

Institutional Effectiveness Report

Academic Year 2011-2012

*Master of Science in Applied Psychology
Specialist in School Psychology*

*Sam F. Broughton, Ph.D.
Coordinator of M.S./S.S.P., School Psychology Option*

*Farrah M. Hughes, Ph.D.
Coordinator of M.S., Clinical/Counseling Psychology Option*

*John R. Hester, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Psychology*

November 28, 2012

Mission and Goals

Francis Marion University is responsive to the needs of the region by offering the Master of Science in Applied Psychology (MSAP) and the Specialist in School Psychology (SSP) and proposing program modifications in these professional degree programs as indicated. Graduates of the MSAP program in Clinical/Counseling Psychology and the SSP program in School Psychology will have developed the knowledge and skills necessary to work as professionals in clinical, school, health, and other community settings as scientist practitioners. The MSAP degree in the School Psychology program is an intermediate degree rather than a terminal degree, and students in the School Psychology Option must complete both the MSAP and the SSP to be eligible for practice. The MSAP program adheres to the standards of training of the Council of Applied Master's Programs in Psychology (CAMPP), and is accredited by the Masters in Psychology and Counseling Accreditation Council (MPCAC). The SSP program adheres to the standards of training of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), is approved as a specialist-level training program of school psychologists by NASP, and is nationally recognized by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Students and graduates of the MSAP and SSP programs bring scholarship and reflection to their work, as well as an understanding of diversity in clientele, methodology, and application. MSAP and SSP faculty produce scholarship that enhances teaching, involves students, and contributes to the profession of psychology. MSAP and SSP faculty members consult with and render academic and practical assistance to local human service agencies, hospitals, and regional schools.

Assessment Activities

The program monitors admission and graduation rates, as well as quantitative characteristics of applicants and matriculated students. Assessment activities are described in more detail below.

Consistent with our mission and goals, best practices for training master's level psychologists are monitored by NASP/NCATE for School Psychology, and CAMPP and MPCAC for clinical/counseling psychology. The evolving standards for licensure of Professional Counselors and Psycho-Educational Specialists by the SC Board of Examiners for Licensure of Professional Counselors, Marriage and Family Therapists, and Psycho-Educational Specialists are monitored, so that graduates will meet didactic training requirements for the appropriate South Carolina license upon graduation.

Practica for the school option are associated with specified applied courses, although students may remain at a given site for multiple practica. Clinical/counseling practica ideally are designed so that students are placed at one site for two consecutive semesters in order to provide a stronger foundation upon which to build applied clinical skills in real-world settings. The number of required practica varies with option. Practica require a minimum of 50 clock hours of practice per course (i.e., PSY 600) and prescribed clinical experiences in association with classroom learning. Students are required to maintain logs of activities and receive case supervision and consultation throughout each practicum, and supervisor ratings are obtained during and at the end of practica. School Psychology students also submit a portfolio of work samples at the end of each practicum.

First-year and second-year students in the School Psychology option take both a written and an oral examination at the end of spring semester to monitor knowledge and skill development as a function of progress through the program. The oral examination requirement has been ongoing for a number of years. This was the sixth year for the use of the written examination. Oral and written exams are used to monitor student growth in knowledge and skill throughout the program, and mastery of NASP skill domain areas, as well as to determine correlations with later performance on the Praxis examination.

The performance of all graduates (Clinical/Counseling and School Psychology) is evaluated during and at the conclusion of their required internships by field supervisors. Interns also provide work logs, and School Psychology interns additionally provide work samples/portfolios (i.e., assessment reports, treatment/intervention plans, counseling/consultation notes, project summaries), which are evaluated by field supervisors and by the faculty formatively as part of the internship seminar and summatively at the conclusion of internship.

School Psychology graduates complete an applied research project during internship and are required to present their research findings and results at the university-wide research poster sessions at the end of the spring semester of their internship.

School Psychology graduates complete the ETS Praxis II Examination required for certification as a School Psychologist II and licensure as a Psycho-Educational Specialist.

