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric? 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know 4. N/A		Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know 4. N/A		

Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO? 4 Faculty	Q3.5.1. If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)? 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know					
Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]?	Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work to review?					
Various means: 243 parent conference rubric: Supervisor completes on each student over the course of 2 semesters (8 total assessments) 239 oral presentation: Final oral presentation at the end of the course wherein students present on their thesis/project	Evolving process over the years to de PLO.	etermine how to best measure this				
Fieldwork Evaluation Rubric: Field Supervisor completes on student 2 times over the course of the year						
Internship Evaluation Rubric: Internship Supervisor completes on student 2 times over the course of the year						
Portfolio: Student maintains this throughout their 3 years in the program						
Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program? Approximately 50 students at any one time are in our program across the 3 years.	Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate? On this PLO, 5	Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate? \[\sum 1. \text{ Yes} \] \[2. \text{ No} \] \[3. \text{ Don't know} \]				
Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys	s, focus groups, interviev	vs, etc.)				
Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO? 1. Yes Focus Group 2. No (Skip to Q3.8) Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?	Q3.7.1. Which of the following i [Check all that apply] 1. National student surveys (2. University conducted students are conducted students are conducted students. 3. College/Department/progents. 4. Alumni surveys, focus grounds. 5. Employer surveys, focus grounds. 6. Advisory board surveys, focus grounds. 7. Other, specify:	s (e.g., NSSE) udent surveys (e.g. OIR) ogram student surveys roups, or interviews groups, or interviews				
Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample.	Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, wh	hat was the response rate?				
Q3C: Other Measures (external a		exams,				

Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or stand tests used to assess the PLO? (for our other PLO's, not Oral Communicat 1. Yes 2. No (Go to Q3.8.2)		Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures was used? ☑ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc.) ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc.)
Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO? 1. Yes 2. No (Go to Q3.9) 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.9)	4. Other, specify: Q3.8.3. If other measures were used, please specify: Required Class participation in most classes.	
Q3D: Alignment ar	nd Quality	•
Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO? 1. Yes 2. No 3. Don't know	e ALL the assessment tools/measures/methods ed good measures for the PLO?	
Question 4: Data, Finding	s and Co	nclusions

Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions: (see Attachment III) [Word limit: 600 for selected PLO]

Tool: Early Fieldwork Evaluation

PLO Area: Team Skills (6 items). PLO AREA 1-6

Results: Average rating across items of 4.1 out of 5 for 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. Indicates above standard performance.

Tool: Internship Evaluation

PLO Area: SST/IEP Team Skills (9 items). Oral Communication of results. PLO AREA 1-6

Results: Average rating of 4.5 on 5 point scale for 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. Indicates above standard performance.

Tool: Practicum Evaluation

PLO Area: Oral Communication. PLO AREA 1-6

Results:

Rapport with Parents. Average of 8+ out of 9 total points

Ability to Provide Feedback in an Understandable Manner. Average of 13+ out of 15 total points

Effective Response to Questions. Average of 10+ out of 12 total points, indicating above standard performance.

Tool: 239 Course Requirement

PLO Area: Effectively orally defend topic of thesis project and present literature review findings. PLO AREA

1-6

Results: 100% pass rate over 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 years.

Q4.2. Are students doing well and meeting program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?
Yes, across the board students are being rated as ABOVE AVERAGE in the PLO area of Oral Communication.
Q4.3. For selected PLO, the student performance:
1. Exceeded expectation/standard
2. Met expectation/standard 3. Partially met expectation/standard
4. Did not meet expectation/standard
5. No expectation or standard has been specified
6. Don't know

