***STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM SUMMARY FORM AY 14-15, AY 15-16, & AY 16-17***

Please complete a separate worksheet for each academic program (major, minor) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department. Worksheets are due to CASA this year by June 15, 2017. Worksheets should be sent electronically to kjsanders@eiu.edu and should also be submitted to your college dean. For information about assessment or help with your assessment plans, visit the Assessment webpage at <http://www.eiu.edu/~assess/>or contact Karla Sanders in CASA at 581-6056.

**Degree and Program Name:**
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**M.A. Clinical Psychology**
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**John Mace**, Department Chair;

Prepared by **Wesley Allan**, Program Coordinator

**PART ONE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations? | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared? |
| 1. Students will develop the theoretical knowledge and skills related to the assessment and diagnosis of clinical disorders | a. End-of-semester instructor ratings of students in areas of assessment and diagnosisNOTE: All graduate faculty complete an online rating form each semester assessing each graduate student in their courses on areas consistent with our learning objectives. The ratings are made on a 5 point scale (1 to 5). | a. 90% receive ratings of 3 (“acceptable”) or higher on a 5-point scale[Data collected from all 33 graduate courses consisting of 40 students] | a. Ratings of 3 or higher were received for 88.9% of the students in assessment knowledge (3.12), assessment skills (3.18), diagnosis knowledge (3.42), and diagnostic skills (3.55). | Graduate Coordinator, Clinical Psychology Program Advisory Committee; graduate faculty.a-d) Results disseminated to Chair and clinical faculty for use in curriculum and program revision and development.a-c) Results reviewed with internship sites and with graduate students, when applicable. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1. The assessment and psychopathology sections of the written comprehensive exam, administered to second- year students each year

NOTE: Successful completion of comprehensive exams is required for all graduate students1. Internship supervisor ratings of interns’ ability to assess and diagnose clients

NOTE: Successful completion of a two semester internship is required of all graduate students1. Exit survey ratings from graduate students related to assessment and diagnosis
 | 1. 90% receive ratings of 3 (“pass”) or higher on a 5- point scale

[Comp exam scores of 30/30 students across 2014 - 2016]1. 90% receive ratings of 3 (“at level”) or higher on 5 pt. scale

[Data collected for 30/30 interns]1. Average ratings of 3 (“acceptable”) or higher on a 5-point scale

[Data obtained from 25/30 graduating students] | 1. 100% pass rate in assessment (4.18) and 100% pass rate in diagnosis (3.88)
2. 100% of students received ratings of 3 or higher in psychological assessment knowledge (3.0), psychological assessment skills (4.0), diagnostic knowledge (3.38), diagnostic skills (3.38), and case conceptualization (4.25)
3. 100% of the students rated the program as being effective in helping them develop skills in assessment (4.33) and diagnosis (4.66)

. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Students will develop theoretical knowledge and skills related to clinical treatment and treatment planning. | 1. End-of-semester instructor ratings of students on items assessing psychotherapy theory and clinical skills.
2. The Psychotherapy, Family Therapy, and Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) sections of the written comprehensive exam, administered to 2nd-year students
3. Internship supervisor ratings from internship sites of interns’ theoretical knowledge and ability to effectively treat clients
4. Exit survey ratings from graduate students related to individual, group and family therapy
 | 1. 90% receive ratings of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale
2. 90% receive ratings of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale
3. 90% receive ratings of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale
4. Average ratings of 3 (“acceptable”) or higher on a 5-point scale
 | 1. 100% of the clinical students earned a rating of 3 or higher in psychotherapy theory (3.13) and 93.3% for clinical skills (3.01)
2. 100% pass rate in Theories of Psychotherapy (4.15). 100% pass rate for Family Therapy (3.57), and 96.7% pass rate for CBT (3.89).
3. 94% of interns received ratings of 3 or higher on the 18 items assessing theoretical treatment knowledge, psychotherapy skills, and treatment planning (4.23)
4. 100% of the students rated the program as being effective in helping them develop skills in individual therapy (4.17), family therapy (3.83) and group psychotherapy (4.32)
 | Graduate Coordinator, Clinical Psychology Program Advisory Committee; graduate facultya-d) Results disseminated to Chair and clinical faculty for use in curriculum and program revision and development.a-c) Results reviewed with internship sites and with graduate students, when applicable. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. Students will develop a thorough understanding of statistics and research methodology | a. End-of-semester instructor ratings of students on their knowledge of statistics and research methods(b). Successful defense of the thesis research project is required. Students begin this project in the Spring of their first yearNOTE: Completion of a thesis is a graduation requirement for all graduate studentsc. Number of research projects submitted and accepted at professional research conferences; number of publications or grants on which students are co-authors | 1. 90% receive ratings of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale
2. 90% will propose and defend within 3 years from the start of the program
3. At least 3 students/year will submit proposals to research conferences, will be co- authors on publications and/or will apply for research grants
 | 1. 98% of the clinical students earned a rating of 3 or higher on their research skills (3.64)
2. Of the students admitted in Fall 2012 (N=11), all 11 (100%) defended their thesis within 3 years of start of the program. Of the students admitted in Fall 2013 (N=11), 9 (82%) completed within 3 years of start of the program (1 of these students subsequently completed and the other is scheduled to complete in August 2017). Of the students admitted in Fall 2014 (N = 9), 3 (33%) completed within 3 years of the start of the program (it is expected that 1 of these students will complete in August 2017)
3. 9 current or former students were co-authors on 7 conference presentations and 2 publications
 | Graduate Coordinator, Clinical Psychology Program Advisory Committee; graduate facultya-e) Results disseminated to Chair and clinical faculty for use in curriculum and program revision and developmenta) Results reviewed with graduate students, when applicable |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1. Exit survey ratings from graduate students related to understanding and conducting research
2. Number of students accepted to doctoral programs
 | 1. Average ratings of 3 (“acceptable”) or higher on a 5-point scale
2. At least 50% of students/alumni who apply will be accepted
 | 1. 100% of the students rated the program as being effective in helping them develop skills in understanding research (3.83) and conducting research (3.52)
2. 9 out of the 18 (50%) students who applied to doctoral programs were accepted for admission.
 |  |
| 4. Students will demonstrate ethical reasoning and ethical behavior related to clinical practice and research as reflected in APA Ethical Standards | 1. End-of-semester instructor ratings of students on knowledge and application of ethical principles
2. The questions related to ethical theory and practice on the written comprehensive exam, administered to the second-year students
 | 1. 90% receive ratings of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale
2. 90% receive ratings of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale
 | 1. 97% of the clinical students earned a rating of 3 or higher on ethical behavior (3.46)
2. 100% pass rate on the comps ethics question (3.65)
 | Graduate Coordinator, Clinical Psychology Program Advisory Committee; graduate facultya-d) Results disseminated to Chair and clinical faculty for use in curriculum and program revision and developmenta-c) Results reviewed with internship sites and with graduate students, when applicable |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1. Internship supervisor ratings from the internship sites concerning knowledge of ethical principles and ethical practice
2. Exit survey ratings from graduate students related to ethical decision-making skills
 | 1. 90% receive ratings of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale
2. Average ratings of 3 (“acceptable”) or higher on a 5-point scale
 | 1. 100% of interns received ratings of 3 or higher on knowledge of ethical principles (3.38), ethical behavior (3.29), and ethical practice (3.38)
2. 100% of the students rated the program as being effective in helping them develop skills in ethical decision-making (4.33).
 |  |
| 5. Students will demonstrate oral communication, written communication, and critical thinking skills at the graduate level | 1. End-of-semester instructor ratings of students in the areas of oral communication, written communication, and critical thinking skills
2. Internship supervisor ratings from the internship sites concerning the intern’s oral communication and professional writing skills
 | 1. 90% will receive ratings of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale
2. 90% receive ratings of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale
 | 1. 78% of students earned ratings of 3 or higher in oral communication (3.59), 94% in written communication (3.72), and 100% in critical thinking (3.76)
2. 100% of interns received ratings of 3 or higher in oral communication (3.13) and 96.7% in professional writing (3.13)
 | Graduate Coordinator, Clinical Psychology Program Advisory Committee; graduate facultya-c) Results disseminated to Chair and clinical faculty for use in curriculum and program revision and developmenta, b) Results reviewed with internship sites and with graduate students, when applicable |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | c. Exit survey ratings from graduate students related to oral, written and critical thinking skills | c. Average ratings of 3 (“acceptable”) or higher on a 5-point scale | c. 100% of the students rated the program as being effective in helping them develop their skills in the areas of oral communication skills (4.17), writing skills (4.33), and critical thinking (4.48) |  |
| 6. Students will develop computer skills and technological proficiency, including use of statistical and data management software, use of technology for research, and word processing software | 1. End-of-semester instructor ratings of students in the area of use of computers/ technology
2. Internship supervisor ratings from the internship sites concerning the intern’s computers/technology proficiency
 | 1. 90% will receive ratings of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale
2. 90% receive ratings of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale
 | 1. 100% of the clinical students earned a rating of 3 or higher (3.40)
2. 100% of interns received ratings of 3 or higher on computer/technology proficiency (4.12)
 | Graduate Coordinator, Clinical Psychology Program Advisory Committee; graduate facultya-b) Results disseminated to Chair and clinical faculty for use in curriculum and program revision and development.a-b) Results reviewed with internship sites and with graduate students, when applicable. |

# PART TWO

Describe your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

The following list summarizes progress made on the M.A. Clinical Psychology assessment program from 2014-2017.