Since the 2007-2008 academic year, advanced clinical/counseling psychology students have been eligible to participate in the Graduate Student Application (GSA) process to become National Certified Counselors (NCC). That is, the FMU clinical/counseling psychology option gained approval from the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC) for FMU students to begin applying for national certification while still enrolled in graduate school, which enables them to take the National Counselor Exam (NCE) prior to graduation. NCE scores are used not only for national certification, but also for state LPC licensure. The first group of students – seven in all – took the NCE on the FMU campus on October 17, 2009. All seven students passed and scored at or above the mean in all CACREP and Counselor Work Behavior areas. Furthermore, the FMU clinical/counseling students scored above the means for both CACREP and non-CACREP programs. One clinical/counseling student took the NCE exam on April 17, 2010, and three more took the NCE on the FMU campus on October 16, 2010. All four of those students passed as well, and all scores were at or above the means for CACREP and non-CACREP programs. The next group of students (six in total) was scheduled to take the NCE on campus on October 15, 2011. However, during the Fall 2011 semester the NBCC developed stricter inclusion criteria for participating in the NCC-GSA program. After conducting an additional review of our curriculum, they determined that we should no longer be eligible for inclusion in the NCC-GSA program. The NCC Credentialing Services Administrator explained that they no longer accept applications from students in anything other than counseling programs; because our program is a psychology program, they do not wish us to participate in the NCC-GSA process. Regardless, we continue to monitor the NCE passing rate of our graduates, and to date, the passing rate continues to be 100%.

The level of faculty scholarship, community service, and student involvement in faculty research is obtained from activities reported in the annual faculty reports.

Summary of Ongoing Assessment Activities

During the 2011-2012 academic year (Fall and Spring) 17 newly accepted students enrolled in the program (10 in clinical/counseling and 7 in school psychology). This compares to 17 students that entered the program the previous academic year (8 in clinical/counseling and 9 in school psychology). Average GRE scores were 460 (GRE-Verbal) and 521 (GRE-Quantitative). The average Verbal score increased 15 points and Quantitative increased 3 points since 2010-2011. This year's average overall undergraduate GPA for newly enrolled students was 3.38, and the Psychology GPA was 3.58, as compared to 3.42 and 3.58 last year. Both GRE scores and GPA continue to fluctuate within a relatively narrow range from year to year. Overall, headcount enrollment in the program is 48 compared to 46 the previous year. Eleven students graduated from the degree program during 2011-2012 (6 clinical/counseling and 5 school). This compares to 11 the previous year. As in previous years, the overall size of the program remained relatively stable.

**Data for Applied Psychology Program:
Newly Enrolled Students, Graduates, and Total Enrollment**

		2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Total MSAP:	Newly Enrolled	18	16	17	17
	GRE-V	445	450	445	460
	GRE-Q	513	533	518	521
	GPA (CUM)	3.2	3.5	3.42	3.38
	GPA (PSY)	3.4	3.5	3.58	3.58
	Graduates	15	13	11	11
	Total Students	57	45	46	48
Clinical/Counseling:	Newly Enrolled	9	9	8	10
	GRE-V	451	446	428	460
	GRE-Q	546	543	523	510
	GPA (CUM)	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.42
	GPA (PSY)	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.59
	Graduates	8	8	4	6
	Total Students	29	23	22	26
School:	Newly Enrolled	9	7	9	7
	GRE-V	440	456	461	460
	GRE-Q	481	519	514	537
	GPA (CUM)	3.0	3.3	3.43	3.32
	GPA (PSY)	3.4	3.4	3.52	3.56
	Graduates	7	5	7	5
	Total Students	28	21	24	22

School Psychology Option Assessment-Written and Oral Examinations

The written examination taken by school psychology option students consists of 90 multiple-choice questions and was designed to be similar in content and format to the Praxis II examination required for certification and licensure, and it is updated regularly to reflect changes in the field and Praxis content. The examination was completely revised for 2011, and so results are not comparable with previous years. Additionally, all students were required to identify themselves on their test papers. Previously, the examination could be taken anonymously. Analysis of previous exam results intimated requiring students to identify themselves might improve motivation. Being able to identify each test taker also will allow program evaluation statistics to include correlation of the program's written examination with the Praxis II required for certification and licensure.

