ASSESSMENT REPORT 2017-2018

Educational Psychology Doctoral Program

Our program prepares individuals for teaching and/or research careers in many specialized areas. Students learn to combine research and practical application to understand significant issues in education and psychology. Students' research areas include development, learning, individual learner differences, intelligence, learning and study strategies, motivation, measurement, evaluation, assessment, and statistics.

Our graduates work for colleges and universities, school systems, state and federal agencies, business and industry, private research and development organizations as well as other educational and developmental settings.
http://www.education.auburn.edu/academic-program/educational-psychology/

Student Learning Outcomes

1. Specificity of Outcomes

The following are the program's revised and most up to date Student Learning Outcomes (also known as SLO/SLOs).

Revised - March 2017

SLO1: Analyze and evaluate educational psychology theories and research to generate and examine a set of research questions.

SLO2: Plan and apply appropriate research methods to questions, issues, and problems in educational psychology, in accordance with professional and ethical standards.

SLO3: Apply the principles of educational psychology and pedagogy to teaching practice.

SLO4: Communicate educational psychology theory and research to professional audiences of researchers and/or practitioners, in a manner consistent with professional and ethical standards.

2. **Comprehensive Outcomes**

Submitted May 2016
Our program team reviewed the College and University mission as well as mission statements and SLOs from other prominent Educational Psychology programs in the country. Through a series of discussions, the educational psychology faculty created a list of SLOs that are comprehensive and reflective of our doctoral program in Educational Psychology. Critical aspects of this development process included:

a. A review and discussion of SLOs of other national programs in educational psychology.

b. Standards for Research Conduct (AEA, 2006) and Code of Ethics (AERA, 2011) proposed by the American Educational Research Association - More specifically, standard 1 (Problem Formation) from the AERA Standards for Research Conduct relates to SLO1; standards 2 (Design and Logic), 3 (Sources of Evidence), 4 (Measurement and Classification) and 5 (Analysis and Interpretation) are reflected in SLO1, SLO2 and SLO4 and standard 6 (Ethics in Reporting) as well as the AERA Code of Ethics are reflected in SLO4.

c. College and University Missions – Finally, these SLOs were created to directly reflect the college and university missions. They reflect the college mission as indicators of preparing competent, committed and reflective professionals. http://www.education.auburn.edu/mission. They also reflect the teaching, research and outreach aspects of the University mission. http://www.auburn.edu/main/welcome/visionandmission.html

AERA (2006). Standards for Reporting on Empirical Social Science Research in AERA Publications. *Educational Researcher, 35(6),* 33-40. - http://www.aera.net/Publications/StandardsforResearchConduct/tabid/15746/Default.aspx

AERA (2011). Code of Ethics, American Educational Research Association. Approved by the AERA Council. February 2011. http://www.aera.net/Portals/38/docs/About_AERA/CodeOfEthics(l).pdf

3. **Communicating Student Learning Outcomes**

During the 2015-16 academic year, our team generated these SLOs through faculty team meetings and on subsequent email discussions. Our program faculty have discussed and communicated this list of Student Learning Outcomes within the program area. More specifically, all program faculty responsible for advising students have been provided with these SLOs and map along with this program assessment report. Advising or not, all Educational Psychology faculty are informed on our

SLOs, map, and related information via emails from program coordinators and at program meetings. The purpose of informing all faculty is to ensure everyone knows this material since all of them teach one or more of our core courses with SLOs. So, all of our faculty team knowing the SLOs and map is vital in order to properly plan, teach, and assess students in these core courses.

