

Institutional Effectiveness Report

Name of Program/Department: Master of Science in Applied Psychology and Specialist in School Psychology

Year: 2018-2019

Name of Preparer: Crystal R. Hill-Chapman, PhD, LP, NCSP, ABPP

Program Mission

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.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

Graduates of the Master of Science in Psychology and Specialist in School Psychology programs at Francis Marion University will:

1. Have the knowledge required to be successful as Licensed Professional Counselors, Licensed Psychoeducational Specialists, or Nationally Certified School Psychologists.
 2. Have the skills needed to be able to function successfully as Licensed Professional Counselors, Licensed Psychoeducational Specialists, or Nationally Certified School Psychologists.
 3. Be able to analyze problems and develop solutions or strategies to solve those problems.
 4. Be able to communicate effectively.
 5. Be able to apply their discipline's code of ethics when making decisions.
 6. Be able to design an experiment and analyze data.
-

Executive Summary

The Master of Applied Science in Clinical/Counseling Psychology (MSAP) and Specialist in School Psychology (SSP) programs generally have been successful this year in meeting the benchmarks established by the faculty. The MSAP program met or exceeded all benchmarks across all three student learning outcomes (SLOs) as rated by the interns, practica supervisors, and students enrolled in their practica.

The SSP program met or exceeded the set benchmarks for all four SLOs. However, the students indicated several areas of concern during exit interview. First, the students felt that more time should be spent in class on program evaluation and single case design. They suggested that during internship a specific refresher should be given on how to write a literature review for publication as well as how to develop a research proposal for the Institutional Review Board (IRB). They also requested that during each of their intervention classes a refresher be given on data-based decision making in single case design. Based on these recommendations, a module has been added to each of the intervention classes as well as in the internship seminar on data-based decision making in single case design. Additionally, a module on program evaluation has been added to the internship seminar to aid in writing a literature review as well as how to develop a research proposal for the IRB. Second, students did not feel there was enough emphasis in their literacy intervention course on writing. They suggested that writing be a separate academic area covered in the literacy intervention course. Based on this recommendation, two modules have been added on evidence based interventions for writing deficits. Third, students identified the need for more time to be spent on family interventions and engagement, with a specific emphasis on empirically based interventions for Conduct Disorder. Thus, fifteen hours have been identified in the Consultation with Diverse Families and Communities class that will discuss behavioral parent interventions as well as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) for the schools. Finally, students expressed concerns with the effectiveness of how crisis prevention, threat assessment, suicide risk assessment, and crisis intervention were taught. Thus, case studies as well as a training using a behavioral training model will be utilized in classes to improve the effectiveness of teaching this material.

Although the programs are generally meeting their benchmarks, we seek to continue to improve SLOs. Thus, the MSAP program's curricula has had several major changes this year. First, the MSAP program, due to accreditation requirements, is no longer allowed to admit during the spring semesters. Second, to prevent ethical and legal issue from occurring during the course of the first year in the program, PSYC 651 Professional/Ethical Issues in Counseling Psychology has been moved to the first semester in the program.

The MSAP and SSP faculty are particularly proud of our students and their performance in meeting not only the SLOs established by the programs, but also meeting the standards set by our national accrediting bodies (i.e., CAMPP & NASP). This is evidenced by their 20-year 100% passing rate, on both the *Praxis II Examination* and the *National Counselor Exam (NCE)*. In addition, all students who have graduated from both programs were offered positions within the Pee Dee Region of SC, fulfilling our program mission to “develop the knowledge and skills necessary to work as professionals in clinical, school, health, and other community settings as scientist practitioners”.

School Psychology Program

Student Learning Outcomes

1. Students will develop a knowledge base in psychology and understand the major domains of practice for the discipline.
2. Students will communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline.
3. Students will apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice.
4. Students will demonstrate the ability to think critically about and analyze psychology concepts and literature. These skills involve the development of scientific reasoning and problem solving, including effective research methods.

Assessment Methods

Table 1. Student Learning Outcomes, Measures, and Benchmarks

Student Learning Outcome	Measures	Benchmark	Score	Met		
Students will develop a knowledge base in psychology and will obtain an understanding of the major domains of practice for the discipline.	Praxis Exam (Interns)	Score of 147	165	YES		
	Written Exam (First and Second Year Students)	Score of				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥40% for First Year Students • ≥50% for Second Year Students 	57%	65%	YES YES	
	Oral Exam	Score of				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥ 2.0 for First Year Students • ≥3.0 for Second Year Students 	4.00	3.59	YES YES	
	Supervisor Ratings	Scores of				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥2.0 for First Year students • ≥3.0 for Second Year Students • ≥4.0 for Interns 		3.25	3.52	YES YES YES		
Intern Exit Questionnaire		Scores of ≥3.0 across each domain	4.62	YES		
Students will communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline.	Assessment Reports	Scores of				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥40% for First Year Students • ≥50% for Second Year Students • ≥60% for Interns 	51%	87%	92%	YES YES YES
		Case Studies	Scores of			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥40% for First Year Students • ≥50% for Second Year Students • ≥60% for Interns 		82%	91%	93%	YES YES YES
	Portfolio		Scores of			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥2.0 for First Year students • ≥3.0 for Second Year Students • ≥4.0 for Interns 	3.27	3.85	4.29	YES YES YES
Intern Exit Questionnaire		Scores of ≥3.0	4.62	YES		
Students will apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice.	Praxis Exam (Interns) Written Exam (First & Second Year Students)	Scores of				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥40% for First Year Students • ≥50% for Second Year Students • ≥60% for Interns 	57%	64%	67%	YES YES YES
		Oral Exam (First & Second Year Students)	Scores of			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥2.0 for First Year Students • ≥3.0 for Second Year Students 		4.00	3.82	YES YES	

Student Learning Outcome	Measures	Benchmark	Score	Met
Students will demonstrate the ability to think critically about and analyze psychology concepts and literature. These skills involve the development of scientific reasoning and problem solving, including effective research methods.	Supervisor Ratings	Scores of		
		• ≥ 2.0 for First Year students	3.19	YES
		• ≥ 3.0 for Second Year Students	4.02	YES
	Portfolio	• ≥ 4.0 for Interns	4.22	YES
		Scores of		
		• ≥ 2.0 for First Year students	4.20	YES
	Intern Exit Questionnaire	• ≥ 3.0 for Second Year Students	4.79	YES
		• ≥ 4.0 for Interns	5.00	YES
		Scores of ≥ 3.0	4.64	YES
	Literature Review (Second Year students) Research Project (Interns)	Scores of		
• ≥ 3.0 for Second Year students		4.03	YES	
• ≥ 4.0 for Interns		4.29	YES	
Supervisor Ratings	Scores of			
	• ≥ 3.0 for Second Year Students	4.08	YES	
	• ≥ 4.0 for Interns	3.94	YES	
Portfolio	Scores of			
	• ≥ 3.0 for Second Year Students	4.25	YES	
	• ≥ 4.0 for Interns	4.00	YES	
Intern Exit Questionnaire	Scores of ≥ 3.0	4.65	YES	

Assessment Results

Student Learning Outcome 1: Development of knowledge base and understanding of the major domains of practice for the discipline.