Results of School Psychology Written Exam for 2011-2012

Class	All	Third Year Cohort	Second Year Cohort	First Year Cohort	Number of items
	Percent of items correct				
Total Score 2010-2011	54.39	57.78	54.17	51.78	90
Total Score 2011-2012	64.81	75.78	65.93	53.33	90

With respect to the 2011-2012 results:

- There is a clear improvement in percent of total items correct from first through third year cohorts during both the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 academic years. Additionally, the performance of all students during 2011-2012 was greatly improved over students during 2010-2011.
- Additional comparisons are possible. First year students during 2010-2011 were second year students at the 2011-2012 testing. Second year students during 2010-2011 were third year students at the 2011-2012 testing. Sizeable improvements are noted in each cohort's longitudinal performance from one year to the next.
- Only two years of data are presented because the written examination was revised for the 2010-11 testing, and comparisons with earlier years would not be valid. Additional changes to the written examination procedure that began with the 2010-2011 academic year included requiring students taking the examination to identify themselves. Previous to that year, students could take the exam anonymously or voluntarily identify themselves in order to receive their results.
- For the 2011-2012 academic year, performance criteria were specified for each cohort. It is clear that requiring published performance standards of students who must identify themselves may be responsible for improvements in overall performance.

First and second year School Psychology students sit for an oral examination, plus portfolio and transcript review in addition to the written examination. The oral examination consists of a case simulation with background characteristics, interview and observational data, test scores and graphs/data of responses to intervention of an anonymous client presented for the student's analysis, summary and intervention recommendations. At least two faculty members evaluate each student's responses on a rating scale developed by the program faculty, and the median ratings of the faculty members present for each examination are recorded as the student's score for each question. A 5 point rating rubric, ranging from 5 (Attends to all data/issues; Applies data in sophisticated manner; Sound conclusions/data-based recommendations) to 1 (Fails to attend to, consider, or address appropriate data and/or issues) is used for each of 10 rating items. The rating items for first and second year students are only partially overlapping due to differences in completed course/practicum backgrounds and developed skill sets, and therefore item by item comparisons between cohorts are not possible. First year students are required to obtain ratings greater than 2.5 on the oral examination. Second year students must meet or exceed a criterion rating of 3.5 on the

oral examination. The master portfolio of the previous year’s work presented by the student also is evaluated at this time. Since items in the portfolio were previously rated and graded during the course/practicum in which the requirements were met, portfolio items are rated simply as present or absent, since a student with an unacceptable performance would not have passed the course or produced an acceptable product for the portfolio. The students’ transcripts also are evaluated to determine their status in the program/curriculum and compliance with prerequisites. Results of the First and Second Year Student Reviews are presented in the table below.

Results of First and Second Year School Psychology Student Oral Exams and Reviews

Oral Examination Results	1st Yr. Students	2nd Year Students
Mean Rating	2.91	3.60
Students passing portfolio review	All (6)	All (10)
Students passing transcript review	All (6)	All (10)

2011-12 first year students ‘scores averaged above the required criterion rating. All first year students exceeded the criterion rating, with individual scores ranging from 2.7 to 3.2 across the 6 students remaining in the cohort. 2011-12 second year students also exceeded the required criterion as a group. Individual ratings ranged between 2.7 and 4.2 for the 10 students in this cohort. One student (the 2.7) failed to meet the criterion rating and was prescribed remedial activities to be completed during the summer.

Examination of practicum logs, work samples, and field supervisor ratings submitted with practicum portfolios showed that all students met or exceeded minimum requirements for acceptable performance and contact hours in course-related practice settings.

School Psychology Option Assessment-Internship Performance Assessment

To assess our goal of developing professionals with skills necessary to work as applied psychologists, the Department assesses the internship experience. In the school psychology option, this year was the sixth year of use for a revised set of practicum and internship field supervisor rating forms designed to provide increased information relevant to NASP training domains. End-of-Internship ratings of school psychology interns by field-based supervisors for 5 interns (all degree seeking students completing level II certification training) who completed their one academic year internship in Spring 2012 produced a mean composite rating of 4.87 on a 5 point scale, with a rating of 5 representing competence at the level of unsupervised practice, 4 representing a requirement of minimal or occasional supervision, and 3 indicating continued intermediate supervision required. Mean internship supervisor ratings computed in relation to NASP training Domains and other skill competency areas are shown in the table below. One hundred percent of the work samples/portfolio materials submitted for summative evaluation at the end of the internship seminar were rated as satisfactory or higher by the faculty for interns in the school psychology option.