Educational Psychology program faculty are communicating these SLOs to students in the following ways. First, they are posted on the Educational Psychology Information Board in the hallway on 4th floor of Haley Center. All incoming students will be emailed the SLOs along with other program information. Additionally, when students meet with advisors, the advisor will discuss the SLOs, the map, and related requirements. As a form of triangulation, the SLOs, the map, and related requirements, will be discussed in each of the three Educational Psychology Apprenticeship courses (EPSY 8440, 8540, and 8640) as these core courses are planned for students to complete near the beginning and mid portion of their program of study. They will also be mentioned by instructors, where each SLO applies, to the other core courses as taught by each faculty member. Program faculty are considering including these on the Graduate Student Evaluation Form that serves as a sort of annual review of each student. Our faculty are in progress in developing an electronic student handbook that details all graduate school and program requirements which would include the SLOs, the curriculum map, and the qualifying portfolio process in which the SLOs will be measured and reported.

4. **Curriculum Map** Revised 3/10/2017

The below is our current and most updated curriculum map that visually represents the alignment between student learning outcomes and required courses/experiences. In the Curriculum Map below, please note the level of progression in which each SLO is provided focus as per the course shown:
1 = introduced, 2 = reinforced, 3 = emphasized.

SLO1: Analyze and evaluate educational psychology theories and research to generate and examine a set of research questions.

SLO2: Plan and apply appropriate research methods to questions, issues, and problems in educational psychology, in accordance with professional and ethical standards.

SLO3: Apply the principles of educational psychology and pedagogy to teaching practice.

SLO4: Communicate educational psychology theory and research to professional audiences of researchers and/or practitioners, in a manner consistent with professional and ethical standards.

Educational Psychology Doctoral Program Curriculum Map: Core Courses Required for All Students with Level of SLO Progression

CORE COURSES	SLO1	SLO2	SLO3	SLO4
EPSY 7400: Ed Psych & Educational Implications	1		1	
EPSY 7410: The Individual in the Teaching-Learning Process	2		2	
EPSY 7420: Learning Theory and Educational Practice	2		2	
EPSY 8440: Ed Psych Apprenticeship Seminar	3			
EPSY 8450: Ed Psych Research Apprenticeship Seminar	3	3		3
EPSY 8640: Ed Psych Learning and Instruction Apprenticeship			3	
ERMA 7100: Advanced Study of Educational Measurement and		1		
ERMA 7200: Basic Methods in Education Research		1		1
ERMA 7210: Theory and Methodology of Qualitative Research	2	2		1
ERMA 7220: Applied Qualitative Research		3		2
ERMA 7300: Design and Analysis in Education I		2		2
ERMA 7310: Design and Analysis in Education II		3		2
ERMA 8320: Design and Analysis in Education III		3		2
EPSY/ERMA 8990/6: Dissertation	3	3		3
The below experiences are encouraged but not required for all students.				
Conference Proposals, Presentations, Manuscripts for Publication	3	3		3
Teaching Experience (as GTA or Instructor of Record)			3	

Measurement

5. **Outcome-Measure Alignment** *[Please provide a description of the assessment measures, noting how they were chosen/developed to align with the student learning outcomes.]*

For alignment with our student learning outcomes, we chose to develop a portfolio-based measurement. The types of Reflections and Artifacts/Reproductions and their alignment with each SLO were chosen based on faculty expertise. The following rationale are provided for using this approach. Portfolios offer an authentic assessment, engaging students in the process of self-assessment and reflection in relation to valuable student learning outcomes (SLOs). For each SLO, supportive evidence will be included based on students' efforts in core coursework and professional experiences. The portfolio-based approach results in student self-analysis and his/her careful selection of evidence provided in support of progress toward meeting expectations for critical program requirements.

Qualifying Portfolio Performance Based Assessments

Below shows the instructions to students and faculty regarding how the portfolio elements align to each specific SLO. Also listed are the portfolio-based artifacts/reproductions which are to be provided by a student to demonstrate a particular SLO. The qualifying portfolio to advance to candidacy for the PhD in Educational Psychology requires a combination of evidence and personal reflection for each of the program outcomes.

SLO1. Analyze and evaluate educational psychological theories to generate and examine a set of research questions.
Reflection

      i.   Please respond to the following reflection prompt: Articulate your identity in educational psychology. What kinds of theories are you working with, integrating, and advancing in your work? Reflect on your professional positioning as an educational psychologist and how that fits within the field of educational psychological theory. How do those theories inform your generation and examination of research questions?

      ii.   Describe the evidence provided and how it supports your reflection.

