

Psychology MA (School Psychology)
Assessment Plan Summary

Psychology MA (School Psychology)

Foundational Competence In School Psychology

Goal Description:

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

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)

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:

Six SSP students took the PRAXIS II exam during the past academic year. Total Test Scores ranged from 162 to 177, with an average score of 168.

All six students (100%) demonstrated scores at or above the average performance range for two domains (i.e., Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery and Direct & Indirect Services for Children, Families and Schools), 4/6 students (67%) demonstrated scores at or above the average performance range for one (i.e., Systems Level Services), and 5/6 students (83%) demonstrated scores at or above the average performance range for one (i.e., Professional Practices: Practices that Permeate All Aspects of Service and Delivery). Ultimately, the Praxis II exam is scored in a Pass/Fail fashion. While we had limited instances of students not meeting the average score requirement on an individual domain, all students successfully passed the exam.

Please see Table 4.

Attached Files

[Table 4 -- Praxis II Data \(2015-2016\)](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

National School Psychology Exam (PRAXIS II)

Action Description:

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 monitor their progress.

Skill Application

Goal Description:

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

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

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.

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. 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:

Finding Skill Application

Practicum Field Supervisor Ratings

There were six candidates who participated in the final Practicum experience during the Spring 2016 semester. Field supervisors rated our candidates, as a whole, very well and solidly within the “Competent” range. Five of the six Practicum students (83%) achieved an average supervisor rating equal to or above the target score of 3.0. The student who failed to meet the target score earned a 2.53, which indicates ‘Improvement Needed’. While these ratings indicate additional supervision needed, communication with the site supervisor revealed that the student is simply in need of additional experience (as is expected) and supervision as s/he progresses through the program. The faculty have taken special care to secure a site supervisor for this student who will best meet his/her needs in the coming year. The university supervisor for the internship course will work closely with this site supervisor to address any needs that may arise during the course of the 2016-2017 year. Finally, the cohort average rating within each of the ten Standard areas measured exceeded the criterion score of 3.0. (See Table 1A.)

Internship Field Supervisor Ratings

Six candidates participated in the Internship experience during the 2015-2016 academic year. Field supervisors rated our candidates, as a whole, very well and solidly within the “Competent” range. All six candidates (100%) achieved an average supervisor rating above the target score of 3.0. Additionally, the cohort average rating within each of the ten Standard areas measured exceeded the criterion score of 3.0. (See Table 1B.)

FRF Portfolio Reviews

Six 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 six candidates (100%) achieved the criterion of 85% or higher on the average FRF rating as well as the overall rating of ‘3’ or higher for the case. For the Behavioral Consultation/Intervention case and/or the Counseling case, all six candidates (100%) achieved the criterion of 85% or higher on the average FRF rating as well as the overall rating of ‘3’ or higher for the case. (See Tables 2A and 2C.)

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, all six candidates (100%) achieved an average PIR score at or above the cut score of 24, with none of the six candidates (0%) receiving scores of ‘0’ on these case ratings. For the Behavioral Consultation/Intervention and/or Counseling cases, five candidates (83%) achieved an average PIR score at or above the cut score of 21, with none of the six candidates (0%) receiving scores of ‘0’ on these case ratings. (See Tables 2B and 2D.)

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. All six internship candidates (100%) achieved at least a moderate impact (see definition above) on student learning for the Academic Intervention Case. Regarding the positive impact data for the Behavioral or Counseling Intervention case, 5 of the 6 students (83%) reported data indicating at least moderate impact (as defined above). The remaining candidate reported positive impact data in a metric not listed above (i.e., Percent of Treatment Objectives Achieved = 100%). In this case, while the metric provided is not part of our standard evaluation approach, the results indicate a positive impact. All ten (100%) candidates either met or exceeded the expectation of a moderate impact for one of the two cases submitted. (See Tables 3A and 3B.)

Attached Files

Rating Forms and Positive Impact Data

Action Description:

All six students who completed the Internship experience were rated as competent by their field supervisors. In the coming years, the faculty will continue working closely with field supervisors throughout the internship experience to ensure ongoing excellence in training and performance.

Five of the six practicum students were rated as meeting expectations for their level of training. As was stated in the Findings section (above), communication with the site supervisor revealed that the student is simply in need of additional experience (as is expected) and supervision as s/he progresses through the program. The faculty have taken special care to secure a site supervisor for this student who will best meet his/her needs in the coming year. The university supervisor for the internship course will work closely with this field supervisor and student to address any needs that may arise during the course of the 2016-2017 year.

Finally, six Interns submitted two cases in their portfolios. We are encouraged by the positive impact indicated for each of these cases, as well as the clear increase in the explicit and concise reporting of positive impact data. Each of the Interns reported the required positive impact data on their Academic Intervention Reports, while 5 of 6 reported the required positive impact data on their Behavior or Counseling Intervention Report. The University Supervisor for Internship and the school psychology faculty will continue working closely with students throughout their internship year to ensure that outcome assessment methodology is consistent with SSP program expectations.

Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement

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

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.

Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:

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.

All of the students (6/6; 100%) who took the Praxis II Exam during the 2015-2016 academic year (AY) earned a passing score. While the structure of the exam changed somewhat (i.e., the assessment domains were conceptualized somewhat differently and the scoring range was changed), those who took the exam in AY 2015-2016 performed at levels commensurate with previous years.

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.

Generally, the faculty observed significant improvement with the inclusion of positive impact data in portfolio submissions. All of the students (6/6; 100%) included positive impact data within their Academic Intervention reports. Further, these data indicated moderate to large positive impact on clients receiving Academic Intervention services.

Five of the six students included positive impact data in their Behavior Consultation or Counseling Intervention reports. These data also indicated moderate to large positive impact on clients receiving Behavior or Counseling Intervention services. The remaining student included positive impact data, although the data did not fit within the designated methods of measurement: effect size, percent of non-overlapping data points, or R-square. Instead, the student reported their positive impact via the percent of treatment objectives achieved. In this case, 100% of the treatment objectives were achieved. While those results are encouraging, students must be encouraged to utilize methods of outcome measurement that are more widely accepted.

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.

We were able to add one new Practicum site for the 2015-2016 year and were very encouraged by the experiences obtained therein. All of our Practicum II students (6/6; 100%) and our Interns (6/6; 100%) were supervised by licensed specialists in school psychology who had a minimum of three years' experience. Furthermore, all of the students in these two groups were able to successfully complete the practical experiences required for their training level.

Plan for Continuous Improvement

Closing Summary:

1. The department has hired two additional core school psychology faculty members who will begin in the Fall (2016). One major goal is to quickly integrate our new faculty members into the local community and schools. To this end, each of the new faculty members has been assigned to teach a Practicum course. This will require the new faculty members to supervise field-based cases in local districts, which will increase their opportunities to work with school administrators as well as local school psychologists who supervise our students in later practice. For support purposes, each of the new faculty members has been assigned a mentor/supervisor from the school psychology program faculty who will guide them in their efforts as new supervisors.
2. While we noted significant improvement in the Interns' reporting of positive impact data, we would like to continue our efforts to train students and encourage site-based supervisors to report these data. To this end, we are conducting a Supervisor's Workshop in August (2016) which will include a unit on outcomes measurement and reporting of positive impact data (within the SHSU SSP Program Framework). The Interns and their individual Site Supervisors are asked to attend this workshop, as well as other supervisors who provide supervision for our students in the Practicum II course.
3. Finally, we would like to continue to grow our base of local Practicum and Internship sites as well as site supervisors. While we currently have a variety and sufficient number of field-based placements for our students, we would like to prepare for program growth by establishing new opportunities.