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 six students completing internships in the School Psychology Option (See Table 2). The six program completers received scores on the Praxis II, which was revised and implemented this year. The mean score for these four completers was 165 with individual scores ranging from 158 to 177. The required cut-score for national certification of school psychologists has been set at 147.

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. This target was achieved.

Written Examination

This year first and second year school psychology students completed a program-developed written examination. It 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. Table 2 illustrates the results of this exam. First year students are required to obtain a 40% or greater in each area of the written examination and obtained a 57% on the written exam. Second year students must meet or exceed a 50% on each area of the written examination and obtained a 65% on the written exam. All students met and exceeded the benchmark goal set by the program.

Oral Examination

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 for a hypothetical client with background characteristics, interview and observational data, test scores and graphs/data of responses 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 (Inter-rater Reliability = .85). 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 2.0 on the oral examination. Second year students must meet or exceed a criterion rating of 3.0 on the oral examination. All students across both cohorts met or exceeded the benchmarks set on the oral examination, with first year students obtaining a criterion rating of 4.04 and second year students obtaining a criterion rating of 3.59. Thus, our target was achieved. Table 3 shows the results from this oral examination.

Portfolio Review

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 on a 5-point scale, where 1 represented "remedial work," and 5 represented "advanced skills comparable to autonomous practice". First year students are required to obtain ratings greater than 2.0 on the portfolio. Second year students must meet or exceed a criterion rating of 3.0 on the portfolio.

Results of the First and Second Year Student Reviews are presented in Table 4. First year students obtained a mean rating of 3.27 on their portfolios; second year students obtained a 3.85 on their portfolios, and interns obtained a 4.29 on their portfolios. Thus, all students across all cohorts met or exceeded the benchmark set. This target was achieved.

Practicum Supervisor Ratings

Practicum field supervisor ratings are required to be completed by both university- and site-based supervisors for all students each semester. First year students are required to obtain ratings greater than 2.0 on the practicum supervisor ratings. Second year students must meet or exceed a criterion rating of 3.0 on the practicum supervisor ratings.

Examination of field supervisor ratings submitted showed that all students met or exceeded minimum requirements for acceptable performance and contact hours in course-related practice settings. First year students were rated at a 3.25 by their practicum supervisors and second year students were rated a 3.52 by their practicum supervisors. Refer to Table 5 for the results of these ratings.

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 eighth 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 4 interns (all degree seeking students completing level II certification training) who completed their one academic year internship in Spring 2019 produced a mean composite rating of 4.40 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. Interns must meet or exceed a criterion rating of 4.0 on the practicum supervisor ratings. Mean internship supervisor ratings computed in relation to NASP training Domains and other skill competency areas are shown in Table 6.

All four of the interns were rated above the expected criterion. 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 & Exit Interviews

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." The program aspired to exceed a criterion rating of 3.0 across all ratings.

Across the 10 skill domains, course ratings averaged 4.59 and practicum ratings averaged 4.60 and internship ratings averaged 4.67. Thus, the benchmark was achieved. Mean ratings for each NASP Domain are displayed in Table 7. Collectively, students completing the program at the end of internship rated their course, practicum, and internship experiences as preparing them in regard to NASP skill domains at a level of general competence or higher.

Comments from students during exit interviews indicated that they generally felt well prepared and are confident in using their skillset in everyday practice. However, several issues were identified to improve the program.

First, the students felt that more time should be spent in class on program evaluation and single case design. They suggested that during internship a specific refresher should be given on how to write a literature review for publication as well as how to develop a research proposal for the Institutional Review Board. They also requested that during each of their intervention classes a refresher be given on data-based decision making in single case design.

In terms of academic interventions, while they felt prepared to deal with reading and mathematics deficits that children displayed, they did not feel there was enough emphasis in their literacy intervention course on writing. They suggested that writing be a separate academic area covered in the literacy intervention course.

Further, they also identified that they would like more intervention courses to deal with problematic behaviors that they encounter on a daily basis. Specifically, they identified the need for more time to be spent on family interventions and engagement, with a specific emphasis on empirically based interventions for Conduct Disorder.

Finally, they expressed an interest in having more time spent in crisis prevention, threat assessment, suicide risk assessment, and crisis intervention. Although there is a full course in these areas, the students suggested case studies and role-plays may be more effective in teaching this information.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Students will communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline.

Evaluation Reports

To assess our learning goal of communicating psychological concepts, the program assesses the evaluation reports that are provided to parents and schools. 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. First year students are required to obtain ratings greater than 50% on all reports. Second year students must meet or exceed a criterion rating of 60% on all reports. Interns must meet or exceed a criterion of 70%. Results of this assessment are shown in Table 8.

Results from these data indicate that each cohort met or exceeded the minimum criterion that was set. First year students averaged 51% on their reports; second year students averaged 87% on their reports; interns averaged 92% on their reports. The target was achieved.

Case Studies

To assess our learning goal of communicating psychological concepts, the program assesses the case studies that are provided to school professionals. 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. First year students are required to obtain ratings greater than 50% on all case studies. Second year students must meet or exceed a criterion rating of 60% on all case studies. Interns are must meet or exceed a criterion of 70% on all case studies. Results of this assessment are shown in Table 9.

Results from these data indicate that each cohort met or exceeded the minimum criterion that was set. First year students averaged 82% on their case studies; second year students averaged 91% on their case studies; interns averaged 93% on their case studies. Thus, this target was achieved.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice.