Evidence (Artifacts/Reproductions)

      iii.   You must supply evidence that you have met this program outcome.

      iv.   Examples of evidence for this learning outcome can include:
- Peer-reviewed publications that focus on theory
- Manuscripts submitted for publication or presentations that focus on theory
- Chapters 1 and 2 of the dissertation proposal
- Course papers focused on theory

SLO2. Plan and apply appropriate research methods to questions, issues, and problems in educational psychology, in accordance with professional and ethical standards.

    a.   **Reflection**

      i. Please respond to the following reflection prompt: Who are you as a researcher in educational psychology? Reflect on your research agenda, and what methodological expertise you have gained that advance that agenda. Describe both your contribution to educational psychological research, and the methods you bring to bear on educational psychology research.

      ii. You will also need to describe the evidence you've provided and how it supports your reflection.

Evidence (Artifacts/Reproductions)

      iii.   You must supply evidence that you have met this program outcome.

      iv.   Examples of evidence for this learning outcome can include:

- Research publications
- Research conference papers
- Other research manuscripts
- Chapter 3 of the dissertation proposal
- Technical reports authored

SLO3. Apply principles of educational psychology and pedagogy to teaching practice.

a.   Reflection

  i.   Please respond to the following reflection prompt: What is your teaching philosophy? What pedagogical approaches, perspectives, and theories shape your work as an educator? Reflect on your own identity as an educator, and how that interacts with the principles of educational psychology andpedagogy.

  ii.   Describe the evidence provided and how it supports your reflection.

Evidence (Artifacts/Reproductions)

  iii.   You must supply evidence that you have met this program outcome.

  iv.   Examples of evidence for this learning outcome can include:

   • Lectures (such as lecture notes, PowerPoints, or videos of lectures [videos should be accompanied by an evaluation])
   • Lesson plans used in teaching
   • Assessment materials (course projects, assignments, and exams created for teaching purposes)
   • Observation reports from faculty
   • Other sources of teaching evaluation, such as student evaluation surveys
   • Anonymous student artifacts from courses taught

SLO4. Communicate educational psychological theory and research to professional audiences of researchers and/or practitioners, in a manner consistent with professional and ethical standards.

a.   Reflection

  i.   Please respond to the following reflection prompt: How do you communicate educational psychological theory and research to professional audiences? Articulate a rationale for the strategies you have used to communicate your theoretical, research, and/or pedagogical contributions to audiences of researchers and/orpractitioners.

  ii.   You will also need to describe the evidence you've provided and how it supports your reflection.

Evidence (Artifacts/Reproductions)

  iii.   You must supply evidence that you have met this program outcome.

  Examples of evidence for this learning outcome can include:
   • Professional development materials presented to professional audiences
   • Research presentations
   • Research publications
   • Technical reports authored

6. Direct Measures   *[Please consider indicating which assessments are direct measures of student learning (e.g., exams, rubric scores).]*

The assessments which serve as *direct measures are performance based* which will be housed in the portfolio as (a) Reflections, and (b) Evidence. In other words, each SLO has a different set of performance-based assessments as shown in the Table for item 5 Data Collection in this report.

Two scoring rubrics were developed in relation to each SLO used to *score the performance-based work* that students create. Specifically, there is a *Reflection* component that students will submit which has its own rubric for scoring the Reflections. Also, there is an *Evidence* component for each SLO and that component has its own rubric to score student work.

7. Data Collection *[Please provide a description of the assessment data collection process (i.e., information on how data were collected, who provided data, and the pertinent methodological details such as rating/scoring design).]*

As a result of participating in the Doctoral Program in Educational Psychology, the student is expected to demonstrate competence of the program student learning outcomes (SLOs). In doing so, students will complete a doctoral portfolio prior to qualification for their oral comprehensive examination. This portfolio requirement will take effect for those students who began coursework in Fall 2017 and later. During Fall 2017, members from the Ed Psych faculty team met with a new cohort of students to explain the portfolio process and criteria to the new cohort of students, three of whom will be expected to complete the portfolio successfully before completing their oral comprehensive examination. The projected timeline for the three students to be at or near the time to submit the portfolio will be Fall 2019 semester.

