

School of Nursing and Health Professions Program
 Evaluation Committee (approved January 2017)
 Score Card 2016-2017

Program: PsyD

Presenter(s): David Martinez

Date: January 30, 2017

PEC Scorecard	Yes	No	Feedback
1. Program' s assessment/evaluation plan (must include one direct measure)			
a. Is there a program goal? (summary statement of PLOs)		X	This is a new SONHP PEC requirement.
b. Is there an assessment plan? Is it sufficiently comprehensive?	X		Clearly guided by APA requirements that also align with SONHP expectations. Of note and congruent with a student-centric approach, students' perspective about the program is annually collected and responded to with faculty developed plan of action that is reported back to the students.
c. Is there a current sufficiently comprehensive curriculum map(s) in place? For undergraduate programs, are ILOs included?	X		Well developed. Courses are aligned with APA Aims 1-3 and APA competencies.
d. Is there a direct measure used to assess if students' learn what is being taught?	X		Multiple direct measures (at end of courses and at key milestones) are in place: DCQE, SPEE, CSEPS, and MAKSS. There are clear passing benchmarks and remediation plans. It is not clear if aggregate data from each direct measure are used for program improvement purposes.
2. Outcomes data (must minimally include: time to graduation, attrition, 1 st time pass rate (NCLEX/NP certification), employment, and results from using one direct measure).			

a. Were the Program Evaluation Plan (PEP) and other program specific benchmarks reached?	X	APA benchmarks exceed SONHP benchmarks: At graduation, 2 years post-graduation, and 5 years post-graduation PsyD program will evaluate, time to degree attrition rate, licensing rate 1 st time pass rate, and post-doctoral fellowship
b. Were there faculty developed action plans?	X	For measures able to be assessed at this early point in the program's history
c. Based on findings, were faculty develop action plans captured in department committee minutes?		Yes, faculty routinely evaluate program data and generate
3. Closing the loop		
a. What was shared and with who? (evidence)		Yes, with faculty and students
b. How was it shared?		At organized routine faculty meetings and at special organized meetings with
c. What impact did this have and what was learned/revised-captured in department committee minutes?		When student outcomes fall below passing, plans are in place for remediation.

PEC Feedback/Priorities:

1. Develop a program goal - PLO summary statement derived from PLOs and APA aims/competencies
2. Reconsider use of course grades in program evaluation plan. There are numerous other methods used by PsyD faculty to assess student learning outcomes. Course grades are not an effective method to accomplish this and it also makes this comprehensive evaluation plan more onerous than necessary.
3. On measures where all students have passed at 100%, consider if the assessment criteria are sufficiently rigorous.
4. Clarification is needed about the use of direct measures. Is the individual student performance data aggregated to assess efficacy of teaching in courses? Is that aggregate data used for continuous program improvement beyond support to the individual student?