

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025	
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences (CEBS)	Psychology
School Psychology 147	
Sarah Bonis	
Is this an online program? ☐ Yes ☒ No	Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here ☒ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under Evaluation)

Instructions: For the 2024-25 assessment, we are asking you to reflect on the last three-year cycle rather than collect data. It's important to take time to look over the results from the last assessment cycle and really focus on a data-informed direction going forward. In collaboration with your assessment team and program faculty, review each submitted template from 2021-2024 and consider the following for each Program Learning Outcome, add your narrative to the template, and submit the draft to your **ASL Rep** by **May 15, 2025**.

The program previously had three SLOs and upon reflection, it was decided that four objectives would better help us evaluate program learning. Four SLOs is an appropriate number for our program to evaluate, and we can manage the assessment process annually. They are also the most representative of our overall program goals. In addition to the reflection below of our last three years of ASLs and SLOs, below are the four new SLOs that will be implemented during the 2025-2026 year.

SLO #1: Students will demonstrate competent skills in the administration, scoring, and interpretation of the basic assessments used in the field.

SLO #2: Students will demonstrate basic consultation skills, including active listening, hypothesis generation, hypothesis testing, feedback to teachers, summarizing, eliciting case details, dealing with resistance, and conducting direct observations.

SLO #3: Students will critically analyze and apply research findings to the practice of school psychology.

SLO #4: Students will demonstrate the ability to design, implement, and evaluate the effectiveness of empirically validated academic and behavioral interventions.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Demonstrate competent skills in cognitive and academic achievement assessment methods.
Evaluation	Assessment remains a critical component of training and practice for school psychologists. School psychologists require preparation in the administration and interpretation of a variety of assessment types, including cognitive and academic. This outcome should be expanded to include the broader variety of assessments we expect students to learn within the program. The previous measurement instruments (two) used for this SLO focused on the administration but had less emphasis on interpretation. And, failed to include other assessment types. The role of the school psychologists regularly shifts as needs and practices within education change. Therefore, school psychologist involvement in various assessment types has and may vary over time. A possible revision for this SLO is: Students will demonstrate competent skills in the administration, scoring, and interpretation of the basic assessments used in the field. This allows for flexibility of the assessment type emphasized at the

	time and captures the importance of the administration, scoring, and interpretation.
Measurement Instruments	The two measurement instruments begin used were both appropriate – one direct and one indirect. They are also consistent with professional and accreditation standards. Therefore, we will keep the first (task analyses for assessment administration mastery) and second (supervisor ratings of assessment on evaluation of internship) instruments but add a third. The third will focus on the interpretation of assessments and will likely include a rubric used to score an integrated psychoeducation report.
Criteria & Targets	As noted in the above evaluation box, assessment is a crucial skill for school psychologists. Assessment and evaluation skills are used to make high-stakes decisions for youth (e.g., placement in special education). Therefore, the previously used criteria for instrument one (100% of students demonstrate at least 90% proficiency) continues to be appropriate. Competence in assessment is an important program milestone and students should not progress unless they demonstrate proficiency. The criteria for the second instrument (supervisor ratings) will likely need to change a bit over the next year, as we plan to update our supervisor evaluation instruments to ensure alignment with NASP’s most recent professional and accreditation standards. Relatedly, we want to ensure there are sufficient evaluation items being completed for this SLO/instrument to ensure it is being adequately measured. A rubric and criteria will need to be selected (several report assignments and rubrics are already in use) and reviewed for use for the third instrument.
Results & Conclusion	<u>Results:</u> Given the program emphasis on assessment and the many opportunities for practice and remediation, it is expected that students would be meeting this SLO. This was true from the data in previous ASLs. Whether internally or for this ASL process, we may want to consider an additional or replacement target around reaching proficiency by the second (or X) administration. The way the instrument target is currently written, a student may need to remediate several times before reaching proficiency but would still be captured as meeting this SLO. Additional evaluation will be helpful to determine the level of support students needed and if the program expects proficiency within a specific window of time or set of opportunities. <u>Conclusions:</u> Overall, our assessment instruction and measurement as a program are strong and well established. One area for improvement is to standardize rubrics and task analysis sheets for scoring assessment administration across our assessment courses. Currently, expectations for proficiency vary slightly across instructor/course. That is, different instructors have a different idea of what constitutes “proficiency” across different courses or assessment instruments. Now that we have two new hires (2025 and 2026 starts), both of whom will teach several assessment courses, it is a good time for the program to come together to discuss and align. This will better support student clarity and help refine program-level expectations for performance. Additionally, we are reviewing peer programs and doing research on any difference in student outcomes based on the order of the assessment sequence. In school psychology, some programs teach the achievement course first and then the IQ. Others have an assessment foundations course, and so on. Based on these findings, we may make changes to our sequencing to better support the development of this SLO.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	2025-2026: Following additional reflection and worktime this summer and early fall, the program will make several program revisions within courseleaf which will also include updating the SLOs and measurement plan. Then, specific to this SLO, we will review and create, as necessary, common rubrics or task analyses for evaluating the assessments across instructors and courses. We will pilot our instruments during this year and get feedback from instructors and students in spring 2026. As we propose program revisions in courseleaf, we will also update and finalize our curriculum map. 2026-2027: The initial data collected in the spring 2026 semester will be reviewed in August of 2026. If there were any major issues with collecting sufficient data, new approaches will be developed and implemented. If not, data collection will continue for the fall and spring semesters.