All students who began coursework during Fall 2017 or after will be eligible for portfolio assessment review, as part of their written comprehensive examination process. The portfolio will be completed, submitted, and reviewed prior to the oral examination. Deadlines for the submission of student portfolios will be established each semester in order to provide sufficient time for review and feedback. Portfolio evidence and reflections will be reviewed by their committee (doctoral committee) as well other faculty associated with the Educational Psychology doctoral program. Reviewers will focus on areas in which they have expertise. The platform being tested (since Spring 2017) for housing the portfolio responses and scoring was the G-drive.

Before the formal start of implementation of the portfolio process with the eligible students, faculty have been working on examining volunteer student portfolio artifacts and reflections. The data shown in the table on page 13 portray student volunteer reflection and evidence responses for the SLO 3 portfolio component. The table shows scores for four students who provided pilot responses for SLO3 completed during Spring 2017, Fall 2017, and Spring 2018 in the course, EPSY 8640, Teaching Apprenticeship. We have utilized two scoring rubrics (for SLO3) to score student

portfolios. The two rubrics for SLO3 include one for *reflection* on teaching skills (as demonstrated during the EPSY 8640 course) and also includes thick description of the student's teaching philosophy. The second rubric is used to score the *evidence* for SLO3 which includes discussion of evidence as well as presentation of evidence including artifacts/reproductions (1) videos of teaching, (2) lesson plans, (3) lesson activities and assessments, and (4) observations of teaching.

For the upcoming year, it will be encouraged to have faculty examine volunteer student portfolio work for other SLOs also. Towards this goal, we have one faculty member examining volunteer/pilot portfolio work by five students on two ERMA related SLOs for the Program Certificate Assessment Report. Examination of piloted student work for all SLOs over the next two years will help us as a team when the time comes to more fully use the portfolio process by all faculty and when the process formally begins with eligible students.

Components and Process of the Qualifying Portfolio

A selective, reflective, and collaborative collection of evidence will be used to document an individual's development and accomplishments. The development of the portfolios should be ongoing and include materials sampled across time, required and elective courses, professional development and experiences, and self-developed materials. Demonstration of some SLOs can be evidenced through required reproduction/artifact components and required knowledge/reflection competency components. In all components, students are expected to abide by the AERA (2011) Code of Ethics.

Reproduction/Artifact Components

In these components, students are asked to draw from materials that they have developed in courses, professional development or other professional experiences to demonstrate specific skills, knowledge, or awareness. Students may also develop materials specific to meeting the identified SLO.

Artifacts: Materials that are normally produced through coursework, experiences, and professional development activities (e.g., research papers, conference presentation materials, course syllabi, instructional materials).

Reproductions: Materials that reproduce actual practice (e.g., video and audio files).

Change or growth may be demonstrated by providing examples of the successive versions of a piece of supportive evidence, not just the most polished version. Additionally, a single reflection, reproduction, or artifact may be used to demonstrate competence in multiple areas.

Reflections: In addition to considering revisions or updated versions of materials, one of the critical aspects of artifact/reproduction selection is the inclusion of

reflective rationale statements that provide clarification of why the specific submitted materials demonstrate the competency and how they may reflect personal and/or professional competence and growth.

Collecting Materials and Developing the Portfolio

It is recommended that students collect materials across all academic courses, professional experiences, professional development activities, and other areas of their doctoral training (see Curriculum Map as a guide on page 4). Components often address multiple areas of competency. It is important that in collecting or developing portfolio components a student considers components that best demonstrate the required competency and provides a rationale for the inclusion of materials. Developing a portfolio requires careful and thoughtful consideration of what components (evidence) to include and to the development of components. Students should consider including works or materials that demonstrate change, growth, or insight into practice as well as professional development. In addition, compiling portfolio components should be a selective process, not an overly inclusive process. It is critical to the portfolio process that students work on their portfolios throughout their academic program up to the time of submission.

