

# School Psychology SSP

## 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 candidates took the PRAXIS II exam during the past academic year. Total Test Scores ranged from 151 to 175, with an average score of 167. (Please see Table 4.)

Regarding individual domain score, four of six candidates (67%) demonstrated scores within or above the average performance range for Domain 1 (Professional Practices: Practices that Permeate All Aspects of Service and Delivery). Further, five of six candidates (83%) demonstrated scores within or above the average performance range for Domains 2 (Direct & Indirect Services for Children, Families and Schools), 3 (Systems-Level Services), and 4 (Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery). Ultimately, however, the Praxis II exam is scored in a Pass/Fail fashion. While we had limited instances of candidates not meeting the average score expectation on an individual domain, all candidates successfully passed the exam.

Attached Files

 [Table 4 -- Praxis II Data \(2016-2017\)](#)

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, thereby meeting program expectations for the total score. Further, these scores are at or above expectations for state licensure (TX) and national certification as a School Psychologist. 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. 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:**

##### **Practicum Field Supervisor Ratings**

There were six candidates who participated in the final Practicum experience during the Spring 2017 semester. Field supervisors rated our candidates, as a whole, very well and solidly within the “Competent” range. All seven Practicum students (100%) achieved an average supervisor rating equal to or above the target score of 3.0 (Range = 3.00 – 3.27; Mean = 3.13). Finally, the cohort average rating within each of the ten Standard areas measured exceeded the criterion score of 3.0 (Range = 3.00 – 3.58; Mean = 3.13). (See Table 1A.)

##### **Internship Field Supervisor Ratings**

Six candidates participated in the Internship experience during the 2016-2017 academic year. Field supervisors rated our candidates, as a whole, very well and solidly within the “Competent” range. Five candidates (i.e., Candidates 1 through 5) achieved an average supervisor rating above the target score of 3.0 (Range = 3.6 – 4.76; Mean = 4.10). Additionally, for Candidates 1 through 5, the average rating within each of the ten Standard areas measured exceeded the criterion score of 3.0 (Range = 3.82 – 4.35; Mean = 4.10). (See Table 1B.) At the time of this report, a Field Supervisor Rating was not available for Candidate 6. Near the conclusion of the semester, the Field Supervisor for Candidate 6 took an emergency leave from her position. The Internship Coordinator attempted (unsuccessfully) to obtain ratings from the supervisor as well as the lead supervisor for the district. Furthermore, the Program Director attempted (unsuccessfully) to obtain ratings from the Candidate and the lead supervisor.

##### **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 two of the six candidates (33%) receiving scores of ‘0’ on these case ratings. For the Behavioral Consultation/Intervention and/or Counseling cases, all six candidates (100%) 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 submitted cases 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 (e.g., Cohen’s  $d$ ),  $R^2$ , or percentage of non-overlapping data points (PND). 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 6 students (83%) reported at least a moderate impact (as defined above). The remaining candidate reported a small to moderate positive impact in his/her report. However, it should be noted that all six (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**

[2016 - 2017 SACS Data Tables \(School Psychology\).](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

##### **Rating Forms and Positive Impact Data**

**Action Description:**

All seven 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 continued excellence in training and performance.

All six practicum students were rated as meeting expectations for their level of training. As with our ongoing consultation and collaboration with Internship supervisors, the faculty will continue working closely with Practicum supervisors to ensure continued excellence in training.

Regarding Portfolio case reviews, the candidates were generally rated quite highly by program faculty. However, as was previously noted, two candidates earned a single ‘zero’ rating on their Behavioral Consultation Procedural Integrity Rubric (PIR) by one faculty member. While these two candidates each earned a single score of ‘0’ on the PIR, they also earned a perfect (i.e., 33/33 points) or near perfect score (i.e., 32/33) on the PIR. With the introduction of two new school psychology faculty members in 2016-2017 and 2017-2018, increased clarity in program expectations for student performance is of paramount importance. The school psychology faculty will meet in the Fall of 2017 for a review and didactic training on the portfolio evaluation tools (i.e., the PIR and the Faculty Rating Form). Special attention will be given to program expectations for explicit inclusion of elements in portfolio reports and to increasing interrater reliability among the reviewers.

