

School Psychology SSP

Foundational Competence In School Psychology

Goal Description:

Students develop competence in the scientific, theoretical and conceptual foundations of professional school psychology.

Providing Department: School Psychology SSP

Progress: Ongoing

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Foundational Competency In School Psychology

Learning Objective Description:

Students demonstrate competency in the scientific, methodological and theoretical foundations of professional school psychology.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

National School Psychology Exam (PRAXIS II) [Foundational Competence]

Indicator Description:

The PRAXIS II School Psychology Exam is a nationally administered examination used to determine an individual's qualification for licensure to practice within the field. Candidate competency is evaluated with respect to the following four domains:

1. Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery
2. Direct & Indirect Services for Children, Families and Schools
3. Systems Level Services
4. Professional Practices: Practices that Permeate All Aspects of Service and Delivery).

Criterion Description:

A minimum score of 147 is required on this examination to obtain the credential of Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP). Thus, a score of 147 or better has been established by the SSP Program as the criterion for this objective. In addition, candidates are expected to perform at or above the average range provided by the test developers for each of the four subcategories.

Findings Description:

All nine Year 3 students on Internship completed the Praxis II School Psychology Exam. All nine students (100%) passed this examination in fulfillment of their comprehensive exam requirement. Thus, all students were eligible for graduation and obtaining professional licensure based on this one learning objective.

Attached Files

 [Table 1, Praxis data, 2022.docx](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

National School Psychology Exam (PRAXIS II) [Foundational Competence]

Action Description:

The SSP Program will maintain current training levels.

Skill Application

Goal Description:

Students develop competence in skill application of professional school psychology in a public school setting.

Providing Department: School Psychology SSP

Progress: Ongoing

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Skill Application

Learning Objective Description:

Candidates in the school psychology program demonstrate knowledge and improving skill application commensurate with their level of training. Specifically, candidates in their final practicum placement and on internship, both held within the public school setting, will demonstrate appropriate application of professional school psychology skills in the areas of assessment, behavioral consultation, academic intervention and counseling.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Intern Rating by Field Supervisor

Indicator Description:

All Interns will be rated by their field supervisors at the conclusion of their Internship experience.

Criterion Description:

The rating scale ranges from 1 to 5, with scores of 1 or 2 indicating areas of concern. Scores of 3, 4 or 5 indicate skill competence has been met.

Findings Description:

All eight Interns (100%) were rated by their field supervisors of having met skill competency based on the rating scales completed prior to their graduation.

Attached Files

 [TABLE 3, Intern rating data, 2022.docx](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Rating Forms And Positive Impact Data

Indicator Description:

Indicator Rating Forms and Positive Impact Data Ratings Forms

(1) Satisfactory ratings from Field Supervisors

1(A) Ratings for Practicum II candidates (Year 2 of 3)

1(B) Ratings for candidates on Internship (Year 3 of 3)

On-site, or field, supervisors are asked to evaluate each candidate’s performance in order to gauge their professional performance according to the NASP Standards for the Domains of Competence. These Standards include: II) Data-Based Decision-Making and Accountability, III) Consultation and Collaboration, IV) Direct and Indirect Services at the Student Level {includes 4.1: Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills and 4.2: Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills}, V) Direct and Indirect Services at the Systems Level {includes 5.1: School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning and 5.2: Preventive and Responsive Services}, VI)

Direct and Indirect Services to support Family-School Collaboration, VII) Foundations of School Psychologists' Service Delivery: Diversity, and VIII) Foundations of School Psychologists' Service Delivery: Research, Program Evaluation, Legal, Ethical and Professional Practice {includes 8.1: Research and Program Evaluation and 8.2: Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice}.

(2) Satisfactory ratings from Program Faculty

2(A) Faculty Rating Forms (FRF) for both of two Portfolio cases submitted

2(B) Procedural Integrity Rubrics (PIR) for both of two Portfolio cases submitted

Candidates completing the Internship Portfolio assessment will obtain satisfactory ratings from the Program Faculty on each of two cases submitted. All candidates are required to submit an Academic Assessment and Intervention case. The candidates are permitted to choose between a Behavioral Consultation and Intervention case and a Counseling case for their second submission. As much as if feasible, two faculty members will evaluate each case, and the average of these two ratings on both the FRF and the PIR will be reported.

Indicator Positive Impact Data

(3) Quantitative data gathered as part of the case intervention

3(A) Effect Size AND/OR

3(B) Percent of Non-Overlapping Data Points (PND)

Candidates completing the Internship Portfolio assessment will submit quantitative data gathered as part of the case intervention monitoring for the two cases submitted. Effect size and/or percent of non-overlapping data points (PND) are to be calculated. For academic cases, the slope (R2) may also be reported. In such cases, a moderate effect of at least 0.09 is expected.