Scores on the Praxis II Examination necessary for certification and licensure in school psychology were received for all six students completing internship. The four program completers received scores on the Praxis II, which was revised and implemented this year. The program expects that our students will achieve a minimum of 60% on internship in the domain of *Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery*, which includes ethical decision-making (See Table 2). Our interns obtained an average of 67% in this area; thus, meeting the benchmarks set.

Written Examination

The program-developed written examination taken by 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 program expects that our students will achieve a minimum of 40% for first year students, and 50% for second year students in the domain of *Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery* (See Table 3). By these evaluative criteria, all students exceeded the benchmark set with first year students obtaining 57% and second year students obtaining 64%. This target was achieved.

Oral 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 a hypothetical 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. First year students are required to obtain ratings greater than 2.0 on the oral examination. Second year students must meet or exceed a criterion rating of 3.0 on the oral examination. By these evaluative criteria, all students exceeded the benchmark set with first year students achieving a 4.00 and second year students achieving a 3.82. This target was achieved. Table 3 illustrates the results from the oral examination.

Portfolio Review

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 on a 5-point scale, where 1 represented "remedial work," and 5 represented "advanced skills comparable to autonomous practice". First year students are required to obtain ratings greater than 2.0 on the portfolio. Second year students must meet or exceed a criterion rating of 3.0 on the portfolio. Interns are expected to achieve or exceed a criterion rating of 4.0 on the portfolio. All students met or exceeded the benchmark and achieved the target with first year students obtaining a 4.20, second year students obtaining a 4.79, and interns obtaining a 5.00. Table 5 indicates the results of these ratings of the portfolio.

Practicum Supervisor Ratings

Practicum field supervisor ratings are required to be completed by both university- and site-based supervisors for all students each semester. First year students are required to obtain ratings greater than 2.0 on the practicum supervisor ratings. Second year students must meet or exceed a criterion rating of 3.0 on the practicum supervisor ratings. Examination of field supervisor ratings submitted showed that all students met or exceeded minimum requirements for acceptable performance and contact hours in course-related practice settings. This target was achieved with first year students obtaining a 3.19 and second year students obtaining a 4.02. Table 5 indicates the results of these ratings.

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 eighth 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 four interns (all degree seeking students completing level II certification training) who completed their one academic year internship in Spring 2019 produced a mean composite rating of 4.85 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. Interns must meet or exceed a criterion rating of 4.0 on the practicum supervisor ratings. Mean internship supervisor ratings computed in relation to NASP training Domains and other skill competency areas are shown in Table 6. All four of the interns met the criterion set.

School Psychology Option Assessment

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." The program aspired to exceed a criterion rating of 3.0 for this area. Table 7 indicates that this benchmark was met. This target was achieved with courses, practica, and internship obtaining a 4.64 rating.

Student Learning Outcome 4: Students will demonstrate the ability to think critically about and analyze psychology concepts and literature. These skills involve the development of scientific reasoning and problem solving, including effective research methods.

Research Project

The School Psychology Program is in the process of developing an internal assessment rubric to evaluate students' critical thinking about and analysis of psychological concepts. In its current form, the assessment has seven questions, some of which assess students' presentation of their research at the FMU Research and Exhibition Day and some of which assess the quality of students' research. Each question is rated on a five-point scale with 1 indicating does not meet expectations and 5 indicating exceeding expectations. Questions include: 1) overall quality of presentation, 2) overall breadth of knowledge, 3) quality of response to questions, 5) review of literature, 6) significance, 7) rationale, 8) research design and implementation, 9) contribution to discipline, and 10) quality of writing. The program has set a benchmark of 3.0 or greater for second year students and 4.0 or greater on this measure for interns. As can be seen in Table 10, the overall average for second year students is a 4.03 and a 4.24 for interns indicating that the program met this benchmark. This target was achieved.

Portfolio Review

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 on a 5-point scale, where 1 represented "remedial work," and 5 represented "advanced skills comparable to autonomous practice". Second year students are expected to exceed a criterion of 3.0 on this portion of their portfolio. Interns are expected to exceed a criterion of 4.0 on this portion of their portfolio. Table 4 shows that all students exceed the benchmarks set with second year students obtaining a 4.25 and interns obtaining a 4.00. This target was achieved.

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 eighth 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. Interns must meet or exceed a criterion rating of 4.0 on the practicum supervisor ratings. End-of-Internship ratings of school psychology interns by field-based supervisors for four interns who completed their one academic year internship in Spring 2019 produced a mean composite rating of 4.40 on a 5 point scale, meeting and exceeding the benchmark set for the year. Mean internship supervisor ratings computed in relation to NASP training Domains and other skill competency areas are shown in Table 5.

School Psychology Option Assessment

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." The program aspired to exceed a criterion rating of 3.0 for this area. Table 10 indicates that this benchmark was met and the target achieved with coursework, practica, and internship being rated at a 4.65.

Action Plan

Student Learning Outcome 1: Development of knowledge base and understanding of the major domains of practice for the discipline.

Generally, students performed well on the *Praxis-II*, the Written Exam, the Oral Exam, the portfolio, the practicum supervisor ratings, intern supervisor ratings, with all meeting and exceeding the overall benchmarks set. However, student concerns on exit interview still must be addressed.

First, the students felt that more time should be spent in class on program evaluation and single case design. They suggested that during internship a specific refresher should be given on how to write a literature review for publication as well as how to develop a research proposal for the Institutional Review Board (IRB). They also requested that during each of their intervention classes a refresher be given on data-based decision making in single case design. Based on these recommendations, a module has been added to each of the intervention classes as well as in the internship seminar on data-based decision making in single case design. Additionally, a module on program evaluation has been added to the internship seminar to aid in writing a literature review as well as how to develop a research proposal for the IRB.

Second, students did not feel there was enough emphasis in their literacy intervention course on writing. They suggested that writing be a separate academic area covered in the literacy intervention course. Based on this recommendation, to modules have been added on evidence based interventions for writing deficits.

Third, students identified the need for more time to be spent on family interventions and engagement, with a specific emphasis on empirically based interventions for Conduct Disorder. Thus, fifteen hours have been identified in the Consultation with Diverse Families and Communities class that will discuss behavioral parent interventions as well as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) for the schools.

Finally, students expressed concerns with the effectiveness of how crisis prevention, threat assessment, suicide risk assessment, and crisis intervention were taught. Thus, case studies as well as a training using a behavioral training model will be utilized in classes to improve the effectiveness of teaching this material.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Students will communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline.