	2027-2028: Faculty will review data from the past two cycles in August of 2027 and evaluate how well the assessment system allows for use of data to evaluate student outcomes and the need for any program modifications. During this review, we will also monitor whether our targets are appropriate and meaningful (i.e., are all students exceeding them?) and plan for modifications to criteria the following cycle.
--	---

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Apply competent consultation skills, including effective interpersonal dispositions.
Evaluation	Consultation remains an important skill for our school psychology students and the training program. The consultation process is taught and evaluated, however, the more critical and foundational component of consultation are the interpersonal dispositions and subskills. To help make the program and students more directly aware of the foundational skills, they should be named within the learning outcome. An appropriate learning outcome that lends itself to several measurement instruments. A possible revision for this SLO is: Students will demonstrate basic consultation skills, including active listening, hypothesis generation, hypothesis testing, feedback to teachers, summarizing, eliciting case details, dealing with resistance, and conducting direct observations. As long as the measurement instruments fully capture the breadth of skills named, this is an appropriate SLO that is measurable and an appropriate level of skill for school psychology graduate students.
Measurement Instruments	Consultation skills have been measured through scores on a praxis category and two supervisor evaluation components (consultation items and professional dispositions). These have been appropriate proxy measurements to get at consultation skills, but not all items within the student-level services category of the praxis focus on consultation and may or may not be consistent with program training. Therefore, in place of the praxis scores, a direct measure of consultation skills will be added. This will be a course assignment on practicum or in consultation that measures through review of a product, presentation, or direct observation of skill. The consultation items of the evaluation and the professional dispositions remain appropriate. This provides one direct measure and two indirect measures.
Criteria & Targets	The criteria for the supervisor ratings is currently 85% of students will X. However, this should be revised that 100% of students meet a specific criterion (e.g., average ratings of 3.5, no less than 3, for example). This revision is necessary because consultation is one of the core competencies within the discipline and it is necessary that all students leave with a certain level of skill acquisition. Therefore, we need to review and determine the acceptable ratings and make that a standard we would expect of all students. This will be done by reviewing previous supervisor ratings from the past 5 years. This revision will also be necessary as we plan to update our supervisor evaluation instruments to ensure alignment with NASP's most recent professional and accreditation standards. Relatedly, we want to ensure there are sufficient evaluation items being completed for this SLO/instrument to ensure it is being adequately measured. A rubric and criteria will need to be selected (several assignments and rubrics are already in use) and reviewed for use for the new instrument directly measuring consultation skills within a course.
Results & Conclusion	<u>Results:</u> Students were typically meeting the overall SLO, but not always meeting the criteria for all three instruments. Particularly the supervisor evaluation ratings. This might highlight a needed change within our sequencing or our curriculum, or it might mean we need to re-evaluate the target for success. Additional data review will be necessary this August to determine and in consultation with all program faculty. This will occur in conjunction with re-evaluating overall performance expectations on the supervisor