1. Our assessment data continue to be comprehensive and complete. We gather information from a wide variety of sources, including psychology faculty who teach clinical graduate courses, clinical students, on-site internship supervisors, EIU clinical psychology intern supervisors, and GA supervisors. Our assessment system was developed circa 2008 by a former CATS employee. During Spring 2017, we had difficulties with the system, and because it was no longer supported by CATS, we needed to redo all of the surveys. After consulting with CATS, we decided to use Qualtrics. Because this system allows changes to be made easily, we are much better able to make changes to our surveys than we were able to previously.
2. One survey that we intend to finesse is the Instructor ratings. Faculty have complained that many of the items do not apply to specific classes, which results in faculty giving lower scores to students or skipping these items entirely. For example, faculty often give low scores or skip the computer/technology item. Because of the flexibility of the Qualtrics system, we can more carefully tailor these surveys for specific courses, which will provide a more accurate assessment
3. Although rare, we have received occasional feedback that a departmental Graduate Assistant (GA) is not performing well. (Each GA typically provides teaching and/or research assistance to two faculty members). Thus, we instituted a brief 15-item GA evaluation form completed by faculty members supervising departmental GAs. The form is administered midway through the Fall semester with immediate feedback given to GAs, as well as at the end of Spring semester. In this manner, feedback can be provided early in the process, allowing students ample opportunity to make needed changes. Feedback about GA performance was excellent, with all students receiving scores of 3 or better on a 5 point scale for each item. We plan on developing a new Learning Objective during Fall 2017 that incorporates this feedback more explicitly. Specifically, the new Learning Objective will focus on professional behaviors, which will allow us to use other data collected in our surveys that currently is not the focus of our assessments.

**PART THREE**

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

1. Thesis completion rates have been an ongoing concern. To help address these concerns, in Fall 2012, we shifted the thesis process up a semester, such that students now take thesis credits starting in Spring of their first year. This process allows students to not only begin the process earlier but also to take advantage of summer to work on the thesis. In addition, second year students now are required to give a formal thesis presentation at a Clinical Brown Bag; these meetings are attended by all clinical students and the core clinical faculty. These changes to the thesis process are aimed at helping students start the process earlier and keep on track. These changes seem to have had a positive effect with thesis completion rates rising to 100% for the cohort admitted in Fall 2012 and 82% for the cohort admitted in Fall 2013. However, unexpectedly, these rates receded to 33% for the 2014 cohort (rates for the 2015 cohort also appear to be poor at this point). During Spring 2017, we had a meeting with the graduate students to discuss this and other issues. Based on their feedback, we are planning to add a 1- credit Thesis Seminar course to the program (pending departmental and graduate school approval). We hope to informally pilot this course in Fall 2017 (we are exploring ways of doing so); the course will focus on general thesis issues (e.g., how to select a topic, how to find a Chair) that we think will help assist students with the thesis process. This course also will emphasize the importance of gaining research experience for students who intend on applying to Doctoral Programs. Although we continue to be successful in helping our students obtain admission into doctorial programs (50% of those who applied during this three year period), students often under-estimate the importance of having research experience.
2. We plan on administering a new alumni survey during the 2017-2018 academic year, as it has been 8 years since our last assessment. The instrument already has been constructed on Qualtrics, which will enable us to send a link directly to alumni and greatly simplify the process. We plan on adding items regarding pass rates for our alumni on the licensure exam. Our current students often ask how many of our alumni pass the licensure exam on the first try, and we do not currently have any data other than anecdotal evidence from the last few years suggesting that our alumni are successful.
3. During this assessment period, we were surprised by the low scores many students received on Oral Communication based on Instructor ratings (see Learning Objective 5a). We have agreed that we will incorporate more oral presentations into current course, especially given the importance of students being able to communicate effectively on Internship when working with clients and supervisors. We also intend on giving students feedback on their thesis Brown Bag presentations.