For the third year, students were required to have their psychological evaluation reports and case studies evaluated by the faculty. On these measures, students performed well across the program. However, these instruments have not been validated and more data are needed to determine the usefulness of the instrument. Thus, during the 2018-2019 academic year we will continue to develop our assessment instruments for this outcome, specifically writing each criterion's answers as more behavioral or observable.

Additionally, we continue to experiment with the best way to assess this attainment of this SLO. The program is considering asking parents and teachers, who are the recipients of our services, about the effectiveness of student communication and their satisfaction with services provided.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice.

Generally, students performed well on the *Praxis-II*, the Written Exam, the Oral Exam, and practicum supervisor ratings, and internship supervisor ratings, with all students (n = 26) meeting the overall benchmarks

set. In previous years, this area was one of the weaker areas of the program. Thus, the course was moved from a 5-week summer course to a 15-week course that is taken during the first semester of enrollment in the program. The cohort that graduated in Spring 2019 is the first cohort to go through the program with this scheduling change. It appears that this scheduling change was effective as students now are performing the highest in this area. We will continue to monitor our students to ensure that they are upholding the ethical and legal standards to the best of their abilities.

Student Learning Outcome 4: Students will demonstrate the ability to think critically about and analyze psychology concepts and literature. These skills involve the development of scientific reasoning and problem solving, including effective research methods.

This year the second year students and the internship class were assessed on critical thinking and analysis of psychological concepts. A new requirement for students to present orally to their classmates prior to participation at the research fair seemed to improve both written and oral products, with students meeting the benchmarks this year for all areas on the literature review and research project. We will continue to emphasize the research and program evaluation aspect for our students.

Appendix A

Other Programmatic Issues

Preparation and renewal of NASP accreditation and CAEP national recognition

The accreditation review was due on September 15, 2016. The 2016 review was conducted employing newly adopted 2010 accreditation standards. This required significant reorganization of program and course goals to correspond to the new standards. Two complete years of program outcome data were required for the review and the review was submitted. In February 2017, the program was notified that we were FULLY APPROVED until 2023. The next review will be due on September 15, 2022.

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 space is available after current students are enrolled.

Currently, graduates are able to exit the program with the following certifications (in addition to SC School Psychologist II and Nationally Certified School Psychologist):

- Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule – Second Edition (ADOS-2)
- Autism Diagnostic Interview – Revised (ADI-R)
- PREPaRE: School Crisis Prevention and Intervention Training
- CPI: Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training
- Trauma-Focused Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy Training
- Trauma-Focused – Grief
- Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools (CBITS)
- Suicide Risk Assessment

Board Certified Behavior Analyst

In the Summer 2016, the school psychology program conducted a feasibility study to determine the utility of adding a certification on to the Specialist in School Psychology for certification as a Board Certified Behavior

Analyst. After reviewing all data, this certification has now been approved by the University and South Carolina's Commission on Higher Education. The added coursework has been reviewed by the Behavior Analyst Certification Board and FMU now is accepted as a location for the Verified Course Sequence (VCS). The first classes toward this additional certification were offered in Fall 2018 and while only one traditional student seeking the MSAP enrolled in the program, due to lack of marketing, seven of the traditional school psychology students enrolled and have completed the additional 15 hours of coursework necessary to sit for the BCBA exam. Although we have not marketed the program again this year, we have 4 students seeking the MSAP enrolled for the Fall 2019 and 2 school psychology students enrolled to complete the VCS.

Faculty Retirement & Resignations

Dr. Samuel F. Broughton retired at the end of the 2014-2015 school year and recently announced that he was no longer able to teach adjunct courses for us. Dr. Robert Bridger retired at the end of the 2015-2016 school year and no longer teaches courses in the school psychology program. Thus, coordination of the school psychology program was passed on to Dr. Crystal R. Hill-Chapman.

Dr. Susan Craft Astary was hired as a replacement for Dr. Doris Paez, who resigned in February 2018; she began teaching assessment courses in Fall 2017, but has since resigned in May 2019 due to a family relocation. Dr. Antonio Cooper has been hired to replace Dr. Astary.

Dr. Taber resigned in February 2018. Dr. Christopher Bullock has taken Dr. Taber's position as the coordinator of the BCBA program, HOWEVER, he is not considered full-time with the school psychology program. Thus, an additional faculty member will be needed by Fall 2020 to meet the stipulated NASP/CAEP accreditation requirements requiring a minimum of 3 FTE dedicated school psychology program faculty members and a maximum faculty to student ratio of 1:10. As a new Project CREATE center for the state of SC, the school psychology is unable to take many students due to the stringent faculty to student ratio. Thus, we are limited to 5 Project CREATE students, who are part-time, and 5 traditional students, who are full-time. We had many acceptable candidates this year for the traditional program that had to be turned down to our faculty to student ratio.

Clinical/Counseling Psychology Option

Student Learning Outcomes

Students in the clinical/counseling program are expected to:

1. Develop a knowledge base in psychology and obtain an understanding of the major domains of practice for the discipline. These include the following:
 - Biological bases of behavior
 - Acquired or learned bases of behavior
 - Social/cultural/systemic bases of behavior
 - Individual or unique bases of behavior
 - Methodology used to investigate questions and acquire knowledge in the discipline
 - Theory, history, and applications of psychological principles and theories
 - Assessment such as interviewing techniques and program evaluation
2. Communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline.
3. Apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice.

Table 11. Student Learning Outcomes, Measures, and Benchmarks

Student Learning Outcome	Measures	Benchmark	Achieved	Met
Students will develop a knowledge base in psychology and will obtain an understanding of the major domains of practice for the discipline.	NCE Exam	Passing Score	100%	YES
	Supervisor Ratings	Scores of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥ 3.0 for Practicum Students • ≥ 4.0 for Interns 	4.00 4.41	YES YES
Students will communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline.	Communication/Collaboration Supervisor Rating	Scores of		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥ 3.0 for Practicum Students • ≥ 4.0 for Interns 	4.54 4.46	YES YES
Students will apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice.	Ethics Supervisor Rating	Scores of		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≥ 3.0 for Practicum Students • ≥ 4.0 for Interns 	4.41 4.43	YES YES

Assessment Results

Student Learning Outcome 1: Development of knowledge base and understanding of the major domains of practice for the discipline.

