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Description of Methods

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

- 2009 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

I. PROGRAM DISPOSITION REVIEW

Disposition reviews are conducted at Benchmark II (end of first year in the program) and III (mid-term during second year in the program) for all school psychology students. Domain scores rated as: 1 (unsatisfactory), 2 (minimal), 3 (satisfactory) to 4 (proficient). Total composite scores range from ≤ 15 (unsatisfactory) to 32 (proficient).
Figure 1 – Comparative Benchmark II Means
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Figure 2 – Comparative Benchmark II Means
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Outcome of the Disposition Review Results

As a whole, the 2010 school psychology students displayed satisfactory to proficient attitudes and behaviors within the program (see Fig. 1 and 2). Scores from 2010 Benchmark II data ranged from mean scores of 3.4 for preparedness and continuous learning to 3.8 for reflective practices. At Benchmark III, mean scores ranged from 3.5 for respectful to 3.8 for reflective practices. All mean scores for 2010 fall within the proficient range of performance on Disposition Reviews.

Conclusion(s):

Benchmark II and III Dispositions allow faculty and students to engage in reflective dialogue regarding each students progress and development of the critical skills necessary for success as a grad student and as a professional. Data from 2010 suggests that students are progressing appropriately in these important skills domains.

II. PRACTICUM AND INTERNSHIP STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Graduate students in the school psychology program complete two (2) supervised field practica totaling 600 hours during their second year in the program, and a culminating 1200 hour internship that is their third and final year in the program. Graduate students completing both Practicum I and Practicum II are evaluated through the use of 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).

Outcomes of the Practicum and Internship Student Evaluations

a) Practicum Evaluations

Results from the 2010 evaluations indicate Practicum I students area scores (means) ranged from 4.0 (Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health) to 4.8 (Systems, Organization and Climate) on the 5-point scale Evaluation Guide for School Psychology. Results indicate that Practicum I 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). For more information, please refer to Figure 3.
Results from the 2010 evaluations indicate Practicum II students area scores (means) ranged from 4.1 (Pupil Service Standards) to 4.8 (Systems and Organizations) on a 5-point Likert scale. Evaluation Guide for School Psychology (see Figure 3). Results indicate that practicum students earned above satisfactory scores (4.0 or higher) in all NASP Domains.

Scores on the Stage of Development scale (see Figure 6) indicate that most Practicum II students were between the Practitioner: Initial Stage (5.0) and the Practitioner: Advanced (6.0). Most students were at the Practitioner: Initial Stage (5.0) in all NASP Domains. In several domains practicum students are rated higher on the Stages of Development scale that interns, and higher than anticipated based on their level of training and experience at this point in their programs. This is a trend that has been noticed over several years. Based on previous results and input from field-based supervisors, the format for evaluation tools will be revised over the 2011-2012 school year, due to reported confusion in how to complete this portion of the evaluation tool, which will hopefully remedy these seemingly inconsistent results.

Figure 3 – Practicum I Evaluation Means
Figure 4 - Practicum II Evaluation Means
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b) **Internship Evaluations**

Results indicate that internship area mean scores ranged from 4.7 (Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health) to 4.90 (Professional Work Characteristics and Consultation) on the 5-point *Evaluation Guide for School Psychology* for the Spring 2010 interns. Results indicate that interns earned above satisfactory to highly satisfactory scores (scores of 4.0 and above) in all *Evaluation Guide* areas (see Figure 5).

**Figure 5 – Internship Evaluation Means**
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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).

Scores on the Stage of Development scale (see Graph 6) indicated that Internship students were between the Practitioner: Advanced (4.0) and the Mentor: Initial (5.0) Stages. Most students were at the Practitioner: Advanced Stage (4.0) in all eleven NASP Domains. Lower means were indicated for Internship students in the Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills (x = 4.1 or Practitioner: Advanced Stage), Socialization and Development of Life Skills, Research and Program Evaluation, and Information Technology (x = 4.3 or Practitioner: Advanced Stage) domains. As mentioned previously, all evaluation tools will be revised during the 2011-2012 school year, both to align with the newly revised NASP domains, as well as to clarify the formatting for scoring the Stages of Development scale.