Portfolio Submission and Evaluation

(a) Portfolio Submission: The EPG Portfolio can be submitted during the Fall and Spring semesters of the year in which the student is prepared to complete the comprehensive examination process. The portfolios will be submitted no later than the l5th class day of each semester. Specific dates will align with the official Auburn University calendar each Fall and Spring semester. Portfolios received after the date and time required will not be accepted for review that semester.

(b) Submission Format: The portfolio will be submitted *electronically,* using a platform determined by the program faculty. The current platform will be EFLT G-drive. Materials will be sent to the student's Chair by the student. The Chair will then provide to EFLT staff or program assessment coordinator to place on the G-Drive inside that student's folder.

(c) Orientation: Students will be informed about the portfolio requirements upon admission. Additional guidance and orientation will be provided in EPSY 8440 and/or meetings with advisors and other faculty upon admission and throughout the program.

(d) Portfolio Reviewers: Educational Psychology Portfolios are reviewed by the program faculty and contributing faculty (College of Education faculty that teach courses required in the doctoral program). *Students will receive feedback and evaluations from the evaluators within 3 weeks* of submitting the Portfolio. Each section of the portfolio will be reviewed by multiple reviewers. A minimum of two reviewers will review each section/SLO with a preference for 3 reviewers.

(e) Portfolio Evaluations: Portfolio reflections and evidence are evaluated using a 4-point rubric. Each section (SLO) will receive a score and be used to form total score. Portfolios are evaluated using a 4-point rubric (see Portfolio Rubrics onpages 14-15).

(f) A section/SLO total score of 2 or higher is considered demonstrating competence or passing for that section. Students must demonstrate competence in a minimum of 3 sections of 4 total sections (3 of 4 SLOs) of the portfolio to move onto the oral defense of the portfolio.

(g) Portfolio Requirements: Students who do not meet the requirement (passing the Portfolio) to move onto the Oral Defense will receive from their committees a plan of remediation for the areas deemed inadequate. Once the student has completed this remediation they can resubmit their portfolio during the next scheduled review period. Students are only permitted to submit for two portfolio reviews. If they are unsuccessful in the second review, they will not meet program requirements and will be dismissed from the program.

Portfolio Defense

When students receive passing scores on their Educational Psychology Doctoral Portfolio, they can move on to preparing for and scheduling their General Oral Exam with their Doctoral Committee. Students should abide by the following as they prepare for the oral defense of their portfolio and any additional questions or requirements provided by their doctoral committee as part of written comprehensive examination process.

• Students must provide committee members who are outside the department (i.e., do not have electronic access to the portfolio) a copy of their portfolio and evaluations from reviewers. This can be provided through a loaned jump drive when necessary.

• Working with their Major Professors, students should schedule the Oral Exam (typically allow 1.5-2 hours) and submit the General Oral Exam (Form A) https://web.auburn.edu/alpha/forms/form-a.aspx This form must be submitted to the Graduate School at least one week (5 working days) before the day the Oral Exam is to be conducted.

• Students are asked to develop a presentation (e.g. PowerPoint) that highlights the areas of their portfolios and includes an overview of the evaluations for all sections (scores across reviewers for sections, and any items for which reviewers' scores indicated that the student did not pass the item).

• For sections that students passed, this should simply be a brief overview of components or areas that the student wants tohighlight.

• For items and sections that students did not pass, the oral exam is the time to address the limitations, demonstrate competencies, and for the student to discuss how he or she

could have done a better job of demonstrating the competency. This is a critical component of the oral exam.

• If students have an item(s) or section(s) that a committee member did not pass them on, but the student passed based on other reviewers' evaluations, it is suggested that the student address the committee member's comments and evaluations as part of his or her presentation at the oral exam.