National Counselor Exam

The *National Counselor Exam (NCE)* is a 200-item multiple-choice examination designed to assess knowledge, skills, and abilities determined to be important for providing effective counseling services. The *NCE* is a requirement for counselor licensure in the state of South Carolina and North Carolina, as well as many other states. The program expects all students to take and pass the exam. Current knowledge indicates that all students who have taken the exam have passed it.

Internship Supervisor Ratings

The following information outlines the assessment of the clinical/counseling psychology students' internship experiences. Community supervisor rating forms for the eight clinical/counseling interns who completed internships were evaluated and produced a mean overall rating of 4.41 (See Table 12), 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. Since 2007-2008, the average supervisor rating of clinical/counseling interns has exceeded consistently a rating of four. Our benchmark for each of the areas is a 4.0 for interns. Our interns met or exceeded the benchmark in all areas.

Intern Ratings of Internship

Evaluation rating scales assessing the quality of internship were sought from students. A questionnaire was distributed to all eight interns. Feedback from this survey indicated that students felt generally positive about their experiences in the Master of Science 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 4.36 (see Table 13). Ratings in all areas of students' internship experiences in the MSAP program, clinical/counseling option exceeded the benchmark of 4.0.

Intern 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. Feedback from this survey indicated that students felt generally positive about their experiences in the Master of Science 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. Table 14 displays the training program quality ratings by interns. The overall, mean program rating was 4.32, compared to 4.27 last year. Ratings in most areas indicated a positive evaluation of students' experiences in the MSAP program, clinical/counseling option meeting the faculty's expectation of 4.0. However, ratings of faculty advising, and faculty responsiveness were below the program expectation of 4.0 at 3.93 for both.

Students' comments on the open-ended questions on the questionnaire regarding their experience in the clinical/counseling option were largely positive. Strengths of the program continue to revolve around three main themes: (1) quality of the faculty (2) student-professor relationship; (3) small class sizes. Areas for suggested improvement included providing more research opportunities, more diverse practica sites, and improving the quality of practica supervisors.

Practicum Supervisor Ratings

The following information pertains to the assessment of the clinical/counseling psychology students' practicum experiences. Community supervisor rating forms for the 14 clinical/counseling students completing practica were completed. 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. Our students were evaluated and their supervisors' ratings produced a mean overall rating of 4.00, meeting our benchmark of 3.0 (see Table 15).

Student Ratings of Practica

Evaluation rating scales assessing the quality of practica were sought from students. A questionnaire was distributed to all eleven students. 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 4.62 (see Table 16). Ratings in all areas generally indicated a positive evaluation of students' practica experiences in the MSAP program, clinical/counseling option and meeting our minimum expectations of 3.0.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Students will communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline.

Internship Supervisor Ratings

The following information summarizes the assessment of the clinical/counseling psychology interns' ability to communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline. 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. Table 12 provides community supervisor ratings for the eight clinical/counseling interns who completed internships. Across all interns a mean overall rating of 4.46 was obtained, meeting our benchmark of 4.0.

Practicum Supervisor Ratings

The following information regards the assessment of the clinical/counseling psychology students' ability to communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline. 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. Table 15 provides community supervisor ratings for the 23 clinical/counseling students completing practica. A mean overall rating of 4.54 was obtained, meeting our benchmark of 3.0.

Intern Ratings

The following information summarizes the assessment of the clinical/counseling psychology student's self-ratings of their ability to communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline. 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. Table 14 displays the training program quality ratings by interns. The overall rating for this area was 4.57, meeting our benchmark.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice.

Internship Supervisor Ratings

The following information regards the assessment of the clinical/counseling psychology interns' ability to apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice. 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. Across all interns a mean overall rating of 4.43 was obtained, meeting our benchmark of 4.0.

Practicum Supervisor Ratings

The following information regards the assessment of the clinical/counseling psychology students' ability to apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice. 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. A mean overall rating of 4.41 was obtained, meeting our benchmark of 3.0.

Intern Ratings

The following information summarizes the assessment of the clinical/counseling psychology student's self-ratings of their ability to apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice. 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 rating for this area was 4.57, meeting our benchmark.

Action Plan

Student Learning Outcome 1: Development of knowledge base and understanding of the major domains of practice for the discipline.

Our interns met or exceeded the benchmark of 4.0 in all areas of the assessment completed by the internship supervisor. Ratings in most areas indicated a positive evaluation of students' experiences in the MSAP program, clinical/counseling option meeting the faculty's expectation of 4.0. However, ratings of practicum sites, practicum supervisors, faculty advising, and faculty responsiveness were below the program expectation of 4.0. A checklist of faculty roles and responsibilities for advising has been developed and faculty will be more available during advising.

Students enrolled in practica met the benchmark in across all areas on the assessment completed by the practica supervisors as well as the 3.0 benchmark set for student ratings of practica.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Students will communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline.

Means for all domains met or exceeded our benchmarks of 3.0 for student enrolled in practica and 4.0 for students on internship.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice.

Means for all domains met or exceeded our benchmarks of 3.0 for student enrolled in practica and 4.0 for students on internship.

Appendix B

Other Programmatic Issues

Preparation and renewal of CAMMP Accreditation

The accreditation review was due on December 31, 2017. Two complete years of program outcome data were required for the review and the review was submitted. In April 2018, the program was notified that we were FULLY ACCREDITED until 2021. The next review will be due on December 31, 2022.

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 continues to explore ways to expand the curriculum.

To remain competitive with other states so that students do not need to seek further training for licensure, the clinical/counseling program approved an additional eight hours to the curriculum, bringing the number of hours to complete the program to 60. These courses are PSY 644 Substance Abuse Counseling and PSY 703 Counseling for Social Justice and Diversity. Each course also has a related PSY 600 or PSY 700 practicum.

The clinical/counseling program continues to explore ways to offer specialized training to students.

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 offered a substance abuse course, both taught by part-time professors recruited from the community. As of Fall 2018, this substance abuse course and associated practicum has been added to the curriculum permanently (PSYC).

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.

In 2013, 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.

Summary of Department Assessment Activities

Program assessment regarding program admissions includes the number of applications received, as well as the number of qualified applicants to whom admission offers are made. Data in Table 17 reveal that 21 of 27 applicants were qualified for admission (77% acceptance rate), representing a slight decrease in the acceptance rate from the previous year (84%). Of those 21 students to whom admissions offers were made, 17 subsequently enrolled in the program (80% enrollment rate). This represents a slight increase in enrollment from the previous year (54%).