Conclusion(s):

Reviews of the Evaluation Guide for School Psychology and the Stage of Development 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, with the exception of planned revision of evaluation tools to align with newly revised and approved NASP domains.

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) used by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) as requirement for national certification. The passing score established by NASP and recognized by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) is 165. This new ruling was adopted and implemented starting May 31, 2009.

In addition to the total score received by examinees’, the 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, preferably, prior to the start of their one-year internship.

Outcomes of the NCSP Results
In 2010, 100% of the students obtained scores of 165 or higher (see Figure 7), with one student re-taking and passing the exam on the second attempt. As such, every student who took the PRAXIS Exam met the passing criteria of NASP and DPI. Mean averages of student performance indicate strengths in the areas of legal and ethics and research-based behavioral and mental health practices, with areas for need of attention including research-based academic practices.

Figure 7 – Praxis II Domain Percentages

[Diagram showing domain percentages for PRAXIS II: Institution Average % Correct 08/09 and PRAXIS II: Institution Average % Correct 09/10.]
Conclusions

Overall results indicate UW-Stout's School Psychology program is preparing students to achieve the foundational knowledge necessary to pass the NCSP exam. Review of domain area trends will be used to inform and shape upcoming revisions to the program plan in school psychology, with a focus on continuous improvement in identified areas such as research-based academic practices.

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 eleven (11) NASP’s Domains of School Psychology training and practice (same as the Department of Public Instruction content guidelines). 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 eleven (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. degree in School Psychology (for Benchmark II) or Internship (Benchmark III).

Outcomes of the Portfolio Assessment

A review of the portfolio ratings in 2009 revealed all students produced satisfactory portfolios at Benchmarks II and III.

During the 2011-2011 school year, portfolio assessment tools will be revised to align with the newly approved NASP domains, as with all other NASP aligned evaluation tools.

b) Survey of Intern Result

In 2010, 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
Results from the spring of 2010 survey indicate students believed that they gained above average to a lot of knowledge and skill ($x = 4.23$) in most program courses. However, students indicated that they gained below average knowledge and skills in the Research Foundations (EDUC 740, $x = 2.57$). Additional comments indicated that the program was excellent, and most reported they believe they were well prepared for the field of school psychology after taking all program requirements.

**Conclusion(s):**

Intern survey responses suggested the need for further review of the EDUC 740 Research Foundations course. Although content related to research is considered foundational knowledge for Masters and Ed.S. Thesis courses, more information is needed to determine whether the course could emphasize more theoretical and research-related information related to be more focused on student research. Some narrative feedback articulated a desire for more statistical analysis content in research foundations coursework.

c) Program Advisory Committee Results

The program faculty members meet with the School Psychology Program’s Advisory Committee (PAC) 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 2010, one meeting was held. Topics of conversation for the PAC included a presentation of one model for revision to the program, including the addition of defined areas of emphasis or concentration.

**Outcome(s) of the Program Advisory Committee Results:**

Comments from the 2010 meeting indicated support of the current school psychology program, its recent changes, and future plans.

**V. PLAN FOR COMMUNICATING ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

The School Psychology Program faculty meets on a bi-weekly 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 at an upcoming meeting. This guide is a valuable resource for faculty to use in guiding program revisions. Furthermore, this report will be disseminated to the Program Advisory Committee (PAC) in the fall of the 2011-2012 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. PRAXIS II data suggests while students are generally proficient across all content areas, a needs exists for the program to continue to work to enhance and/or further emphasize the following content areas into new or existing courses: educational foundations and academic interventions. This goal will be addressed through enhancement of existing course content, as well as future proposals for new course content as part of an upcoming revision to the program (still in process of development).

C. Based on data from Intern Surveys, program faculty will consult with faculty teaching EDUC 740 Research Foundations, to ensure that goals and objectives for the course are consistent with needs of our students.

D. Recruitment for the vacant faculty position in school psychology will be a priority for this school year, to ensure a stable and high quality faculty who will lead the program into a promising future.

E. Based in part on Program Advisory Committee (PAC) recommendations, the program will continue with comprehensive revision to the program of study, to align both with updated NASP domains as well as to stay current with the evolving nature of the field of school psychology. Revisions are in process, and will be submitted for initial comments and input in the coming months.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine R. Peterson, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Program Director for School Psychology
University of Wisconsin-Stout