• Faculty may ask questions across multiple components of the student's portfolio or in general areas of the student's coursework and professional development.

• Following the student's presentation and committee members' questions, the student's Major Professor will ask the student to leave the room; this is standard procedure and allows the committee time to discuss the student's oral exam.

• When students pass both the oral and written components of the Comprehensive Exam, they acquire the status of a Doctoral Candidate.

AERA (2011). Code of Ethics, American Educational Research Association. Approved by the AERA Council. February 2011 - http://www.aera.net/Portals/38/docs/About_AERA/CodeOfEthics(l).pdf

Results

8. **Reporting Results** *[Please provide assessment results aligned with the Student Learning Outcomes. If historical assessment data is available, consider providing this data to reveal any student learning trends.]*

No historical assessment is available since we have changed the SLOs and their measurement processes. However, results from pilot data collected from Spring and Fall 2017 and Spring 18 (based upon the new SLOs, and new performance-based assessments and processes) from four students (one in Spring 17, one in Fall 17, and two in Spring 18) indicate successful attainment of SLO3 as shown in the table.

Please note score differences shown in the table across the student samples for the reflection and evidence components. Also noteworthy in one of the most recent samples, there is a difference in scores earned for Reflection and the Evidence. However, both reviewers agreed on their scores they used for each of these two criteria. Please refer to SLO3a and SLO3b performance assessments on page 3 which were scored by two reviewers. These scores were derived using the portfolio rubrics shown for SLO3 and are seen on page 15, Portfolio Rubrics. Please note that the full array of rubrics for all SLOs are also shown as Portfolio Rubrics on pages 14-15.

In addition to the pilot data, our plan to answer this *reporting results* component

is also to help readers understand two plausible examples of what types of results we might anticipate when more data is forthcoming. The first scenario for results would be that student evidence and reflections score as either Competent/Pass or Accomplished/Pass in all or most of the SLOs for all students being assessed. A second scenario could be that student *evidence* and/or their *reflections* score as either Inadequate/Fail or Developing/Fail in one or more of the SLOs for one or more students being assessed.

See table on the next page.

Portfolio Pilot Data Results for SLO3 Performance Based Assessments SP2017- SP2018

Student And Semester	Portfolio Results SLO3	Inadequate Fail (0)	Developing Fail (1)	Competent Pass (2)	Accomplished Pass (3)
	REFLECTION				
Student 1 Spring 17	Reviewer A Reviewer B				3 3
Student 2 Fall 17	Reviewer A Reviewer B			2 2	
Student 3 Spring 18	Reviewer A Reviewer B				3 3
Student 4 Spring 18	Reviewer A Reviewer B			2 2	
	EVIDENCE				
Student 1 Spring 17	Reviewer A Reviewer B				3 3
Student 2 Fall 17	Reviewer A Reviewer B			2 2	
Student 3 Spring 18	Reviewer A Reviewer B				3 3
Student 4 Spring 18	Reviewer A Reviewer B				3 3

Portfolio Rubrics

SLO1: Analyze and evaluate educational psychological theories and research to generate and examine a set of research questions.

Rubrics	*Inadequate/Fail (0)*	*Developing/Fail (1)*	*Competent/Pass (2)*	*Accomplished/Pass (3)*
Reflection Rubric	Inadequate reflection is provided, or the reflection is not substantively related to the learning outcome.	Articulation includes inaccurate, unclear, or vague language.	Clearly and accurately articulates how the artifact/reproduction demonstrates mastery of the learning outcome; uses specific language; and focuses on personal learning and growth.	Clearly and accurately articulates how the artifact/reproduction demonstrates mastery of the learning outcome; integrates information from multiple sources; uses specific language; focuses on personal learning and growth; and includes plans for future professional practice.
Evidence Rubric	Inadequate evidence is provided, or the evidence is not substantively linked to the learning outcome.	Perfunctory - not a synthesis, not comprehensive.	Comprehensive and synthesizing	Adequate and makes a substantial contribution to the field.

