Preparing teachers, leaders, and student services professionals who are...

**Reflective Practitioners**

- to engage in... 
  - evidence-based practice.

- who can reflect on...
  - actions, performances, and practice

- in the contexts of...
  - planning and preparation,
  - learning environments,
  - professional practice, and
  - professional responsibilities
Description of Methods

The following assessment tools and strategies were utilized to determine student performance, progress, and levels of satisfaction in the major:

- 2007 Assessment in the Major report outcomes
- Faculty review/selection of program applicants
- Transcripts review
- Criterion-referenced
- Student scores on the National Certification in School Psychology Exam (NCSP) or Praxis II
- Students portfolio reviews
- Faculty reviews of student performance, including academic progress, experiential evaluations, and professional conduct
- Student disposition reviews
- Review of placement results
- Survey of interns regarding their perceptions of program competencies and coursework
- 2008 NASP Review Report

I. PROGRAM DISPOSITION REVIEW

Disposition reviews were conducted for all (N=19, Fall 2006 cohort, n=11; and Fall 2007 cohort n=8; respectively) school psychology graduate students (Benchmark II and Benchmark III) in 2008. Area scores range from 1 (unsatisfactory) to 2 (minimal) to 3 (satisfactory) to 4 (proficient). Total scores range from ≤ 15 (unsatisfactory) to 32 (proficient).

Outcome of the Disposition Review Results

As a group, the 2008 school psychology students displayed satisfactory to proficient attitudes and behaviors within the program (see Fig. 1 and 2). Three (3) students earned minimal area scores in attendance (n=1), preparedness (n=2), positive climate (n=2), reflective (n=1), and cooperative & collaborative (n=1). No student earned composite scores indicating minimal performance in 2008.
Conclusion(s):

Benchmark II and Benchmark III disposition review results indicated a need to address areas of deficient disposition ratings with problematic students only (n=3). As a cohort, disposition review (see Fig.1 and 2) results did not indicate a need to address any deficient disposition ratings in 2008.

II. PRACTICUM AND INTERNSHIP STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Graduate students in the school psychology program complete two (2) supervised field practica and one year-long internship. Graduate students (Fall 2007 cohort, n=8) completing Practicum I during the Spring 2008, are evaluated through the use of a newly revised assessment tool, The Evaluation Guide for School Psychology, which includes two rating scales: 1) the student’s level of performance (i.e. needs improvement, satisfactory, and/or highly satisfactory), and 2) the student’s current stage of development (i.e. observer, novice, practitioner, and/or mentor). The Student’s Level of Performance uses a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (needs improvement) to 5 (highly satisfactory). The Stage of Development evaluates students on a developmental continuum ranging from Stage 1 (observer) to Stage 4 (mentor).

Graduate students (Fall 2006 cohort, n=11) completing Practicum II during the Fall 2008, are evaluated through the use of two assessment tools: 1) the Evaluation Guide for School Psychology Practicum, and 2) the Developmental Performance Appraisal. The Evaluation Guide uses a Likert-style format ranging from 1 (needs improvement) to 5 (highly satisfactory). The Developmental Performance Appraisal evaluates students on a developmental continuum ranging from Stage 1 (observer) to Stage 4 (mentor).
Outcomes of the Practicum and Internship Student Evaluations

a) Practicum Evaluations

Results from the 2008 evaluations indicate Practicum I students (Fall 2007 cohort, n=8) area scores (means) ranged from 4.3 (Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health) to 4.95 (Professional Work Characteristics) on a newly revised 5-point Likert scale Evaluation Guide for School Psychology (see Table 1).

Results indicate that practicum students earned above satisfactory scores in all areas (Data-based Decision Making; Consultation and Collaboration; Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills; Socialization and Development of Life Skills; Student Diversity in Development and Learning; School and Systems Organization, Policy Development, and Climate; Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health; Home/School/Community Collaboration; Research and Program Evaluation; School Psychology Practice and Development; Information Technology; Professional Work Characteristics; and Communication Skills).

Mean scores on the Stage of Development scale indicated that most Practicum I students were between the Novice - Initial Stage (3.0) and the Practitioner - Initial Stage (5.0). Most students were at the Novice - Advanced Stage (4.0) in all NASP Domains. Lower means were indicated for Practicum I students in the Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health (x = 3.0 to 3.9 or Novice - Initial Stage), as well as the Socialization and Development of Life Skills (x= 3.0 to 4.0 or Novice - Initial Stage to Novice - Advanced Stage) domains.
Table 1.