Question 5: Use of Asse	essme	ent Dat	a (Clos	ing t	he Lo	оор)		
Q5.1. As a result of the assessment effort in 2014-2015 and based on the prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?	Q5.1.1. Please describe what changes you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes. [Word limit: 300 words]							
1. Yes 2. No (Go to Q5.3) 3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3) Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making?	time. H was dee	lowever, bas eded critical,	ed on our la therefore it	st assess is being	ment ef		g information	
☐ 1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐ 3. Don't know	It is imperative to our program that we conduct a new faculty hire. Some of the feedback from the last Annual Review supported the fact that we are in need of more faculty.							
Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (2013	- 2014) l	peen used s	so far? [Che	ck all th	at apply]]		
		(1) Very Much	(2) Quite Bit	a	(3) Some	(4) Not at all	(8) N/A	
1. Improving specific courses								
2. Modifying curriculum								
3. Improving advising and mentoring								
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals								
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations								
6. Developing/updating assessment plan								
7. Annual assessment reports								
8. Program review								
9. Prospective student and family information								
10. Alumni communication								
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)								
12. Program accreditation								
13. External accountability reporting requirement								
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations								
15. Strategic planning								
16. Institutional benchmarking								
17. Academic policy development or modification								
18. Institutional Improvement								
19. Resource allocation and budgeting								
20. New faculty hiring								
21. Professional development for faculty and staff								
22. Recruitment of new students								
23. Other Specify:								

Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above.
We have recently submitted a Justification for Hire to our Department based on our last assessment effort.
Additional Assessment Activities
Q6. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to PLOs (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected data on the program elements, please briefly report your results here. [Word limit: 300]
Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year?
1. Critical thinking 2. Information literacy
3. Written communication
4. Oral communication
5. Quantitative literacy
6. Inquiry and analysis
7. Creative thinking
8. Reading
9. Team work
10. Problem solving
11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
13. Ethical reasoning 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
15. Global learning
15. Global learning 16. Integrative and applied learning
17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
19. Other, specify any PLOs not included above :
a.
b.
c.

Q8. Have you attached any appendices? If y	es, pleas	e list then	n all her	e:						
Fieldwork Evaluation Form Internship Evaluation Form 243 Assessment Forms 239 Syllabus										
	Pro	ogram	Info	rmatio	on					
P1. Program/Concentration Name(s):			P2.	Report A		l-D				
School Psychology Program				ivielissa	Holland P	טוז				
P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, o Graduate and Professional Studies	r College	:	P4.	College: College	of Educati	ion				
P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (See <u>Department</u> <u>Fact Book 2014</u> by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2012 enrollment: 16 Students incoming 48 Students total, across 3 years										
Undergraduate Degree Program(s): P7. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: P8. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 1 Masters, 1 PPS credential, 1 EdS degree P7.1. List all the name(s): P8.1. List all the name(s): P8.1. List all the name(s): P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this diploma for this page.										
Credential Program(s): P9. Number of credential programs the acad P9.1. List all the names: PPS Credential	demic un	it has: 1	Doc P10 has	ster progr storate Progression Number 1: 1 1: 1. List the section Sp	rogram(s r of docto ne name(s	orate deg		rams the	acade	mic unit
When was your assessment plan?	1. Before 2007-08	2. 2007-08	3. 2008-09	4. 2009-10	5. 2010-11	6. 2011-12	7. 2012-13	8. 2013-14	9. 2014-15	10. No formal plan
P11. Developed				$\vdash \sqcap$	П	П	\Box	П	\Box	
P12. Last updated			\boxtimes							

	1.	2.	3.
	Yes	No	Don't
			Know
P13. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?	\boxtimes		
P14. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of student learning occurs in the curriculum?	\boxtimes		
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?	\boxtimes		
P16. Does the program have ANY capstone project?	\boxtimes		

Assessing Other Program Learning Outcomes

If your program assessed PLOs not reported above, please summarize your assessment activities in the table below. If you completed part of the assessment process, but not the full process (for example, you revised a PLO and developed a new rubric for measuring it), then put N/A in any boxes that do not apply.

