

Online Assessment Tracking Database

Sam Houston State University (SHSU)
2014 - 2015

Psychology MA (School Psychology)

Goal	Foundational Competence In School Psychology  Students develop competence in the scientific, theoretical and conceptual foundations of professional school psychology.
Objective (L)	Foundational Competency In School Psychology  Students demonstrate competency in the scientific, methodological and theoretical foundations of professional school psychology.
Indicator	National School Psychology Exam (PRAXIS II)  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 test subcategories: 1. Data Based Decision Making (35%), 2. Research-based Academic Practices (12%), 3. Research-based Behavioral and Mental Health Practices (16%), 4. Consultation and Collaboration (12%), 5. Applied Psychological Foundations (13%), and 6. Ethical, Legal, and Professional Foundations (12%).
Criterion	Minimum Score  A minimum score of 165 was required on the previous version of this examination to obtain the credential of Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP), and now the score of 147 is required. Thus, for this cohort, a score of 165 or better OR 147 or better has been established by the SSP Program as the criterion for this objective, depending on which version of the exam was completed. In addition, candidates are expected to perform at or above the average range provided by the test developers for each of the six subcategories.
Finding	National School Psychology Exam (PRAXIS II)  Ten SSP students took the PRAXIS II exam during the past academic year, with five students taking the former version and five taking the newest version. For the earlier version, Total Test Scores ranged from 169 to 175, with an average score of 171. There were three subcategories where 4/5 students (80%) achieved a score at or above the average performance range (i.e., Data-Based Decision Making, Applied Psychological Foundations, and Ethical/Legal and Professional Foundations) and three subcategories where 5/5 students (100%) achieved a score at or above the average performance range (i.e., Research Based Academic Practices, Research Based Behavioral and Mental Health Practices, and Consultation/Collaboration). For the newest version, Total Test Scores ranged from 158 to 182, with an average score of 169.2. There are four subcategories for this version of the Praxis II, and of these 5/5 students (100%) demonstrated scores at or above the average

performance range for two (i.e., Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery and Student-Level Direct & Indirect Services for Children, Families and Schools), 4/5 students (80%) demonstrated scores at or above the average performance range for one (i.e., Systems Level Services), and 3/5 students (60%) demonstrated scores at or above the average performance range for one (i.e., Professional Practices; Practices that Permeate All Aspects of Service and Delivery). Student performance on the previous version of the Praxis II examination is commensurate with past performance. Because the newest version was just implemented this year, it is impossible to determine at this time whether the Program needs to make modifications in order to improve student performance in any given subcategory.

Action**PRAXIS II** 🔑

All members of the cohort scored at or above the acceptable level on the PRAXIS II exam and on each of the subcategories within the exam. We will continue instructing the next cohort of students in the methods that resulted in our recent success and continually check on how they are progressing. In addition, one faculty member from the program resigned this past month and we were fortunate to have hired an excellent candidate who will bring new excitement to the program.

Goal**Skill Application** 🔑

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

Objective (L)**Skill Application** 🔑

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.

Indicator**Rating Forms And Positive Impact Data** 🔑

Indicator Rating Forms and Positive Impact Data

Ratings Forms

(1) Satisfactory ratings from Field Supervisors

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

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

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.

Criterion

Skill Application

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. 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.

Finding**Skill Application**  

Finding

Skill Application

1A: Table 1A: Practicum II Field Supervisor Ratings

Table 1A: Practicum Field Supervisor Ratings

There were six candidates who participated in the final Practicum experience during the Spring 2015 semester. Field supervisors rated our candidates, as a whole, very well and solidly within the "Competent" range. All candidates (100%) achieved an average supervisor rating equal to or above the target score of 3.0. Further, the cohort average rating within each of the ten Standard areas measured exceeded the criterion score of 3.0.

1B: Table 1B: Internship Field Supervisor Ratings

There were ten candidates who participated in the Internship experience during the 2014-2015 academic year. Field supervisors rated our candidates, as a whole, very well and solidly within the "Competent" range. The electronically submitted rating for one candidate could not be read for data entry purposes, and the Program Director is in the process of accessing the hard copy record. The remaining nine candidates (100%) achieved an average supervisor rating equal to or above the target score of 3.0. The cohort average rating within each of the ten Standard areas measured exceeded the criterion score of 3.0.

2A: Data Tables for FRF Portfolio Reviews

Ten candidates completed their Internship Portfolios this academic year. Two Portfolio cases submitted were rated by two faculty members to obtain an average Faculty Rating Form (FRF) rating and an average overall case rating. For the Academic Intervention case, all ten candidates (100%) achieved the criterion of 85% or higher

on the average FRF rating, with nine of ten (90%) meeting the overall rating of '3' or higher for the case. For the Behavioral Consultation/Intervention case and/or the Counseling case, nine of ten (90%) candidates achieved the criterion of 85% or higher on the average FRF rating and an overall rating of '3' or higher for the case.