School Psychology Internship Supervisor Rating Results by Average for Professional Skill Domains

Professional Skill Area (Domain)	Mean Supervisor Rating			
	2009	2010	2011	2012
General Professional Competencies (2.10)	4.78	4.75	4.54	4.85
School Psychology Practice & Development (2.10)	4.88	4.80	4.21	4.73
Diversity in Development & Learning (2.5)	4.88	4.73	4.69	4.73
Data-Based Decision Making (2.1)	4.79	4.73	4.48	4.87
Professional Consultation & Collaboration (2.2)	4.83	4.67	4.42	4.76
Effective Instruction & Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills (2.3)	4.83	4.80	4.19	4.72
Socialization & Development of Life Skills (2.4)	4.96	4.87	4.29	4.80
Prevention, Crisis Intervention & Mental Health Plans (2.7)	4.81	4.73	4.38	4.73
Home/School/Community Collaboration (2.8)	4.69	4.50	4.42	4.60
Research & Program Evaluation (2.9)	5.00	4.73	4.42	4.60
Information Technology (2.11)	4.94	4.90	4.58	4.73
Mean Rating	4.85	4.75	4.42	4.87

Written comments by supervisors for school psychology interns were uniformly positive, indicating overall satisfaction by supervisors with the nature and level of intern preparation within the option, and with intern performance while on internship.

School Psychology Option Assessment-Praxis II Performance

Scores on the Praxis II Examination necessary for certification and licensure in school psychology were received for all 5 students completing internship in the School Psychology Option. The 5 program completers received scores on the revised Praxis II scoring scale, which was implemented 2 years ago. The mean score for these 5 completers was 172.20 with individual scores ranging from 165 to 179. These scores are equivalent to the 2011 class, which was scored on the same scale. The required cut-score for certification of school psychologists in South Carolina beginning September 13, 2008 has been 165. The new required cut-score for certification of school psychologists in North Carolina is 159. By these evaluative criteria, all graduates exceeded the examination requirements for certification in their anticipated states of practice. Graduates of the program have traditionally provided a 100% pass rate for the required certification and licensure examination, and this year's graduates continue that tradition.

School Psychology Option Assessment-Exit Interviews

Exit interviews and program evaluation rating scales were obtained from School Psychology option graduates. Graduates' evaluations of course and practicum quality were favorable, with the mean ratings for items being 4.36 for course and practicum work, and 4.44 for internship, on a 5-point scale where 3 represented "helpful or adequate," 4 represented "very helpful, very adequate," and 5 represented "extremely helpful, more than very adequate." Variability in each area was roughly equivalent to previous years. This is a notable improvement from the previous year.

School psychology option graduates also were asked to rate the extent to which they assessed their courses, practica, and internship work as addressing NASP skill domains. A 5-point scale was employed where 3 represented “general competence,” 4 represented “considerable competence,” and 5 represented “complete competence.” Across the 11 skill domains, course and practicum ratings averaged 3.94 as did internship ratings also. Mean ratings for each NASP Domain are displayed in the table below. Collectively, students completing the program at the end of internship rated their course, practicum, and internship experiences as preparing them in regard NASP skill domains to a level of general competence or higher.

Mean School Psychology Intern Skill Development Ratings by NASP Domains

2.1 Data-based decision-making	2009	2010	2011	2012
courses and practicum	3.71	4.00	4.29	4.49
internship	4.29	4.00	3.29	4.37
2.2 Consultation and collaboration				
courses and practicum	3.13	3.50	3.71	4.58
internship	4.00	4.25	3.86	4.60
2.3 Effective Instruction, Development of Skills				
courses and practicum	3.75	3.75	4.14	4.41
internship	4.94	4.00	3.85	4.53
2.4 Socialization, Development of Life Skills				
courses and practicum	3.44	3.75	4.00	4.35
internship	4.06	3.75	4.00	4.38
2.5 Student Diversity, Development and Learning				
courses and practicum	3.88	3.50	4.14	4.34
internship	4.44	3.75	4.14	4.60
2.6 School and Systems Organization, Policy...				
courses and practicum	3.13	2.75	3.71	4.33
internship	4.00	3.25	4.14	4.30
2.7 Prevention, Crisis Intervention, Mental Health				
courses and practicum	3.44	3.75	3.86	4.37
internship	3.69	3.50	4.00	4.36
2.8 Home/School/Community Collaboration				
courses and practicum	3.19	3.25	4.00	4.33
internship	3.94	2.75	3.86	4.27
2.9 Research and Program Evaluation				
courses and practicum	3.50	4.00	3.57	4.00
internship	3.93	3.50	3.71	3.80
2.10 School Psychology Practice Development				
courses and practicum	4.19	4.00	4.14	4.36
internship	4.25	3.75	3.86	4.80
2.11 Information Technology				
courses and practicum	3.67	3.50	3.86	4.40
internship	4.00	3.25	3.71	4.79
Course and Practicum Mean	3.55	3.61	3.94	4.36