SLO2: Plan and apply appropriate research methods to questions, issues, and problem in educational psychology in accordance with professional and ethical standards.

Rubrics	*Inadequate/Fail (0)*	*Developing/Fail (1)*	*Competent/Pass (2)*	*Accomplished/Pass (3)*
Reflection Rubric	Inadequate reflection is provided, or the reflection is not substantively related to the learning outcome.	Articulation includes inaccurate, unclear, or vague language.	Clearly and accurately articulates how the artifact/reproduction demonstrates mastery of the learning outcome; uses specific language; and focuses on personal learning and growth.	Clearly and accurately articulates how the artifact/reproduction demonstrates mastery of the learning outcome; integrates information from multiple sources; uses specific language; focuses on personal learning and growth; and includes plans for future professional practice.
Evidence Rubric	Inadequate evidence is provided, or the evidence is not substantively linked to the learning outcome.	Mismatch between problem/question and the design OR fundamental flaw in the application of methods.	Appropriate and well conducted	Substantial contribution

Continued on next page

SLO3: Apply the principles of educational psychology and pedagogy to teaching practice.

Rubrics	Inadequate/Fail (0)	Developing/Fail (1)	Competent/Pass (2)	Accomplished/Pass (3)
Reflection Rubric	Inadequate reflection is provided, or the reflection is not substantively related to the learning outcome.	Articulation includes inaccurate, unclear, or vague language.	Clearly and accurately articulates how the artifact/reproduction demonstrates mastery of the learning outcome; uses specific language; and focuses on personal learning and growth.	Clearly and accurately articulates how the artifact/reproduction demonstrates mastery of the learning outcome; integrates information from multiple sources; uses specific language; focuses on personal learning and growth; and includes plans for future professional practice.
Evidence Rubric	Inadequate evidence is provided, or the evidence is not substantively linked to the learning outcome.	Surface level thinking about teaching, perfunctory or limited links between pedagogy and theory	Clearly connects principles of ed psych and pedagogy to decision-making regarding planning, instruction, and assessing student learning.	Innovative or exceptionally strong connections between theory and practice.

SLO4: Communicate educational psychological theory and research to professional audiences of researchers and/or practitioners in a manner consistent with professional and ethical standards.

Rubrics	Inadequate/Fail (0)	Developing/Fail (1)	Competent/Pass (2)	Accomplished/Pass (3)
Reflection Rubric	Inadequate reflection is provided, or the reflection is not substantively related to the learning outcome.	Articulation includes inaccurate, unclear, or vague language.	Clearly and accurately articulates how the artifact/reproduction demonstrates mastery of the learning outcome; uses specific language; and focuses on personal learning and growth.	Clearly and accurately articulates how the artifact/reproduction demonstrates mastery of the learning outcome; integrates information from multiple sources; uses specific language; focuses on personal learning and growth; and includes plans for future professional practice.
Evidence Rubric	Inadequate evidence is provided, or the evidence is not substantively linked to the learning outcome.	Fails to reach an audience beyond the institution or violates professional or ethical standards	Relevant communication (presentation or publication) national or international audience, aligned with professional/ethical standards.	Relevant communication (presentation or publication) with a national or international audience, aligned with professional and ethical standards. • Multiple Peer Reviews

9. **Interpreting Results** *[Please provide an interpretation of the results aligned with the student learning outcomes. The interpretation should reflect consideration of factors (e.g., capabilities of a particular cohort, innovative curricular change) that may have affected the results.]*

The findings from the Portfolio Pilot Data for SLO3 (see page 13) show the scores from both reviewers for each of four students. Please note that for scoring purposes, 6 points out of a possible 6 points was the maximum score possible (Accomplished status) for the *Reflection Rubric* used, and 6 points out of 6 points was the maximum possible score for the *Evidence Rubric* used. Minimum points that would be acceptable as passing (Competent status) to earn on each of these criteria would be 4 points for each rubric since both reviewers must enter a score of at least 2 (competent) on the *Reflection Rubric* plus 2 on the *Evidence* Rubric. This means that it is possible for a student to pass the *Reflection component* while not passing the *evidence* component. In order to be declared passing on the SLO, a student must have a minimum of passing content for both *Reflection* and *Evidence.* Until all reviewers score both criteria (Reflection and Evidence) as at least at competent, then the student must rewrite and resubmit, whichever of these criteria were below passing.