PLO	STANDARD	MEASURES	DATA	IMPROVEMENT
PLO Written Communication	Students will have Above Average competencies in this area	1) Evaluative rubrics completed by 243 instructors 2) Evaluative rubrics completed by internship supervisors on writing skills 3) EdS Thesis Project 4)Masters Exam	1) Above Standard Performance (11/12) 2) Above standard Performance (4.5/5) 3) Successful EdS Projects 4) 85% Pass Rate 2013 & 2014	Continue to prepare students in effectively passing their Masters Exam via good instruction and examine current student to faculty ratios
PLO Inquiry and Analysis	Students will have Above Average competencies in this area	1) Evaluative rubrics completed by 243 instructors 2) Evaluative rubrics completed by internship supervisors on 3)Masters Exam	1) Above Standard Performance (31/33) 2) Above Standard Performance (4.4/5) 3) 85% Pass Rate 2013 & 2014 combined	Continue to prepare students in effectively passing their Masters Exam via good instruction and examine current student to faculty ratios
PLO Ethical Reasoning	Students will have Above Average competencies in this area	1) Evaluative rubrics completed by fieldwork supervisors 2) Evaluative rubrics completed by internship supervisors on 3)Masters Exam 4) Focus Group	1) Above Standard Performance 4.2 out of 5 2) Above Standard Performance 4.8 out of 5 3) 85% Pass Rate 2013 & 2014 combined 4) 5 out of 5 ethical practice, but 3.5/5 for legal	Continue to prepare students in effectively learning and applying legal and ethical principles. Examine more formal means of introducing legal statutes to students to increase knowledge in area
PLO Overall Competencies	Students will successfully pass the Masters Case Study Exam and the PRAXIS (the Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP) exam by the end of their 2 nd year	PRAXIS Scores 150 or above And Master's Exam Scores at passing or higher	1) Praxis scores at 150 and above 2013 and 2014 combined 2) 85% pass rate	Continue to adequately prepare students to be competent in all areas as it pertains to the field of School Psychology

Appendix A

Portfolio: Candidates maintain a portfolio throughout their time in the program **Those directly related to ORAL COMMUNICATION are in bold.** The portfolio is required to contain the following items:

Semester One: Fall semester, first year evaluation (EDS 245 instructor)

- Resume (which will be updated each semester)
- Developmental/Health History Questionnaire (from EDS 248)
- Hotsheet (from EDS 245)
- Abstract of group curriculum (from EDS 231)

Semester Two: Spring semester, first year (EDS 242A instructor)

- Updated Resume
- GATE evaluation (from EDS 242B)
- CHC Handout (from EDS 242A
- Case Evaluation (from EDS 241/440)

Semester Three: Fall semester, second year (EDS 439 instructor)

- Updated Resume
- Psycho-educational evaluation (from EDS 243 first semester)
- Assessment Resources Notebook (from EDS 244)
- FBA and BIP (from EDS 240)

- Academic Intervention Case Study (from EDS 246A)
- Early Fieldwork in School Psychology Evaluation Form (from EDS 439)

Semester Four: Spring semester, second year (EDS 439 instructor)

- Updated Resume
- Disability information pamphlet (from EDS 247)
- Psycho-educational evaluation (from EDS 243 second semester)
- Crisis Intervention and Suicide Intervention scripts (from EDS 246b)
- School Psychology Early Fieldwork Evaluation Form (from EDS 439)

Semesters Five & Six: Internship, third year (EDS 441 instructor)

- Updated Resume
- School Psychology Internship Evaluation Form
- Behavioral Intervention Case Study
- Academic Intervention Case Study
- Psycho-educational evaluation

In addition candidates may include any other items that they deem useful to them in documenting their progress and developing skills. Candidates use the portfolio not only for internal evaluation, but are also encouraged to take it with them to interviews to provide examples of their work and their unique skills. The portfolio is reviewed each semester by a designated faculty member and feedback is provided. The portfolio serves both a formative and summative purpose. Regular semester reviews of the portfolios as well as the final evaluation indicate that candidates are able to produce high level work for inclusion in portfolios. Particularly noteworthy are the academic and behavioral intervention case studies include in the Internship year items. These documents are a relatively recent addition to the portfolio and meet the NASP training standard that requires the Program to be able to document the effect of our interns on K-12 student outcomes.