During the 2018-2019 academic year (Fall and Spring) 17 newly accepted students enrolled in the program (7 in clinical/counseling and 10 in school psychology). This number compares to 19 students that entered the program the previous academic year (7 in clinical/counseling and 12 in school psychology). Average GRE scores were Verbal of 149 (42nd percentile), Quantitative of 144 (23rd percentile), and Writing of 3.65 (42nd percentile). While the average Verbal GRE Score and Quantitative score remained the same from previous years, the the average GRE Writing Score increased slightly. This year's average overall undergraduate GPA for newly enrolled students was 3.46, and the Psychology GPA was 3.47, as compared to 3.42 and 3.42 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 increased slightly to 50. Eleven students graduated from the degree program during 2018 - 2019 (7 clinical/counseling and 4 school). This compares to 15 the previous year. As in previous years, the overall size of the program remained relatively stable.

Issues of Departmental Concern

Recruitment for graduate applicants remained an issue that requires addressing (a priority since 2007)

The Department continues to develop ideas for improving the recruitment process. A marketing and recruitment plan was developed by Dr. John Hester, Dr. Samuel Broughton, Dr. Farrah Hughes, and Ms. Jennifer Taylor (whose position has since been filled by Ms. Charlotte Stephens). However, due to the retirement of Drs. Hester and Broughton, and the departure of Dr. Hughes, this plan will need to be redeveloped, due to its age. In the past we have received assistance from the Provost's office to assist with our marketing efforts.

This year the university launched a new format for the entire department website and has supported the department by adding a graduate admissions coordinator. However, several complaints were made by applicants indicating that they had applied, but had done so after our recommended cut date. The department was not notified of any of these completed applications, thus 12 applications for admission were unable to be considered. The Psychology Department will continue to work with the University on the graduate application process to ensure that we continue to attract the highest quality candidates.

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. We will begin offering one each summer for course credit to further increase our visibility.

The need to improve efforts to retain students has remained an issue requiring attention

Dr. Hill-Chapman and Dr. James 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. The school program has lost one student this year due to poor academic performance. Although a remediation plan was implemented and monitored, it was unsuccessful in remediating the student's academic difficulties.

Being able to recruit from a larger and higher quality applicant pool will significantly impact retention as well (see Recruitment above).

The Department continues to seek means to provide greater financial support to graduate students.

During this school year the Department continued to look for 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 [20 hours]). Other on-campus assistantships available to graduate students include positions with, the

Center of Excellence, the Housing Office, Admissions, Student Health Services, Counseling and Testing, 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.

Appendix C Tables

Table 2. Students' Knowledge and Skills for the School Psychology Program

Principal	2016-2017			2017-2018			2018-2019		
	First Year (n=8)	Second Year (n=12)	Intern (n=8)	First Year (n=12)	Second Year (n=4)	Intern (n = 4)	First Year (n=5)	Second Year (n=12)	Intern (n = 4)
Professional Practices, Practices that Permeate all Aspects of Service (2.1, 2.2)	39%	40%	39%	42%	42%	76%	68 [^]	68%	70%
Direct and Indirect Services for Children, Families, & Schools (2.3, 2.4)	52%	53%	52%	53%	54%	71%	66%	62%	82%
Systems-Level Services (2.5, 2.6, 2.7)	60%	63%	60%	57%	63%	87%	65%	72%	67%
Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery (2.8, 2.9, 2.10)	50%	43%	50%	55%	52%	64%	57%	64%	67%
OVERALL	50%	52%	50%	52%	53%	74%	64%	66%	72%

Table 3. Results of School Psychology Oral Exam

	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year
2.1 Data-based Decision Making and Accountability	3.20	3.85	2.42	3.55	4.00	3.59
2.2 Consultation and Collaboration	-	3.27	-	3.40	-	3.69
2.3 Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills	-	3.88	-	3.60	-	3.60
2.4 Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills (2.4)	3.06	3.75	2.75	3.60	4.16	3.54
2.5 School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning	3.27	3.00	-	3.90	4.18	3.53
2.6 Preventive and Responsive Services	-	3.18	-	3.80	4.00	3.50
2.7 Family-School Collaboration Services	-	3.92	-	3.60	-	3.64
2.8 Diversity in Development and Learning	3.31	3.14	2/58	4.00	3.93	3.31
2.9 Research and Program Evaluation	-	3.32	-	3.60	-	3.69
2.10 Legal, Ethical, & Professional Practice	3.18	3.75	2.67	3.60	4.00	3.82
OVERALL	3.20	3.51	2.60	3.67	4.04	3.59

Table 4. Results of First and Second Year School Psychology Student Portfolios

	2016-2017			2017-2018			2018-2019		
	First Year	Second Year	Intern	First Year	Second Year	Intern	First Year	Second Year	Intern
Data-based Decision Making and Accountability (2.1)	3.57	3.50	4.67	2.50	2.80	4.25	3.00	4.67	4.25
Consultation and Collaboration (2.2)	3.83	3.50	4.67	2.75	3.20	4.00	3.20	2.92	4.29
Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills (2.3)	-	4.50	4.83	2.00	2.80	4.00	3.00	3.08	3.86
Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills (2.4)	3.67	4.00	4.50	2.75	2.80	4.00	3.40	3.13	4.00
School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning (2.5)	3.57	3.75	5.00	2.50	2.80	4.50	3.00	3.83	4.25
Preventive and Responsive Services (2.6)	-	3.50	4.83	2.50	2.80	4.50	3.00	3.67	4.25
Family-School Collaboration Services (2.7)	3.57	4.00	4.83	2.50	2.80	4.50	3.20	4.00	4.25
Diversity in Development and Learning (2.8)	3.71	4.25	4.83	2.80	2.80	5.00	3.40	4.17	4.88
Research and Program Evaluation (2.9)	-	3.50	5.00	2.20	4.00	4.00	-	4.25	4.00
Legal, Ethical, & Professional Practice (2.10)	3.86	3.88	4.83	2.80	4.00	5.00	4.20	4.79	5.00
OVERALL	3.71	3.83	4.76	2.53	3.15	4.38	3.27	3.85	4.29

