

Institutional Effectiveness Report

Academic Year 2012-2013

*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*

June 28, 2013

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 consist of 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.

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

Program assessment regarding program admissions includes the number of applications received, as well as the number of qualified applicants to whom admissions offers are made. Data in the table below reveal that 25 of 41 applicants were qualified for admission (61% acceptance rate). Of those 25 students to whom admissions offers were made, 15 subsequently enrolled in the program (60% enrollment rate).

***Data for Applied Psychology Program:
Applications and Admissions Offers***

	Clinical/Counseling	School	Total
<i>Complete Applications</i>	26	15	41
<i>Incomplete Applications</i>	2	0	2
<i>Applicants Offered Admission</i>	14	11	25
<i>Students Enrolled</i>	9	6	15

During the 2012-2013 academic year (Fall and Spring) 15 newly accepted students enrolled in the program (9 in clinical/counseling and 6 in school psychology). As illustrated in the table below, this number compares to 17 students that entered the program the previous academic year (10 in clinical/counseling and 7 in school psychology). Average Revised GRE scores were 149 (40th percentile; Rev. GRE-Verbal) and 147 (31st percentile; Rev. GRE-Quantitative). Because of structural and scoring changes to the GRE, direct score comparisons between 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 scores are impossible. Percentile scores can be compared, however: The average Verbal score decreased 9 percentile points and Quantitative scores increased 11 percentile points since 2010-2011. This year's average overall undergraduate GPA for newly enrolled students was 3.44, and the Psychology GPA was 3.62, as compared to 3.38 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 remained fairly steady with 48 students in 2011-2012 and 49 in 2012-2013. Eighteen students graduated from the degree program during 2012-2013 (8 clinical/counseling and 10 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**

		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Total MSAP:	Newly Enrolled	16	17	17	15
	GRE-V	450	445	460	149
	GRE-Q	533	518	521	147
	GPA (CUM)	3.5	3.42	3.38	3.44
	GPA (PSY)	3.5	3.58	3.58	3.62
	Graduates	13	11	11	18
	Total Students	45	46	48	49
Clinical/Counseling:	Newly Enrolled	9	8	10	9
	GRE-V	446	428	460	150
	GRE-Q	543	523	510	148
	GPA (CUM)	3.6	3.4	3.42	3.39
	GPA (PSY)	3.6	3.6	3.59	3.62
	Graduates	8	4	6	8
	Total Students	23	22	26	27
School:	Newly Enrolled	7	9	7	6
	GRE-V	456	461	460	147
	GRE-Q	519	514	537	146
	GPA (CUM)	3.3	3.43	3.32	3.49
	GPA (PSY)	3.4	3.52	3.56	3.61
	Graduates	5	7	5	10
	Total Students	21	24	22	22

School Psychology Option Assessment-Written and Oral Examinations

The program-developed 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.

Results of School Psychology Written Exam for 2012-2013

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
Total Score 2012-2013	58.73	67.27	42.05	49.62	90

With respect to the 2012-2013 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. The 2012-2013 results differed from this trend, with the first year cohort performing better than the second year cohort, while performing lower than the first year cohort of previous years. Additionally, the second year cohort performed lower than they had performed previously as first year students. The reasons for this result are unclear.
- 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 usually are noted in each cohort's longitudinal performance from one year to the next. As noted above, this trend did not hold for 2012-2013. The 2012-2013 third year cohort performed better than they had as second year students the previous year, but not as well as the third year cohort from the previous year.

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	3.01	3.80
Students passing portfolio review	All (6)	All (6)
Students passing transcript review	All (6)	All (6)

2012-13 first year students ‘scores averaged above the required criterion rating. All individual first year students exceeded the criterion rating. 2012-13 second year students also exceeded the required criterion as a group and individually.