	evaluations. Students sometimes obtained the target for success for the praxis category scores, and sometimes did not. It is important that the program review praxis data annually and look at trends across 3-5 year data to determine whether a difference emphasis is needed within the curriculum (e.g., if students are consistently missing items in the ethics domain, revisions are warranted in this content). Making the measurement instruments a bit more specific and developed based on previous data will hopefully help with positive/successful results in future ASLs. <u>Conclusions:</u> Overall, this SLO has been marginally successful at evaluating student development of consultation skills, but there is room for improvement. There is some evidence that students are demonstrating basic consultation skills. One thing that hasn't happened in the past is program-wide discussion of SLOs, course alignment, and data. Historically, this has fallen exclusively with the program coordinator which doesn't allow for a cohesive curriculum or for each instructor to ensure they are adequately training students in the necessary areas/SLOs.
**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:	2025-2026: Following additional reflection and worktime this summer and early fall, the program will make several program revisions within courseleaf which will also include updating the SLOs and measurement plan. Then, specific to this SLO, we will review and create, as necessary, a rubric for evaluating consultation skills. This will be created in conjunction with review of the evaluation items to ensure that across all three measurement instruments this SLO is fully measured. We will pilot our instrument during this year and get feedback from instructors and students in spring 2026. As we propose program revisions in courseleaf, we will also update and finalize our curriculum map. 2026-2027: The initial data collected in the spring 2026 semester will be reviewed in August of 2026. If there were any major issues with collecting sufficient data, new approaches will be developed and implemented. If not, data collection will continue for the fall and spring semesters. 2027-2028: Faculty will review data from the past two cycles in August of 2027 and evaluate how well the assessment system allows for use of data to evaluate student outcomes and the need for any program modifications. During this review, we will also monitor whether our targets are appropriate and meaningful (i.e., are all students exceeding them?) and plan for modifications to criteria the following cycle.

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Demonstrate knowledge of research and statistics.
Evaluation	Understanding research is important to the field of school psychologists for many reasons, including the necessity of being data-based decision makers who use evidence-based practice (both of which are developed from research). Therefore, this SLO content area remains important. The field, program, and students have less training emphasis on statistics and place a greater importance on research, overall. As a result, a possible revision to this SLO is: Students will critically analyze and apply research findings to the practice of school psychology. This still allows for including measurement of statistics (one way to analyze research), but also places some focus on the application of findings – which is the primary goal. The SLO becomes specific enough that it is clear what is being measured, but still comprehensive enough to allow for several measurement instruments.
Measurement Instruments	Historically, the only measurement instrument for this SLO was the completion of a specialist project in April of the third year.

	This is an important internal marker to ensure students are graduating in a timely manner. However, this doesn't perfectly match the SLO. Whether a student defends their specialist project in April or July doesn't meaningfully discriminate whether they obtained knowledge of research. The program hopes to use SLOs to ensure students are learning the skills necessary for successful practice in the field as school psychologists and for continuous improvement. If 100% of students don't defend their specialist project by the spring deadline, when reviewing data, it would appear that students are NOT meeting the SLO (and therefore obtaining knowledge of research), but this would be a misinterpretation of the data. Therefore, additional instruments are necessary. In PSY 617 (Reading and Understanding Statistics in Psychology), students complete several large, meaningful assignments that demonstrate their ability to analyze and apply research findings. In PSY 509 (Foundations of School Psychology), students complete a literature review and proposal which is evaluated using a rubric. Currently, they also take PSY 514 (Program Evaluation and Research Methods) which targets this SLO. There are many opportunities for adding instruments to more effectively and comprehensively measure students' research knowledge.
Criteria & Targets	Please see previous discussion in measurement instrument box above. The instrument, criteria, and targets were not accurately measuring students' demonstration of research knowledge. Revision are necessary.
Results & Conclusion	<u>Results:</u> Based on the way this SLO was written, students/the program weren't typically meeting this SLO because sometimes students defended their specialist project in the summer. However, as stated above, a defense one month apart wouldn't meaningfully discriminate a student who did and did not demonstrate knowledge in research. <u>Conclusions:</u> Overall, the content area of this SLO (research) remains an important domain, but much revision/addition is needed to make the measurement accurate and meaningful.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	2025-2026: Following additional reflection and worktime this summer and early fall, the program will make several program revisions within courseleaf which will also include updating the SLOs and measurement plan. Then, specific to this SLO, we will revise/add three measurement instruments, likely from course-based assignments and maybe one related to the specialist project. Course-based assignments (direct measures) will be most appropriate for this SLO because field-based evaluations do not emphasize research skills as they are not as directly measured and observed by supervisors. One possible revision is to add a common, program rubric for the specialist project proposal and defense. Then, one instrument could be students must obtain a specific score on the rubric to demonstrate knowledge in research. We will pilot our instruments during this year and get feedback from instructors and students in spring 2026. As we propose program revisions in courseleaf, we will also update and finalize our curriculum map. 2026-2027: The initial data collected in the spring 2026 semester will be reviewed in August of 2026. If there were any major issues with collecting sufficient data, new approaches will be developed and implemented. If not, data collection will continue for the fall and spring semesters. 2027-2028: Faculty will review data from the past two cycles in August of 2027 and evaluate how well the assessment system allows for use of data to evaluate student outcomes and the need for any program modifications. During this review, we will also monitor whether our targets are appropriate and meaningful (i.e., are all students exceeding them?) and plan for modifications to criteria the following cycle.

To add more outcomes, if needed, select the table above and copy & paste below.