Internship Mean	4.14	3.61	3.94	4.44

Clinical/Counseling Psychology Option Assessment – Internship Supervisor Ratings

The following information regards the assessment of the clinical/counseling psychology students’ internship experiences. Community supervisor rating forms for the 6 clinical/counseling interns who completed internships in 2011-2012 were evaluated and produced a mean overall rating of 4.6, which is favorable on a 5 point scale. A rating of 5 represents competence at the level of unsupervised practice, 4 represents a requirement of minimal or occasional supervision, and 3 indicates that continued, intermediate supervision is required. Four interns received a rating of 5, one received a 4, and one received a 3.5. Last year, the average overall rating was 4.8, so, overall, the results are relatively similar. Since 2007-2008, the average supervisor rating of clinical/counseling interns has fluctuated within a fairly narrow range and has consistently been over a rating of 4.

Written feedback provided by internship supervisors was very positive overall. Examples of interns’ strengths included being quick to learn; being self-directed; reliability and skill in providing excellent client care; working well with others; being willing to go the extra mile; possessing a well developed understanding of psychotherapy theories and case conceptualization; being able to successfully implement CBT and behavioral interventions; being sensitive to patients’ needs; being able to develop rapport with clients; treatment planning; knowledge of the DSM-IV; begin dedicated, committed to client care, resourceful, and hardworking. Recommendations for improvement included becoming more discerning regarding focusing on only relevant client information (e.g., for paperwork purposes), developing organizational skills and attention to detail (i.e., in regard to paperwork), developing assessment skills (e.g., in clinical interview).

Internship Supervisor Ratings by Domain for Clinical/Counseling Interns

Professional Skill Area	Mean Supervisor Ratings		
	2009-2010 (10 students)	2010-2011 (4 students)	2011-2012 (6 students)
Communication/Collaboration	4.4	4.9	4.6
Interviewing and Psychological Assessment	4.5	4.6	4.3
Therapeutic Interventions	4.3	4.7	4.4
Group or Family Treatment	4.1	4.8	4.6
Consultation and In-Service Training	4.5	4.6	4.7
Professional Behavior	4.6	4.7	4.7
Overall Rating of Trainee	4.7	4.8	4.6

This year we are reporting for the first time the internship hours accrued by each student. Below is a table reporting each student’s total number of internship hours, as well as the number of those hours that were spent in direct therapeutic contact with clients (excluding assessment activities) and the

number of those hours that were spent in supervision. One student (L. Bendle) accrued significantly more hours of experience on internship than did her classmates; her internship placement would only accept an internship under the condition that the intern commit to a six-month contract (versus a one-semester contract, which the other students completed). The number of contact hours varied widely across internship sites, as did the number of hours spent in supervision.

Internship Hours for 2011-2012 Graduates

Student's Initials	Cumulative Hours	Client Contact Hours	Supervision Hours
C. B.	639.5	319.75	41.5
L. B.	930.0	349.5	64.0
K. C.	693.25	293.3	35.25
S. G.	608.25	138.75	39.75
R. M.	645.5	355.5	59.5
D. N.	619.5	174.25	52.5
Avg. Hrs.	689.3	271.8	48.8

Clinical/Counseling Psychology Option Assessment – Student Ratings of Internship

In addition to the assessment of supervisors’ ratings of the clinical/counseling psychology students’ performance during their internship experiences, the clinical/counseling program solicits feedback from the students regarding their perceptions of the quality of their internship experiences. Rating forms were available for all six clinical/counseling interns who completed internships in 2011-2012. They produced a mean overall rating of 4.4, which is favorable on a 5 point scale, and slightly elevated from the previous year’s rating. A rating of 1 indicates “unhelpful or inadequate,” a rating of 3 indicates “helpful or adequate,” and a rating of 5 indicates “extremely helpful or adequate” in the area being assessed.