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 seventh 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 10 interns (all degree seeking students completing level II certification training) who completed their one academic year internship in Spring 2013 produced a mean composite rating of 4.54 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

Domain/Year	Mean Supervisor Rating				
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Data-Based Decision Making (2.1)	4.79	4.73	4.48	4.87	4.60
Professional Consultation & Collaboration (2.2)	4.83	4.67	4.42	4.76	4.42
Effective Instruction & Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills (2.3)	4.83	4.80	4.19	4.72	4.56
Socialization & Development of Life Skills (2.4)	4.96	4.87	4.29	4.80	4.50
Diversity in Development & Learning (2.5)	4.88	4.73	4.69	4.73	4.63
School and Systems Organization, Policy Development, and Climate (2.6)					4.48
Prevention, Crisis Intervention & Mental Health Plans (2.7)	4.81	4.73	4.38	4.73	4.63
Home/School/Community Collaboration (2.8)	4.69	4.50	4.42	4.60	4.53
Research & Program Evaluation (2.9)	5.00	4.73	4.42	4.60	4.67
General Professional Competencies (2.10)	4.78	4.75	4.54	4.85	4.53
School Psychology Practice & Development (2.10)	4.88	4.80	4.21	4.73	4.72
Information Technology (2.11)	4.94	4.90	4.58	4.73	4.72
Mean Rating	4.85	4.75	4.42	4.87	4.58

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 10 students completing internship in the School Psychology Option. The 10 program completers received scores on the revised Praxis II scoring scale, which was implemented 2 years ago. The mean score for these 10 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 moderately favorable, with the mean ratings for items being 3.15for course and practicum work, and 3.38for 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.” These scores were much lower than previous years.

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 3.15 and internship ratings averaged 3.38. 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. However, the 2013 graduates rated their self-perceived competence resulting from the program as lower than previous graduating cohorts (see table below). The reasons for this decline in competence ratings is unclear, since it is not consistent with verbal self-reports of graduating students or the ratings and verbal reports of their internship supervisors.

Mean School Psychology Intern Skill Development Ratings by NASP Domains

2.1 Data-based decision-making	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
courses and practicum	3.71	4.00	4.29	4.49	3.13
internship	4.29	4.00	3.29	4.37	3.38
2.2 Consultation and collaboration					
courses and practicum	3.13	3.50	3.71	4.58	3.10
internship	4.00	4.25	3.86	4.60	3.20
2.3 Effective Instruction, Development of Skills					
courses and practicum	3.75	3.75	4.14	4.41	3.16
internship	4.94	4.00	3.85	4.53	3.22
2.4 Socialization, Development of Life Skills					
courses and practicum	3.44	3.75	4.00	4.35	3.11
internship	4.06	3.75	4.00	4.38	3.44
2.5 Student Diversity, Development and Learning					
courses and practicum	3.88	3.50	4.14	4.34	3.25
internship	4.44	3.75	4.14	4.60	3.50
2.6 School and Systems Organization, Policy...					
courses and practicum	3.13	2.75	3.71	4.33	3.0
internship	4.00	3.25	4.14	4.30	3.43
2.7 Prevention, Crisis Intervention, Mental Health					
courses and practicum	3.44	3.75	3.86	4.37	3.08
internship	3.69	3.50	4.00	4.36	3.17
2.8 Home/School/Community Collaboration					
courses and practicum	3.19	3.25	4.00	4.33	3.14

internship	3.94	2.75	3.86	4.27	3.43
2.9 Research and Program Evaluation					
courses and practicum	3.50	4.00	3.57	4.00	3.17
internship	3.93	3.50	3.71	3.80	3.33
2.10 School Psychology Practice Development					
courses and practicum	4.19	4.00	4.14	4.36	3.13
internship	4.25	3.75	3.86	4.80	3.43
2.11 Information Technology					
courses and practicum	3.67	3.50	3.86	4.40	3.33
internship	4.00	3.25	3.71	4.79	3.67
Course and Practicum Mean	3.55	3.61	3.94	4.36	3.15
Internship Mean	4.14	3.61	3.94	4.44	3.38