Mean Scores and Stage of Development based on NASP Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NASP Domains</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Stage of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data-based Decision Making and Accountability</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>Novice: Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation and Collaboration</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>Novice: Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>Novice: Initial to Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization and Development of Life Skills</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>Novice: Initial to Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Diversity in Development and Learning</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>Novice: Initial to Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Systems Organization, Policy Development, and Climate</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>Novice: Initial to Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>Novice: Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/School/Community Collaboration</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>Novice: Initial to Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>Novice: Initial to Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology Practice and Development</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>Novice: Advanced to Practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>Practitioner: Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Work Characteristics</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from the 2008 evaluations indicate Practicum II students (Fall 2006 cohort, n=11) area scores (means) ranged from 4.0 (Pupil Service Standards) to 5.0 (Supervisory Relationships) on the 5-point scale Evaluation Guide for School Psychology. Results indicate that Practicum II students earned above satisfactory scores in all areas (General; Personal Characteristics; Interpersonal Relations; Communication and Consultation Skills; Supervisory Relationships; Assessment Skills; Professional Growth; Direct Service; and Pupil Services). For more information, refer to Fig. 3.
Fig. 3  Comparative results of Practicum II students based by content areas and cohorts.

Mean scores on the Developmental Performance Appraisal form indicated that although most Practicum II students were between the Novice Stage and the Practitioner Stage, some students were at the Practitioner Stage in the Knowledge and Performance competency areas. A particular strength was noted in the Information Technology domain ($x = 3.09$ to $3.14$ or Practitioner). Lower means were indicated for Practicum II students in the School and System Organization, Policy Development, and Climate ($x = 2.23$ to $2.55$ or Novice) and Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills ($x = 2.27$ to $2.59$ or Novice) domains.

b) Internship Evaluations

Results indicate that internship area scores (means) ranged from 4.40 (Pupil Service Standards) to 4.79 (Personal Characteristics) on the 5-point Evaluation Guide for School Psychology for the Spring 2008 interns (Fall 2005 cohort, n=7). Results indicate that interns earned above satisfactory to highly satisfactory scores in all Evaluation Guide areas (see Fig. 4). Mean scores on the Developmental Performance Appraisal form indicated that most interns were at the Practitioner Stage in the eleven Knowledge and Performance competency areas at the conclusion of their internship year.
Results for the Fall 2008 interns (Fall 2006 cohort, n=11) indicate area scores (means) ranged from 4.06 (Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills) to 4.67 (Professional Work Characteristics) on a newly revised 5-point Evaluation Guide for School Psychology (see Table 2).

Results indicate that interns earned above satisfactory scores in all Evaluation Guide areas (Data-based Decision Making; Consultation and Collaboration; Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills; Socialization and Development of Life Skills; Student Diversity in Development and Learning; School and Systems Organization, Policy Development, and Climate; Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health; Home/School/Community Collaboration; Research and Program Evaluation; School Psychology Practice and Development; Information Technology; Professional Work Characteristics; and Communication Skills).
### Table 2.
**Mean Scores and Stage of Development based on NASP Domains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NASP Domains</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Stage of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data-based Decision Making and Accountability</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>Practitioner: Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation and Collaboration</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>Practitioner: Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Practitioner: Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization and Development of Life Skills</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>Practitioner: Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Diversity in Development and Learning</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>Practitioner: Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Systems Organization, Policy Development, and Climate</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>Practitioner: Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Practitioner: Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/School/Community Collaboration</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>Practitioner: Initial to Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Practitioner: Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology Practice and Development</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>Practitioner: Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>Practitioner: Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Work Characteristics</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion(s):**

Reviews of the Evaluation Guide for School Psychology, the Stage of Development, and the Developmental Performance Appraisal forms indicate that students met or exceeded the performance and developmental standards relative to their practica and internship. No changes or program improvements are suggested by the practica or internship evaluation data.

### III. PRAXIS II: CONTENT TEST SUMMARY OR NATIONAL SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS EXAM RESULTS

It is a program requirement to take the National Certification in School Psychology (NCSP) exam (PRAXIS II – National School Psychology Exam) used by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) as requirement for national certification. The National Association of School Psychologist’s previous passing score was 600 during the 2008 year. Further Wisconsin’s Department of Public Instruction (DPI) adopted a cut-off score of 660 or above for program completers after August 31, 2007. **NOTE:** Starting in 2009, DPI adopted a cut-off score of 165 or above for program completers after May 31, 2009.

In addition to the total score, the NCSP or PRAXIS II exam also report scores addressing the following content areas: 1) Data-based Decision Making, 2) Research-based Academic Practices, 3) Research-Based Behavioral and Mental Health Practices, 4) Consultation and Collaboration, 5) Applied Psychological
Foundations, and 6) Ethical, Legal, and Professional Foundations. Students and interns can take the
national certification exam at any point during their graduate program.

Outcomes of the NCSP Results

In 2008, 100% of the students (11 out of 11 students) obtained scored of 690 or better (refer to Fig. 5). As
such, every student in this cohort met the passing criteria of NASP and Wisconsin’s Department of Public
Instruction. Furthermore, all met or exceeded the criterion score (i.e., 620) set by Wisconsin’s Board of
Psychology.