Criterion Description:

Criterion Skill Application 1A: Candidates are rated by field supervisors according to a five-point scale including the following competency rating categories: Major Area of Concern (Additional, Intensive Supervision Required) {1}, Improvement Needed (Additional Supervision Required) {2}, Meets Expectations for Training Level (Supervision Needed) {3}, Exceeds Expectations for Training Level (Supervision Needed) {4}, Professionally Competent (No Supervision Needed) {5}. Because candidates in their final practicum will be under supervision for two more years, they are expected to maintain an overall average rating of "3.0" for all of the NASP Domains evaluated. 1B: Candidates are rated by field supervisors according to a five-point scale including the following competency rating categories: Major Area of Concern (Additional, Intensive Supervision Required) {1}, Improvement Needed (Additional Supervision Required) {2}, Meets Expectations for Training Level (Supervision Needed) {3}, Exceeds Expectations for Training Level (Supervision Needed) {4}, Professionally Competent (No Supervision Needed) {5}. Because candidates completing their internship year will continue to be under supervision for one more year, they are expected to maintain an overall average rating of "3.0" for all of the NASP Domains evaluated. 2A: Candidates completing their internship experience are required to submit two distinct Portfolio cases. Each case will be reviewed, as much as is feasible, by two faculty members and assigned ratings on the Faculty Rating Form (FRF). These ratings will then be averaged across the two faculty raters. The FRF addresses all domains of practice related to the type of case being reviewed. Each item on the FRF includes the following competency rating categories: Pass (score 1), No Pass (score 0), Not Included (score 0), and Not Applicable (removed from the scoring

calculation). Candidates are expected to achieve a minimum domain competency average of 85%. In addition, candidates are given a single faculty rating for the overall case completion. This rating ranges from 1 (Very Poor) to 5 (Very Good).

Candidates are expected to achieve a minimum average overall rating of 3 across the two faculty raters, which is equivalent to “average” work completed in the field. 2B: Internship portfolio case submissions are also scored by faculty using a Procedural Integrity Rubric, or PIR. Each case PIR includes critical procedures that must be performed as part of completing the case in order for the intern to be judged as following best practices within the field. Each item on the PIR can be scored as follows: 0 = Incomplete, 1 = Needs Improvement (task is completed, with some concerns), 2 = Completed Satisfactorily (Competency Met), and 3 = Exemplary Performance (task is completed at a level above expectations). Each PIR for the cases submitted has an established cut score equivalent to achievement of at least 85%. Additionally, candidates are expected to obtain no ratings of “0” on any PIR. 3A: Based on the quantitative data included as part of the Behavioral Consultation and Intervention, Counseling, and/or Academic Assessment and Intervention Portfolio case submissions, the candidate’s impact on student behavior and/or learning can be calculated in a variety of ways. Effect size allows for the comparison of the standard mean difference in student performance during baseline and treatment phases of intervention. An effect size of .8 is considered to be of moderate impact. For academic cases, the slope (R2) may also be reported. In such cases, a moderate effect of at least 0.09 is expected. Candidates are expected to demonstrate moderate impact through either effect size or PND calculation for both of the cases submitted. 3B: Based on the quantitative data included as part of the Portfolio case submissions, the candidate’s impact on student behavior and/or learning can be calculated in a variety of ways. Percent of Non-overlapping Data points, or PND, provides a comparison of the percentage of data points during the treatment phase that do not overlap with the most extreme baseline phase point. A PND calculation of 60% is considered to be of moderate impact. Candidates are expected to demonstrate moderate impact through either effect size or PND calculation for both of the cases submitted.

Findings Description:

All nine Interns submitted two cases for faculty review as part of their Internship requirements. Following review, all nine students (100%) submitted a behavioral consultation case report that met the review requirements. Additionally, all nine students (100%) submitted an academic intervention case report that met the review requirements.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Rating Forms and Positive Impact Data

Action Description:

The SSP Program will continue to maintain current training levels.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Supervisor Rating of Practicum Experience

Indicator Description:

Each year candidate performance during their final practical experiences will be rated by their field supervisor.

Criterion Description:

The rating scale ranges from 1 to 5, with ratings falling at levels 1 and 2 indicating areas of concern. Ratings of 3, 4 or 5 indicate criterion met.

Findings Description:

All candidates completing their final practicum during the Spring 2022 were rated positively by their field supervisors (100%).

Attached Files

 [TABLE 2, Practicum rating data, 2022.docx](#)

Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement Item

Previous Cycle's Plan For Continuous Improvement (Do Not Modify):

Closing Summary

The data from the 2020-2021 assessment application yield overwhelming support for the success of the SSP Program. Nevertheless, there are some specific actions that can take place during the coming academic year to improve the Program's functioning and the overall candidate success:

1. The supervisor rating forms for practicum, Internship and the Faculty Rating Forms for the Portfolio cases must all be revised to reflect the newest NASP standards (2020). These revisions will be initially implemented during the 2021-2022 application cycle.
2. Faculty will investigate ways to support candidate knowledge of statistical analysis of intervention effectiveness, including the calculation of effect size, PND and R-squared.

Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:

1. Instead of updating the rating forms as planned, the SSP Program faculty instead embarked on completion of the External Program Review as required by the TSUS Coordinating Board. In spite of the fact that the Program maintains an outside professional accreditation, this external review had to be conducted.
2. Again, the SSP Program faculty had to attend to the External Program Review and was therefore not able to address any other Programatic needs during the 2021-2022 academic year.

New Plan for Continuous Improvement Item

Closing Summary:

The Specialist in School Psychology (SSP) Program has been functioning admirably for many years. Additionally, the Program has also held NASP Approval and full CAEP Accreditation for many years. The 2022-2023 academic year will mark the first of three years of Program Evaluation data collection that will be the core of the next Initial Report related to maintaining the Approval and Accreditation. Because of this, the following continuous improvement items are planned:

1. To align the Practicum Supervisor rating scale with the most recently updated NASP Standards.
2. To align the Intern Supervisor rating scale with the most recently updated NASP Standards.
3. To align the system of Portfolio case evaluation with the most recently updated NASP Standards.
4. To incorporate all evaluation system pieces within the Tevera system for ease of analysis.