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 8 clinical/counseling interns who completed internships in 2012-2013 were evaluated and produced a mean overall rating of 5.0, 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. Seven interns received a rating of 5, and one supervisor failed to endorse a rating on this item (all supervisor ratings of that intern were either a 4 or 5). Last year, the average overall rating was 4.6, 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 the following: “enthusiasm to learn new skills”; “dedication to becoming an ethical and professional clinician;” “skilled at assessment and using structured interventions;” “truly functioned like a member of our clinical staff”; “responsible and professional”; “well prepared... easily identified appropriate therapeutic interventions.” Recommendations for improvement included “limited experience with family counseling” and “more practice with the format of report writing (content is excellent).” Other comments were largely positive, and supervisors’ only comments regarding weaknesses dealt with the need for more experience in specific areas of training or with specific populations.

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)	2012-2013 (8 students)
Communication/Collaboration	4.4	4.9	4.6	4.9
Interviewing and Psychological Assessment	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.7
Therapeutic Interventions	4.3	4.7	4.4	4.7
Group or Family Treatment	4.1	4.8	4.6	4.9
Consultation and In-Service Training	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.7
Professional Behavior	4.6	4.7	4.7	5.0
Overall Rating of Trainee	4.7	4.8	4.6	5.0

Since 2011-2012 we have reported 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, which also included direct client contact required for administering psychological tests) and the number of those hours that were spent in supervision. We also have included the total number of practicum hours (PSY 600-A, 600-B, and 600-C) that students accrued during their tenure in the program. The table below reveals that 2012-2013 graduates accrued 926.27 hours of applied practical training, on average, during their tenure in the M.S. Program. The total number of internship hours is down slightly from the previous year; the average for 2011-2012 was slightly elevated because one student contracted for a 6-month internship (due to agency requirements) while all other students contracted for a one-semester internship. On average, 2012-2013 graduates spent over 40% of their clinical time in direct contact with clients, which is consistent with the training goals of the program. Moreover, students accumulated well over the 750 required hours for LPC-I application in South Carolina. For SC LPC licensure, graduates must have had 150 hours of practicum and 600 hours of internship training.

Internship and Practicum Hours for M.S. Program Graduates

	2011-2012	2012-2013
Internship:		
Total Hours	689.3	621.3
Client Contact (%)	271.8 (39.4%)	260.1 (41.86%)
Supervision	48.8	66.3
Practicum:		
Total Hours	--	304.97
Total:	--	926.27

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 eight clinical/counseling interns who completed internships in 2012-2013. They produced a mean overall rating of 4.4, which is favorable on a 5 point scale, and consistent with 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		
	2010-2011 (4/4 students reporting)	2011-2012 (6/6 students reporting)	2012-2013 (8/8 students reporting)
Internship Guidelines	3.8	4.3	4.0
Internship Contract	3.5	4.0	4.0
Student Evaluation Form/Feedback	4.0	4.3	4.4
University Faculty	3.8	4.5	4.0
Internship Seminar (699-A)	3.5	4.5	4.1
Internship Site Resources	5.0	4.5	4.8
Site Supervision – Amount	5.0	4.7	4.8
Site Supervision – Quality	4.8	4.7	4.9
Overall Rating of Internship	4.2	4.4	4.4

Student ratings of their internship experience are consistent with those from the last two years. Overall, students' comments regarding their internship experience were positive. Strengths of the internship sites, from the students' perspectives, included "valuable one-on-one experience with my own clients"; "ample opportunity to grow as a therapist"; "supervisor showed genuine compassion for the profession and clients"; "the variety of clients taught me to be prepared for anything." Areas for improvement included "not all personalities can roll with the interactions between office management staff" (referring to difficulties maintaining professional role boundaries); "need better clarity between the site and PSY 699 professor regarding job tasks"; "site supervisor's lack of organization"; a desire for more contact with FMU professors while on internship; a request that 699 seminars could be doubled in frequency; "agency needs a structured plan for interns"; "site supervisor tended to be busy."