In addition, our plan to answer this component is to portray our interpretation of results and actionable plans based on two sets of results that are plausible. First, if we receive results that meet expectation or that are ideal, then the main emphasis will be on reflecting on factors including what we did properly during instruction in various courses that showed strong scores. As a second scenario, if we receive lower than ideal results from student work in the Evidence or Reflection areas of the portfolio, then our team will need to examine which courses perhaps may need more visiting of the key concepts related to teach SLO.

10. **Communicating Results** *[Please provide a very brief narrative describing with whom the results are shared (e.g., all program faculty).]*

The results will be shared within the Educational Psychology program team faculty, between the reviewers and the student who submitted the pilot data, as well as to the EFLT Department Head, and the Assessment Directors for Auburn University and the College of Education. This communication of results will be done through email with the students as well as for faculty and admin on the EFLT G-Drive inside the folder for a student's portfolio which will house the portfolio plus communication in the form of scoring rubrics completed by reviewers and whatever feedback comments they wish to provide, attached to the scoring rubrics. Lastly, between Ed Psych faculty, we will communicate about results.

Use of Results

11. <u>Purposeful Reflection and Action Plan</u> *[Please provide a narrative describing the process in which faculty engage to discuss assessment results and create actionable plans in an effort to improve student learning.]*

The faculty will have dialogue about the assessment results after their review of the pilot data and the scores provided by reviewers. Specifically, for these pilot data, the actionable plan would be not to focus on student learning [since the student passed] but instead to concentrate on faculty preparation for future students who engage in this SLO3 assessment process.

For future data, once it is more abundant, the discussion will hopefully lead to some actionable plan that implicates improvement or changes in instruction to any courses that are implicated in the findings. Additionally, the student remediation plan would be considered an actionable plan so that any student who fails one or more SLO, can then know what to study further on in order to create improved portfolio *evidence* and/or portfolio *reflection.*

As another actionable plan for future data, if we receive lower than ideal results from student work in the evidence or reflection areas of the portfolio, then we can examine how to provide more clarity in the evidence prompts to help students better understand what is needed to produce certain evidence in their artifacts/reproductions for a particular SLO. The same holds for the written reflection of each SLO. Again, perhaps the prompt (instructions for the task) can be improved, clarified, and qualified.

Based on existing data from 2017 to 2018, another actionable plan is to consider adding specific parameters regarding length of responses to the SLO 3 reflection component. The task itself is worthy for students to engage in but parameters possibly included in the SLO3 instructions area to limit student response length might be worth considering in order to make the duty by reviewers more feasible by making it less time consuming. The longer the student entry, the longer it will take to score which means faculty time is consumed at the cost of other teaching, research, service and/or outreach job load obligations.

As a part of future responses to this item in the report it would be warranted for the office of assessment to suggest where in the report that a program can describe student responses/reactions to their experience with the portfolio and the criteria expected, the rubric, etc. Essential within learning is to ask the learners how they see the experience and what suggestions they may have which can potentially improve the overall process and clarity of expectations. For example, near the end of when the materials were finished or near finished, the instructor of the 8640 conducted informal discussion with each student about how they felt about the portfolio. So far, all four students felt the overall process and tasks expected for SLO3 were helpful and worth completing. There were specific recommendations here and there for areas that might

be written more clearly. One such area mentioned by three of the students was with regards to further clarifying in the instructions for SLO3 minimum length required and maximum length allowed for the reflection component. These insights are being mentioned here since this seems like the most appropriate location.