Quality of Internship Ratings by Clinical/Counseling Graduates

Internship Domain	Mean Student Ratings		
	2009-2010 (9/10 students reporting)	2010-2011 (4/4 students reporting)	2011-2012 (6/6 students reporting)
Internship Guidelines	3.6	3.8	4.3
Internship Contract	4.0	3.5	4.0
Student Evaluation Form/Feedback	4.2	4.0	4.3
University Faculty	4.1	3.8	4.5
Internship Seminar (699-A)	4.0	3.5	4.5
Internship Site Resources	4.2	5.0	4.5
Site Supervision – Amount	4.3	5.0	4.7
Site Supervision – Quality	4.6	4.8	4.7
Overall Rating of Internship	4.1	4.2	4.4

Student ratings of their internship experience have increased slightly from ratings from the last two years. Notably, ratings for Internship Guidelines, Internship Contract, Student Evaluation Form, Faculty, Seminar, and the overall rating have increased, while ratings for Site Resources, Amount of Supervision, and Quality of Supervision have declined, albeit slightly, from last year. Overall, students' comments regarding their internship experience were positive. Strengths of the internship sites, from the students' perspective, included exposure to a wide range of diagnoses and clinical issues; exposure to inpatient treatment; training in group therapy (i.e., process); training processes that involved modeling, supervision of skills, and ultimately the independent provision of services; exposure to multidisciplinary teams (MDTs); opportunities for professional development, clinical training, and professional networking. Areas for improvement included more opportunity to conduct clinical assessment (e.g., instead of assessment being solely the responsibility of staff psychiatrists) and more consistently scheduled supervision meetings.

Student Ratings of the Clinical/Counseling Option

Evaluation rating scales assessing the quality of courses, practica, and internship preparation as part of the overall clinical/counseling curriculum were sought from graduates for the fifth year; this process was first begun in the Spring 2008 semester. A survey was distributed to the 2011-2012 graduates, and all six students' forms were available at the time of this report. Feedback from this survey indicated that students felt generally positive about their experiences in the MSAP clinical/counseling option. A rating of 1 indicates "unhelpful or inadequate," a rating of 3 indicates "helpful or adequate," and a rating of 5 indicates "extremely helpful or adequate" in the area being assessed. The overall, mean program rating was 4.0, compared to 4.5 last and 4.1 the year before that. Ratings in all areas, except for *Quality of Texts and Readings* and *Technology*, were the same or higher than those from last year and signify a generally positive evaluation of students' experiences in the MSAP program, clinical/counseling option.

Training Program Quality Ratings by Clinical/Counseling Graduates

Training Program Domain	Mean Graduate Ratings		
	2009-2010 (9/10 students)	2010-2011 (4/4 students)	2011-2012 (6/6 students)
Course requirements	4.2	4.8	4.5
Prerequisites and course sequencing	3.8	4.8	4.5
Quality of teaching	3.9	4.3	4.5
Quality of texts and readings	3.9	4.5	3.8
A/V resources and Technology	3.7	4.8	4.0
Practicum experiences	4.2	4.8	5.0
Practicum hours required	4.6	4.8	4.7
Practicum sites	4.0	4.3	4.7
Practicum site supervisors	4.2	4.5	5.0
Internship preparation via courses	4.2	4.8	5.0
Internship preparation via practica	4.1	4.5	5.0
Faculty adviser	4.2	3.8	4.0
Faculty in general	4.0	4.0	5.0
Availability of faculty	4.0	4.3	5.0

Average rating:	4.1	4.5	4.0
------------------------	-----	-----	-----

The lowest rating was for “Quality of Texts and Readings.” Individual ratings on this item were 4, 4, 4, 3, 4, and 4. There were no written comments to shed light on the ratings given for this category. Even though 3.8 was the lowest average rating in any area, a score of 3.8 reflects higher than average helpfulness/adequacy, and is almost at the very helpful/very adequate benchmark.