2B: Data Tables for PIR Portfolio Reviews

Two Portfolio cases submitted were evaluated by two faculty raters using the Procedural Integrity Rubric (PIR) in order to obtain an average PIR score. Additionally, candidates were expected to obtain no ratings of '0' on each of the PIR documents. For the Academic Intervention case, nine candidates (90%) achieved an average PIR score at or above the cut score of 24, with one of the ten candidates (10%) receiving scores of '0' on these case ratings. For the Behavioral Consultation/Intervention and/or Counseling cases, nine candidates (90%) achieved an average PIR score at or above the cut score of 21, with all ten (100%) receiving no scores of '0' on these case ratings.

3A-B: Positive Impact Data for Quantitative Intervention Cases

Candidates' impact on student learning during the Internship experience is evaluated quantitatively through intervention cases submitted as part of the Portfolio assessment. All types of cases potentially submitted are expected to involve intervention with students that is conducive to collecting progress monitoring data. A candidate's positive impact on student functioning is evaluated by calculating either an effect size or percentage of nonoverlapping data (PND) points. Nine internship candidates (90%) achieved at least a moderate impact (see definition above) on student learning for both cases submitted, and all ten (100%) candidates either met or exceeded the expectation of a moderate impact for one of the two cases submitted.

There are no actions for this objective.

Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

The SSP Program works to continuously improve the services and training provided to students in a number of ways. Listed below are the major agenda items for continuous improvement of the Program over the next 12-month period:

1. Program faculty have been working to revise the Program Assessment System following NASP's adoption of new Standards for Training and Practice. Building upon the work completed last year, this year the faculty will review and update the Faculty Review Form utilized during Internship Portfolio review for behavioral intervention, academic assessment and intervention and counseling cases;
2. Also related to the Program Assessment System, the faculty will be working this year on the development of a Practice Log document in Excel that will allow students to record their hours of practice in the field during various courses throughout their program of study. This log document will be used by the student during all three years they are enrolled in the Program, and will provide cumulative details of hours spent in a variety of professional roles and experiences;
3. The Program and the Department are dedicating both time and resources to expand recruitment efforts. It is hoped that the expanded quality applicant pool will increase the number of qualified admissions to the Program;
4. The Program continues to work to strengthen relationships with local school districts. It is the licensed professionals in the field who provide extremely valuable practical experiences and supervision to our students. Without these individuals, our Program's quality would decline substantially. A professional development workshop is being planned for this coming January. It is hoped that an event of this type can become an annual occurrence;
5. The Program would like to develop as detailed a database of graduates as possible, dating back to the year of first NASP Program approval. Having contact information of our graduate would support our ongoing contact with them in the form of a semi-annual Program newsletter. This is something we would like to put into place in collaboration with our student organization;
6. The Program would like to develop both an Exit Survey for graduating students as well as a Survey of Program Graduates that would be given randomly to graduates and their employers. These tools would be used to gauge both the impact of the Program based on our graduates as well as trends in the field.

Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.

1. Program faculty updated the program materials to bring them more into line with recent changes to NASP standards. Specific changes included updating to the Practicum Student Supervisor Evaluation Forms and the Faculty Rating forms for the Portfolio Evaluations, both to align with the new NASP Practice Domain. This seems to have had a positive impact as all students taking the Praxis were successful.
2. The Practice Logs had a positive impact in being able to identify and advise students when they might be falling behind.
3. Program faculty met with students at both Prairie View A and M and Lamar Universities. We are still assessing the impact of these visit.
4. The workshops have been successful in having the participants get to know one another and to talk about practice of concern typical of field training sites. Such issues include topics such as supplying the requisite number of hours to students, allowing students access to specific training opportunities, the ethical provision of supervision in the field, and keeping up

with current trends.

5. We are continuing to gather these data and add to our data base.

6. We are in the midst of developing the Exit Survey and it will be finalized for our current third-year cohort.

Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2014 - 2015 Cycle Findings.

1. The Praxis test is a Pass-Fail and all of our students (100%) passed during the 2014-2015 academic year. NASP, this past year, instituted a revised version of the exam and therefore we are going to closely monitor our students' progress with respect to the revised version.

2. When the students do their portfolio evaluations, they submit two cases. They collect data for both cases. They are expected to show a positive impact on the child's performance for at least one of the two cases. The students need to understand how to work with the data, how to report those data to others (e.g., teachers/parents), and how they, the practitioner, can have a positive impact. All students need to report their positive impact data in the report submitted. In doing this they have demonstrated practical and theoretical knowledge of the procedures.

3. We are continuing to expand our practicum and internship sites by identifying new and appropriate sites and meeting with administrators from those sites. Criteria include a willing supervisor with at least three years experience who is employed by the district. Site administrators should also be able and open to providing specific practical experiences for the students.