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 sixth year; this process was first begun in the Spring 2008 semester. A survey was distributed to the 2012-2013 graduates, and all eight 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 M.S. program, 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 4.3, compared to 4.0 last year and 4.5 the year before that. Ratings in all areas generally indicated a positive evaluation of students' experiences in the MSAP program, clinical/counseling option. Ratings for "Quality of Texts and Readings"

improved, while ratings of “A/V Resources and Technology” decreased. One comment indicated that they videos were “outdated, but I still learned from them.”

Training Program Quality Ratings by Clinical/Counseling Graduates

Training Program Domain	Mean Graduate Ratings		
	2010-2011 (4/4 students)	2011-2012 (6/6 students)	2012-2013 (8/8 students)
Course requirements	4.8	4.5	4.5
Prerequisites and course sequencing	4.8	4.5	4.0
Quality of teaching	4.3	4.5	4.6
Quality of texts and readings	4.5	3.8	4.4
A/V resources and Technology	4.8	4.0	3.3
Practicum experiences	4.8	5.0	4.6
Practicum hours required	4.8	4.7	4.6
Practicum sites	4.3	4.7	4.4
Practicum site supervisors	4.5	5.0	4.4
Internship preparation via courses	4.8	5.0	4.8
Internship preparation via practica	4.5	5.0	4.6
Faculty adviser	3.8	4.0	4.0
Faculty in general	4.0	5.0	4.3
Availability of faculty	4.3	5.0	4.5
Average rating:	4.5	4.0	4.3

Students’ comments regarding their experience in the clinical/counseling option were largely positive. Strengths of the program included revolved around three main themes: (1) “passionate,” “knowledgeable,” and “concerned” faculty, who gave “quality instruction”; (2) extensive coursework and practica resulting in feeling “well prepared” for a career in counseling; (3) small class sizes. Areas for suggested improvement included an increased focus on preparation for the LPC licensure process; more specialized courses (e.g., a substance abuse treatment course); PSY 639: Lifestyle and Career Development being “rushed” because it occurred during the summer; in PSY 630: Psychological Assessment “we were thrown into giving IQ tests and graded harshly for any mistakes we made.”

Regarding the weaknesses reported by the graduates, we have recently made programmatic changes that should eliminate two of the concerns. PSY 639 now takes place during the fall semester; it should not feel as “rushed” now. Also, 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. The selection of training videos is at each instructor’s discretion; we will encourage all faculty to request the purchase of more recent videos as available. Regarding a need for more specialized therapy courses, 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, and in Fall 2013 we will offer a substance abuse treatment course.