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 explicit reporting of positive impact data. Each of the Interns reported the required positive impact data on their Academic Intervention and their Behavior or Counseling Intervention Report. This is a clear improvement from the 2015-2016 cycle, in which only 5 of 6 interns reported positive impact data on the 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 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 practica. 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.

**Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:**

1. One of the two newly hired faculty members began teaching school psychology courses in the Fall of 2016. This faculty member taught a Practicum course focused on counseling interventions, and supervised cases in three local school districts. In addition to the supervision of our students, this faculty member worked closely with administrators at each of these districts to identify at-risk students or those otherwise in need of services. Further, this faculty member began work to establish relationships with local organizations (e.g., the YMCA) for the purposes of research partnerships and educational workshops. This faculty member’s assigned mentor assisted her/him in establishing momentum with a research program and pursuing licensure as a psychologist in the state of Texas.

Unfortunately, due to not competing his/her doctoral dissertation prior to his/her hire date, the second newly hired faculty member was unable to begin teaching graduate-level courses in the Fall of 2016. Instead, this faculty member taught undergraduate courses in the department and focused efforts on completion of his/her doctoral dissertation.

2. A workshop was conducted in August 2016 with great success. Both practicum and internship supervisors from area schools attended, and special attention was given to measurement of outcomes and reporting positive impact data. As was noted in our assessment results, all of the Interns reported at least one measure of positive impact for each of their portfolio cases.

3. While we did not establish any new practicum sites for our students during the 2016-2017 year, we maintained positive and productive relationships with each of our current practicum sites. Regarding internship sites, we are pleased to have established relationships with new school districts for four of the seven outgoing interns. Three of these districts are in the greater Houston area, while one district is located in Washington state.

## **Plan for Continuous Improvement**

### **Closing Summary:**

1. As was noted in the Update to the 2015-2016 Plan for Continuous Improvement, one of our two newly hired faculty members was unable to teach for the school psychology program during the 2016-2017 school year. Therefore, for the Fall of 2017, one goal is to quickly integrate this faculty member into the local community and schools. To this end, this faculty member has been assigned to teach an Advanced School Psychology course, which includes a field-based component. This will require the faculty member to work with school psychologists, teachers, and administrators in local districts, thereby establishing new contacts for the faculty member and foundational opportunities for the development of our students' knowledge of the field. For support purposes, the faculty member has also been assigned a mentor/supervisor from the school psychology program faculty who will provide guidance in establishing momentum for a research program and teaching graduate-level courses.

2. We noted significant improvement in the Interns' reporting of positive impact data, with all of the interns providing positive impact data for each of their portfolio cases. For the Behavior Consultation case, each of the interns provided a Cohen's  $d$  value. However, it was noted that only half of the interns also provided data for Non-Overlapping Data points (NDP). While providing two measures of positive impact for an individual case is not currently required, multiple outcome measures can provide a more comprehensive picture of impact. Therefore, the instructor of the Behavior Consultation Course (PSYC 5338) and the Internship Coordinator (PSYC 6371) will encourage/prompt students to provide multiple outcomes for individual cases where applicable.

3. Finally, we would like to increase the number of applicants from local universities that do not house specialist-level school psychology programs (e.g., Prairie View A&M, Texas A&M, Lamar University). In the Fall of 2017, SSP program faculty will meet to establish a list of area schools for recruitment, establish contacts at those schools within the colleges of education and departments of psychology, and to develop a presentation on the field of school psychology and the benefits of training in the SSP Program at Sam Houston State University. We would like to meet with junior and senior level students and Psi Chi organizations for at least two Universities during the Fall of 2017.