![Fig. 5 Comparative Praxis II scores for school psychology cohorts since spring 2005.](image)

Conclusions

Overall results indicate UW-Stout’s School Psychology program is preparing students to achieve the
foundational knowledge necessary to pass the NCSP exam. In the past, NCSP mean area scores and
trend scores suggested a possible program need for additional emphasis on Applied Educational
Foundations. However, current area scores suggest recent programmatic changes have led to increases in
student knowledge relevant to this area. However, because of the limited sample size, NCSP data from
future cohorts are needed before definitive conclusions can be made regarding how recent program
changes have impacted student knowledge in this area.

IV. OTHER INFORMATION

a) Portfolio Assessment (Benchmark II and Benchmark III)

Students initiate and complete components of a portfolio over the course of the program. The
completed portfolio includes evidences or artifacts demonstrating professional competence in all 11
Department of Public Instruction content guidelines (the same as NASP’s eleven domains of
school psychology training and practice). A partially completed portfolio (Benchmark II)
demonstrating competency in 8 out the 11 domains is submitted to the program faculty for review after completion of the M.S.Ed. and prior to admittance to the Ed.S. in School Psychology Program. At Benchmark III, students re-submit their portfolio to demonstrate competency in all 11 domains. Faculty members rate the portfolio materials. Based on a review of the portfolio ratings, academic performance, and professional conduct, a student is either recommended for, or denied admittance to, the Ed.S. in School Psychology Program (for Benchmark II) or internship (Benchmark III).

Outcomes of the Portfolio Assessment

A review of the portfolio ratings in 2008 revealed all students produced satisfactory portfolios at Benchmarks II and III.

b) Survey of Intern Results

In 2008, as in previous years, school psychology interns were surveyed to determine their perceptions regarding their previous coursework. Each intern was asked to respond to questions on a 5-point Likert-style survey (1 = No knowledge or Skill gained to 5 = A lot of knowledge or Excellent skills gained) to assess how much knowledge or skill the student gained in each course. Further, interns are asked to identify the five most important courses in terms of how helpful they were in preparing them for their internship year. They also are asked to identify which courses were not helpful or had overlapping content.

Outcomes of the Intern Survey

Data was not available at time of submission.

Conclusion(s):

Data was not available at time of submission.

c) Program Advisory Committee Results

The program faculty members meet with the School Psychology Program’s Advisory Committee two times a year. Internal and external colleagues meet to discuss updates in the program and solicit information from the committee about program needs and future goals. In 2008, one meeting was held.

Outcome(s) of the Program Advisory Committee Results:

Comments from the 2008 meeting indicated support of the current school psychology program and its recent changes.
d) 2008 NASP Review Results

The program was reviewed by the National Association of School Psychologists in the Fall 2008. As a result of the review, the program received "full NASP approval" for a period of two years (until Dec., 2011). The report commended the school psychology program for its substantial changes to the Practicum and Internship evaluation forms/requirements, as well as the addition of a new course in prevention and crisis intervention. Further, the report indicated it was evident that the program uses data in a systematic fashion to improve the quality of the program.

The report also pointed a need for:

1. Provide evidence of attainment in all 11 NASP domains, which continues to be lacking.

2. Provide documentation and data to show that program candidates integrate domains of knowledge and apply professional skills in delivering comprehensive range of services evidenced by measurable positive impact on children, youth, families, and other consumers.

Outcome(s) of the NASP 2008

As a result of the review, the program received "full NASP approval" for a period of two years (until Dec., 2011). The report commended the school psychology program for its substantial changes to the Practicum and Internship evaluation forms/requirements, as well as the addition of a new course in prevention and crisis intervention.

Conclusions

The report indicated a need for the program to provide attainment data for all 11 NASP domains. In response to the NASP report, faculty will discuss and address ways to provide artifacts/data to show attainment of all domains.

V. PLAN FOR COMMUNICATING ASSESSMENT RESULTS

The School Psychology Program faculty meets on a monthly basis to discuss program issues and plan for the future. This Assessment in the Major report will be disseminated to all members of the program faculty, and the results will be discussed by the program faculty in the program's meeting schedule for October, 2009. Furthermore, this report will be disseminated to the Program Advisory Committee in the fall of the 2009-2010 academic year.

VI and VII. CONCLUSIONS AND ACTION PLAN TO IMPROVE TEACHING AND/OR ADVISEMENT IN THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM

A. Previous results indicated students were in need of more information about academic/behavioral prevention and interventions. Student performance on the NCSP exam, intern surveys, and alumni surveys will be analyzed in the future to determine whether additional changes are needed.
B. Results from the 2008 NASP review indicated the need for attainment of all 11 NASP domains. The report also indicated the need for documentation and data to show that program candidates integrate domains of knowledge and apply professional skills in delivering comprehensive range of services evidenced by measurable positive impact on children, youth, families, and other consumers.

Respectfully submitted,

Carlos Dejud, Ph.D.
Interim Program Director
School Psychology Program