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

Primary Issues Identified During 2012-2013

Issues of Concern 2012-2013	Actions Taken
<i>Overall Graduate Program Issues:</i>	
<p>Recruitment for graduate 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 was developed by Dr. Hester, Dr. Broughton, Dr. Hughes, and Ms. Taylor (whose position has since been filled by Ms. Cherrise Gaster). This plan continues to expand, and we have received assistance from Dr. Peter King and Dr. Jeannette Myers with our marketing efforts. - In Summer 2012 we launched our new psychology department website (www.fmupsychology.com). This website allows us to better advertise our program, including the offering of CE opportunities for professionals. - 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 informed us that an online application process would be instituted during the 2012-2013 academic year. We believe that progress was made toward that end, but we are still awaiting an online graduate application process. - To increase the visibility of our department, and thus spread word about our graduate program, we hold continuing education events each year, with the goal of at least two annually. These events also serve our colleagues in the community by helping them to obtain quality training to maintain their licensure/certifications.
<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. We believe that such peer networking efforts will enhance the quality of life for graduate students and increase their investment in the program. - A graduate student work area was created in CEMC 109 A. This area contains a computer, desks, couches, and chairs, as well as bookshelves with many professional books of interest. - 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 graduate students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During 2012-2013 the Department acquired access to additional on-campus assistantships for MSAP/SSP students. We implemented an application process for referring students to departments on campus for their selection processes. Within the Department we now have 6 assistantships (4 TAs, 1 front desk, 1 Center for the Child [10 hours]). Other on-campus assistantships available to graduate students include positions with the FMU School of Education, the Center of Excellence, Housing, Registrar's Office, Admissions, Student Health, Counseling and Testing, the ARCH program, and the Office of Career Development. - The Department continues to make student financial support a priority and will continue to seek additional sources of funding and employment for graduate students. Such efforts have been subsumed under the overall marketing and recruitment plan and include greater collaboration with the FMU Foundation, for example. Enrollment Management and the Graduate Office have provided critical support for this endeavor as well.
<p><i>Clinical/Counseling Option Issues:</i></p>	
<p>There remains a need to increase the number of competitive applicants to the clinical/counseling option.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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.
<p>The clinical/counseling program option continues to cope with a reduced number of clinical faculty members.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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, 2011-2012, or 2012-2013 academic years. - It remains the case that a growing number of part-time instructors teach courses in the graduate program, and some faculty carry instructional overloads to compensate for the loss in faculty.
<p>The clinical/counseling program continues to explore ways to offer specialized training to students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students continue to request that we 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. Rather, we now aim to offer at least one specialized course each Fall. In Fall 2012 we offered a child/adolescent psychopathology course, and in Fall 2013 we are offering a substance abuse course, both taught by part-time professors recruited from the community. - 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 (e.g., PSY 714: Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy). - 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 semester-long placement (16-18 weeks) versus the previous 6-month placement; students still accrue a sufficient number of hours for licensure but are able to do so in one semester versus two. Alternatively, we also 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.
The hours of experience accrued by students on internship varies widely.	- To try to improve the consistency and rigor of students' training experiences, we now require that at least 40% of required 600 hours be spent in direct client contact.

<i>School Psychology Option Issues:</i>	
Obtain renewal of NASP approval and NCATE national recognition	-The next accreditation review will be due March 15, 2016. The date was determined by CAEP to be three years prior to the next unit (School of Education) review in 2019.
Preparation for 2016 NASP/NCATE accreditation review	-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. -Two complete years of program outcome data are required for the review, so data collection and program improvements for the 2016 review have begun.
There remains a need to increase the number of competitive applicants to the school psychology option	- 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. -Continued increases in student financial aid opportunities (scholarships, assistantships, on campus employment opportunities, etc.) also would improve our competitiveness with regional programs, which continue to offer more generous financial incentives.
Specialized training for school psychology students	-Since the school psychology option is unable to offer entry incentives competitive with other regional programs, the program has been offering training imbedded within required coursework that leads to professional certifications for graduates that will improve their employability upon graduation. Competing programs typically do not provide similar opportunities at the current time. Some of these training opportunities also are made available to regional practitioners as a continuing education outreach resource if

	<p>space is available after current students are enrolled.</p> <p>-Currently, graduates are able to exit the program with the following certifications (in addition to SC School Psychologist II and Nationally Certified School Psychologist):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PREPaRE: School Crisis Prevention and Intervention Training -CPI: Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training -Trauma-Focused Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy Training
	<p>-Drs. Broughton and Bridger are approaching retirement within the next 1 to 3 years. Coordination of the school psychology program will be passed to a continuing school psychology faculty member at the end of the 2013-2014 academic year, and plans for immediate replacement of both positions will require prompt approval and implementation of faculty searches when necessary. NASP/CAEP accreditation requirements stipulate a minimum of 3 FTE school psychology program faculty members and a maximum faculty to student ratio of 1:12.</p>