Table 5. Results of First and Second Year Practicum Supervisor Ratings

Domain/Year	2016-2017		2017-2018		2018-2019	
	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year
Professional Skills	-	-	-	-	3.51	4.04
Data-based Decision Making and Accountability	2.47	3.51	2.72	3.04	3.30	3.99
Consultation and Collaboration	2.35	3.59	3.69	3.86	3.24	3.88
Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills	2.40	3.83	3.44	3.49	3.08	3.96
Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills	3.40	4.10	3.38	3.35	3.31	3.80
School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning	3.46	3.57	3.22	3.25	2.50	3.49
Preventive and Responsive Services	2.09	3.99	3.28	3.39	3.21	3.71
Family-School Collaboration Services	2.97	3.75	3.45	3.52	2.96	3.85
Diversity in Development and Learning	3.11	3.68	3.20	3.65	3.20	3.87
Research and Program Evaluation	2.23	3.90	2.75	3.52	2.75	4.08
Legal, Ethical, & Professional Practice	2.54	3.56	3.39	3.64	3.19	4.02
OVERALL	2.70	3.75	2.70	3.75	3.25	3.52

Table 6. School Psychology Internship Supervisor Rating Results by Average for Professional Skill Domains

Domain/Year	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Professional Skills	-	-	4.60
Data-based Decision Making and Accountability	4.15	4.71	4.25
Consultation and Collaboration	4.16	4.60	4.31
Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills	4.46	4.65	4.04
Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills	4.42	4.64	4.16
School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning	4.90	4.52	4.42
Preventive and Responsive Services	4.38	4.66	4.50
Family-School Collaboration Services	4.77	4.57	4.50
Diversity in Development and Learning	4.77	4.78	4.42
Research and Program Evaluation	4.56	4.80	4.40
Legal, Ethical, & Professional Practice	3.97	4.80	4.85
OVERALL	4.23	4.67	4.40

Table 7. Mean Ratings across NASP Domains for School Psychology Option

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2018-2019		
	Courses	Practica	Internship	Courses	Practica	Internship	Courses	Practica	Internship
Professional Skills	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.70	4.72	4.93
Data-based Decision Making and Accountability	4.61	-	4.89	4.94	-	4.50	4.46	4.46	4.67
Consultation and Collaboration	4.13	-	4.38	4.92	-	4.58	4.63	4.63	4.69
Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills	4.36	-	4.67	4.94	-	4.50	4.59	4.59	4.67
Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills	4.22	-	4.61	4.94	-	3.89	4.71	4.71	3.88
School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning	3.89	-	4.42	4.78	-	4.06	4.50	4.50	4.50
Preventive and Responsive Services	4.36	-	4.67	4.94	-	4.00	4.58	4.58	4.58
Family-School Collaboration Services	4.03	-	4.31	4.83	-	4.33	4.54	4.54	4.54
Diversity in Development and Learning	4.56	-	4.89	5.00	-	4.83	4.54	4.58	4.58
Research and Program Evaluation	4.57	-	4.93	4.93	-	4.07	4.65	4.65	4.65
Legal, Ethical, & Professional Practice	4.55	-	4.86	5.00	-	4.90	4.64	4.64	4.64
OVERALL	4.33	-	4.66	4.92	-	4.37	4.59	4.60	4.67

Table 8. Evaluation Report Means

	2016-2017			2017-2018			2018-2019		
	First Year	Second Year	Intern	First Year	Second Year	Intern	First Year	Second Year	Intern
Assessment Procedures	-	-	-	59% (2.96)	76% (3.78)	97%(4.84)	56%(2.8)	82%(4.1)	89%(4.46)
Background	57%(2.86)	75%(3.77)	95%(4.74)	53%(2.65)	70%(3.48)	76%(3.80)	51%(2.57)	80%(4.02)	96%(4.8)
Behavioral Observations	58%(2.90)	56%(2.80)	83%(4.13)	52%(2.60)	62%(3.12)	66%(3.30)	47%(2.33)	64%(3.22)	76%(3.8)
Data Analysis and Interpretation Percentage	58%(2.90)	70%(3.50)	93%(4.67)	54%(2.71)	72%(3.60)	88%(4.39)	52%(2.6)	75%(3.75)	98%(4.89)
Synthesis	56%(2.82)	66%(2.75)	91%(4.56)	51%(2.55)	72%(3.60)	95%(4.75)	49%(2.43)	73%(3.67)	93%(4.67)
Application	76%(3.80)	60%(3.00)	76%(3.78)	44%(2.18)	70%(3.50)	89%(4.46)	51%(2.56)	69%(3.46)	89%(4.44)
Style, Clarity, & Communication	54%(2.72)	89%(4.46)	99%(4.94)	53%(2.67)	71%(3.57)	100%(5.00)	51%(2.56)	80%(4.00)	100% (5.00)
OVERALL	60%(3.00)	68%(3.38)	89%(4.47)	52%(2.62)	70%(3.52)	87%(4.36)	51%(2.55)	87%(4.36)	92%(4.58)

Table 9. Case Study Means

	2016-2017			2017-2018			2018-2019		
	First Year	Second Year	Intern	First Year	Second Year	Intern	First Year	Second Year	Intern
Elements of an Effective Case Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	82%	97%	95%
Problem Identification	76%	68%	78%	72%	70%	63%	80%	88%	94%
Problem Analysis	78%	74%	77%	60%	68%	65%	87%	93%	91%
Intervention	80%	97%	99%	54%	89%	98%	83%	90%	93%
Evaluation	66%	61%	56%	52%	52%	52%	77%	82%	94%
TOTAL	75%	75%	78%	60%	70%	70%	82%	91%	93%

Table 10. Research Project Means by Area

Area	2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
	Second Year	Intern	Second Year	Intern	Second Year	Intern
Overall Quality of Presentation	3.88	4.44	4.44	4.67	4.34	4.27
Overall Breadth of Knowledge	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.50	3.95	4.75
Quality of Response to Questions	4.42	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.50
Review of Literature	3.82	3.60	3.60	4.38	3.87	3.94
Significance	3.67	4.75	4.75	5.00	4.38	3.88
Rationale	3.56	4.00	4.00	4.58	4.12	3.75
Research Design and Implementation	3.08	3.83	3.83	4.78	3.78	4.46
Contribution to Discipline	3.00	3.50	3.50	4.63	3.35	4.00
Quality of Writing	4.18	4.13	4.13	4.89	4.22	4.61
OVERALL	3.73	3.97	3.97	4.66	4.03	4.24

Table 12. Internship Supervisor Ratings by Domain for Clinical/Counseling Interns