Students’ comments regarding their experience in the M.S. program were largely positive. Strengths of the program included the faculty (described as “skilled,” “professional,” “approachable,” “helpful,” “thorough,” and “dedicated”); the “hands-on” practicum experiences that each spanned one academic year (“being able to engage in clinical work from the start”); preparation for passing the NCE exam; opportunities to conduct extracurricular research even though research is not a primary focus of the program. Areas for suggested improvement included more exposure to clients with severe problems (e.g., psychosis, Axis II traits); updating the clinical videos used in training; required training in mandated reporting prior to internship; more consistent and objective grading in the assessment courses; providing an option for child/adolescent clinical training that does not involve courses in the school psychology option (“The school course talked a lot about IEPs and less about clinical/counseling info.”).

Regarding the weaknesses reported by the graduates, we can only address exposure to more difficult clients if such practicum and internship opportunities are available. Dr. Murphy works continually to develop relationships with mental health providers in the Pee Dee to provide such opportunities to students. The use of clinical videos is at the instructors’ discretion; we will encourage all faculty to request the purchase of more recent videos as available. An interesting suggestion is the opportunity to provide training on mandated reporting; Dr. Hughes will evaluate the feasibility of including this training in one of the clinical courses, if not the ethics course. Regarding the assessment courses, students’ primary difficulties were with PSY 630, the first assessment course in the training program. Since these students took PSY 630, Dr. Hughes and Dr. Hester have replaced the instructor (now Ms. Lisa Mady); students are now reporting fewer issues with the instruction and grading in that course. Regarding the option for training in children and adolescents, we were able to secure approval from the Provost to offer in Fall 2012 a course titled PSY 640: Assessment and Diagnosis of Child/Adolescent Psychopathology, which is a course developed for clinical/counseling students. We have enrolled nine students for the course, which will have an accompanying 600A: Practicum. We have recruited a skilled and experienced clinician, Ms. Jennifer Elkins, from the community to teach this course.

Faculty scholarship, professional activities and community involvement continued as reflected in the annual reports of individual faculty members.

Primary Issues Identified During 2011-2012

Issues of Concern 2011-2012	Actions Taken
Overall MSAP Program Issues:	
<p>Recruitment for MSAP applicants remained an issue that requires addressing (a priority since 2007)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Department continues to develop ideas for improving the recruitment process. A marketing and recruitment plan has been developed by Dr. Hester, Dr. Broughton, Dr. Hughes, and Ms. Taylor. This plan continues to expand, and we have received assistance from Dr. Peter King and Dr. Jeannette Myers with our marketing efforts. - In 2010-2011 we hired a web designer to develop a new website for the Psychology Department. A more accessible website is critical for improving our web presence and enhancing our recruitment efforts. The process of creating a new website was complicated by several factors; however, we expect it to be launched early in the Fall 2012 semester, if not before. - We will continue to work with the University to encourage the development of an online graduate application process, which is expected to increase the number of applications. Dr. King has informed us that an online application process will be instituted during the 2012-2013 academic year.
<p>The need to improve efforts to retain students has remained an issue requiring attention</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dr. Broughton and Dr. Hughes continue to co-sponsor the FMU Psychology Graduate Student Association (PGSA), which is run by student leaders from both the school and clinical/counseling options. It is hoped that such peer networking efforts will enhance the quality of life for graduate students and increase their investment in the program. - We continue to collect data from students regarding their reasons for leaving the program; we hope to discover impediments to staying in the program that we can proactively address. -Being able to recruit from a larger and higher quality applicant pool will significantly impact retention as well (see Recruitment above)
<p>The Department continues to seek means to provide greater financial support to MSAP students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During 2011-2012 the Department has acquired connections to at least three additional on-campus assistantships in addition to the six assistantships offered to MSAP/SSP students within the Department (3 TAs, 1 front desk, 1 Center for the Child [10 hours], 1 Student Health). On-campus assistantships available to MSAP students include positions with the FMU School of Education, the Center of Excellence, and the Office of Career Development. New positions include the ARCH program, the Registrar's office, and the Housing office. - The Department continues to make student financial support a priority and will continue to seek additional sources of funding and employment for MSAP/SSP students. Such efforts have been subsumed under the overall marketing and recruitment plan and include greater collaboration with the FMU Foundation, for