Professional Skill Area/Year	Mean Supervisor Ratings		
	2016-2017 n=11	2017-2018 n=6	2018-2019 n=14
Communication/Collaboration	4.30	4.50	4.46
Interviewing and Psychological Assessment	4.54	4.35	4.16
Therapeutic Interventions	4.02	4.31	4.20
Group or Family Treatment	4.81	4.11	4.02
Consultation and In-Service Training	4.34	4.40	4.26
Professional Behavior	4.46	4.59	4.43
OVERALL RATING	4.41	4.38	4.41

Table 13. Student Ratings of Internship

Question	2016-2017 (n=11)	2017-2018 (n=6)	2018-2019 (n=14)
I found the practicum guidelines published in the <i>Clinical/Counseling Psychology Handbook</i> to be:	4.20	4.33	4.14
I found the practicum contract between the site/agency, University, and intern to be	4.20	4.67	4.33
I found the <u>Intern Evaluation Form</u> feedback to be	4.70	4.17	3.93
I found my contacts with the University practicum faculty supervisor to be	4.20	4.67	4.53
I found the practicum seminar (PSY 600) to be	4.00	4.33	4.33
I found the resources at my site/agency for providing relevant experiences to allow me to meet my contract obligations to be	4.70	4.50	4.47
I found the amount of supervision provided by site supervisor to be	4.70	4.50	4.53
I found the quality of supervision provided by my site supervisor to be	4.60	4.67	4.57
OVERALL RATING OF INTERNSHIP	4.41	4.48	4.36

Table 14. Training Program Quality Ratings

	2016-2017 (n=11)	2017-2018 (n=6)	2018-2019 (n=14)
I found the course requirements of the program to be:	4.88	4.33	4.43
I found the program's ability to help me develop a knowledge base and an understanding of the major domains of practice for the discipline to be:	-	4.67	4.50
I found the program's ability to aid in developing my critical thinking skills to be:	-	4.50	4.43
I found the program's ability to help me learn to communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline to be:	-	4.83	4.57
I found the program's ability to help me learn to apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice to be:	-	4.83	4.57
I found the prerequisite requirements and course sequencing to be:	4.33	4.00	4.14
I found the quality of teaching in my courses to be:	4.22	4.60	4.38
I found the quality of texts and readings in my courses to be:	4.11	4.17	4.21
I found the audiovisual material and technology resources available for each course to be:	4.56	4.33	4.29
I found the practicum experiences required by the program to be:	4.11	4.83	4.57
I found the number of practicum hours required by the program to be:	4.66	4.67	4.50
I found the sites selected for practicum experiences to be:	4.22	3.83	4.21
I found practicum site supervisors to be:	4.56	3.83	4.29
My preparation for internship resulting from my course work was:	4.00	4.33	4.43
My preparation for internship resulting from my practicum work was:	4.88	4.33	4.43
I found the advice and guidance of my faculty adviser to be:	4.11	3.50	3.93
I found the advice and guidance provided in general by the faculty to be:	4.22	3.60	4.00
I found the availability/responsiveness of the faculty to be:	4.33	3.67	3.93
OVERALL	4.37	4.27	4.32

Table 15. Practicum Supervisor Ratings by Domain for Clinical/Counseling Students

Domain	2016-2017 (n=15)	2017-2018 (n=16)	2018-2019 (n=20)
Communication/Collaboration	4.05	4.35	4.54
Interviewing and Psychological Assessment	3.31	3.82	4.00
Therapeutic Interventions	4.01	3.88	4.12
Group or Family Treatment	3.00	4.17	4.00
Consultation and In-Service Training	-	-	4.19
Professional Behavior	4.42	4.34	4.41
OVERALL RATING	3.75	4.11	4.00

Table 16. Student Ratings of Practica

Question	2016-2017 (n=11)	2017-2018 (n=6)	2018-2019 (n=22)
I found the practicum guidelines published in the <i>Handbook</i> to be:	3.46	4.51	4.68
I found the practicum contract between the site/agency, University, and intern to be	3.66	4.50	4.62
I found the <u>Student Evaluation Form</u> feedback to be	3.67	4.19	4.40
I found my contacts with the University practicum faculty supervisor to be	3.70	4.33	4.68
I found the practicum seminar (PSY 600) to be	3.40	4.53	4.27
I found the resources at my site/agency for providing relevant experiences to allow me to meet my contract obligations to be	3.33	4.47	4.82
I found the amount of supervision provided by site supervisor to be	3.30	4.71	4.68
I found the quality of supervision provided by my site supervisor to be	3.66	4.65	4.77
OVERALL RATING OF PRACTICA	3.52	4.49	4.62

Table 17. Data for Applied Psychology Program: Applications and Admissions Offers

	Clinical/ Counseling	School	Total
Complete Applications	12	15	27
Incomplete Applications	3	3	6
Applicants Offered Admission	9	12	21
Students Enrolled	7	10	17

Table 18. Data for Applied Psychology Program: Newly Enrolled Students, Graduates, and Total Enrollment

Total MSAP	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Newly Enrolled	16	17	19	17
GRE-V	149	149	149	149
GRE-Q	147	147	144	144
GRE-W	3.65	3.79	3.39	3.65
GPA (CUM)	3.28	3.55	3.42	3.46
GPA (PSY)	3.44	3.72	3.42	3.47
Graduates	15	18	13	11
Total Students	51	50	46	50

Table 19. Data for Clinical/Counseling Psychology Program: Newly Enrolled Students, Graduates, and Total Enrollment

Clinical/Counseling	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Newly Enrolled	10	8	7	7
GRE-V	150	152	147	148
GRE-Q	148	150	145	147
GRE-W	3.60	3.75	3.36	3.43
GPA (CUM)	3.21	3.51	3.36	3.40
GPA (PSY)	3.32	3.67	3.40	3.60
Graduates	8	12	8	6
Total Students	31	28	25	24

Table 20. Data for School Program: Newly Enrolled Students, Graduates, and Total Enrollment

School	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Newly Enrolled	6	9	12	10
GRE-V	148	147	149	149
GRE-Q	145	144	144	142
GRE-W	3.70	3.83	3.42	3.17
GPA (CUM)	3.35	3.59	3.49	3.52
GPA (PSY)	3.56	3.78	3.44	3.34
Graduates	7	6	4	4
Total Students	20	21	21	21