	example.
<i>Clinical/Counseling Option Issues:</i>	
There remains a need to increase the number of competitive applicants to the clinical/counseling option.	- As part of the Psychology Department's overall graduate marketing and recruitment plan, efforts have been undertaken to network with colleagues at other universities and increase our internet presence.
The clinical/counseling program option continues to cope with a reduced number of clinical faculty members.	- A clinical faculty member was lost in Fall 2008 due to retirement (Dr. Tom Dorsel), bringing the number of clinical faculty from 4 to 3. This loss of clinical faculty remains a problem for the program. The position remained unavailable, and so a faculty search did not take place during the 2009-2010 academic year; we were not approved to do a similar search during the 2010-2011 or 2011-2012 academic years. - A growing number of adjunct professors continue to teach courses in the MSAP program (clinical/counseling option), and some faculty carry instructional overloads to compensate for the loss in faculty.
The clinical/counseling program continues to explore ways to offer specialized training to students.	- Students frequently request that we modify the program to include "tracks" (e.g., child/adolescent therapy, substance abuse); however, adding tracks to the program would increase the credit hours and would be physically impossible with our limited number of clinical faculty. - We continue to recommend that students supplement their clinical/counseling curriculum by taking courses in the School Psychology option if they wish to specialize in work with children and adolescents. Moreover, we are offering a child/adolescent psychopathology course, uniquely designed for clinicians, in the Fall 2012 semester. Nine students have enrolled. - More creative ideas will need to be explored, and more faculty members added to the program, if the program is to expand its offerings in the future. More specialized offerings will likely increase the number of applicants to the program.
Each semester it becomes increasingly difficult for the clinical/counseling program to find paid placements for students' capstone internship experiences.	- Last year we streamlined the internship process by moving to a 16-18 week placement versus the previous 6-month placement; students will still accrue a sufficient number of hours for licensure but will likely be able to do so in one semester versus two. Alternatively, we now permit students to complete a two-semester, part-time placement so that they may choose an unpaid placement if it better suits their training interests and needs.

<p>The hours of experience accrued by students on internship varies widely.</p>	<p>- To try to improve the consistency and rigor of students' training experiences, we will explore the feasibility of requiring a certain percentage of the required 600 hours to be spent in direct client contact, as well as in supervision.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<i>School Psychology Option Issues:</i>	
Obtain renewal of NASP approval and NCATE national recognition	<p>-The NASP/NCATE accreditation review was submitted as scheduled during fall 2010. The school psychology option received national recognition with conditions. There was a requirement to address the conditions within 18 months. Conditions included improvements to the program evaluation data collection and aggregation procedures and the addition of a course dealing with diversity issues.</p> <p>- A submission to NASP/NCATE was made in March 2012. All conditions had been addressed and assessed in the 18 months since the initial review and described in the 2012 submission.</p> <p>-Full approval by NASP and National Recognition by NCATE was received August 1, 2012.</p> <p>-The next accreditation review will be due March 15, 2016. The date was determined by NCATE to be three years prior to the next unit (School of Education) review in 2019.</p>
Preparation for 2016 NASP/NCATE accreditation review	<p>-The 2016 review will be conducted employing newly adopted 2010 accreditation standards. This will require reorganization of program and course goals to correspond to the new standards.</p> <p>-Three complete years of program outcome data are required for the review, so data collection and program improvements for the 2016 review will begin immediately this academic year (2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15).</p>
There remains a need to increase the number of competitive applicants to the school psychology option	<p>- As part of the Psychology Department's overall graduate marketing and recruitment plan, efforts continue to be undertaken to network with colleagues at other universities and increase our internet presence. The number and quality of applicants continues to be variable. The FMU program attracts one quarter to one third of the applicant pool of competing regional programs. The lack of an FMU online application process appears to be a major barrier to increased applications.</p> <p>-Continued increases in student financial aid opportunities (scholarships, assistantships, on campus employment opportunities, etc.) also would improve our competitiveness with regional programs.</p>
Succession planning	<p>-Drs. Broughton and Bridger are approaching retirement within the next 2 to 3 years. Coordination of the school psychology program will need to be assumed by a continuing school psychology faculty member, and plans for immediate replacement of both positions will require prompt implementation of faculty searches when necessary.</p> <p>NASP/NCATE requirements stipulate a minimum of 3 FTE school psychology program faculty members and a minimum faculty to student ratio of 1:12.</p>