

# Institutional Effectiveness Report

---

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

**Year:** 2016-2017

**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. Although the benchmark set for ratings of interns by internship supervisors was met for the areas of Communication/Collaboration, Therapeutic Interventions, and Professional Behavior, our interns did not meet the benchmark set for the areas of Interviewing and Psychological Assessment, Group or Family Treatment, or Consultation and In-Service Training on the assessment completed by the internship supervisor. The program is reviewing the current course offerings to determine if changing either the course sequencing or content of courses is necessary to improve these outcomes.

The SSP program met or exceeded the set benchmarks for three of the four SLOs. Similar to last year, the students in the SSP program continue to have difficulties with Research and Program Evaluation, specifically how to make their research project contribute meaningfully to the scientific discipline of psychology. In addition, internship supervisors and students also indicated that this was a particular area of difficulty for them. Thus, although they have had no difficulty with recognizing the content of Research and Program Evaluation, as evaluated by their performance on the national exam, these students do have difficulty with the application of the concepts in their day-to-day work. The program has approved a change in the timing of the required research course, moving it from the beginning of the first year of training to the end of the second year of training. This change will be implemented in the Fall 2016.

Although the programs are generally meeting their benchmarks, we seek to continue to improve SLOs. Thus, the MSAP and SSP programs' curricula have had multiple changes over the course of the last year. The MSAP has two required courses and two related practica added: PSY 644 Substance Abuse Counseling/PSY 600 Practicum and PSY 703 Counseling for Social Justice and Diversity/PSY 700 Practicum. While improving SLOs, the addition of these courses brings the MSAP program to 60 credit hours, giving our program reciprocity for licensure in other states. The SSP program has altered one course (i.e., PSY 704 Academic Assessment and Intervention) to not only improve SLOs, but also to meet the state's Read to Succeed mandate (i.e., PSY 674: Academic Assessment and Intervention: Literacy). Furthermore, the SSP has deleted two courses from its curriculum (i.e., EDUC 616 Curriculum and Organization of Public Schools, K-12 and EDUC 745 Teaching Reading and Written Language to Divergent and Exceptional Learners) and added three (i.e., EDUC 637 Foundations of Reading, PSY 703 Counseling for Social Justice and Diversity, PSY 774 Academic Assessment and Intervention: Numeracy). All curricula changes that have been approved will be implemented beginning in Fall 2016.

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 18-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.
  - Practices that Permeate All Aspects of Service Delivery
    - Data-based decision making
    - Consultation & collaboration
  - Direct and Indirect Services for Children, Families, & Schools
    - Interventions and instructional support to develop academic skills
    - Interventions and mental health services to develop social and life skills
  - Systems-Level Services
    - School-wide practices to promote learning
    - Preventive and response services
    - Family-school collaboration services
  - Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery
    - Diversity and development in learning
    - Research and Program evaluation
    - Legal, ethical, and professional practice
  - Applied psychological foundations including:
    - biological basis of behavior,
    - acquired or learned bases of behavior
    - social/cultural/systemic bases of behavior, and
    - individual or unique bases of behavior.
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
Students will develop a knowledge base in psychology and will obtain an understanding of the major domains of practice for the discipline.	Praxis Exam	Score of 147
	Written Exam	Score of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 40\%</math> for First Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 50\%</math> for Second Year Students</li> </ul>
	Oral Exam	Score of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 2.0</math> for First Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 3.0</math> for Second Year Students</li> </ul>
	Supervisor Ratings	Scores of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 2.0</math> for First Year students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 3.0</math> for Second Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 4.0</math> for Interns</li> </ul>
Students will communicate psychological concepts effectively using the professional standards of the discipline.	Assessment Reports	Scores of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 50\%</math> for First Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 60\%</math> for Second Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 70\%</math> for Interns</li> </ul>
	Case Studies	Scores of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 50\%</math> for First Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 60\%</math> for Second Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 70\%</math> for Interns</li> </ul>
	Portfolio	Scores of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 2.0</math> for First Year students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 3.0</math> for Second Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 4.0</math> for Interns</li> </ul>
	Student Exit Interviews	$\geq 3.0$ across each domain
Students will apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice.	Praxis Exam (Interns) and Written Exam (First & Second Year Students)	Scores of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 40\%</math> for First Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 50\%</math> for Second Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 60\%</math> for Interns</li> </ul>
	Oral Exam (First & Second Year Students)	Scores of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 40\%</math> for First Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 50\%</math> for Second Year Students</li> </ul>
	Supervisor Ratings	Scores of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 2.0</math> for First Year students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 3.0</math> for Second Year</li> </ul>

Student Learning Outcome	Measures	Benchmark
	Portfolio	Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 4.0</math> for Interns</li> </ul> Scores of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 2.0</math> for First Year students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 3.0</math> for Second Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 4.0</math> for Interns</li> </ul>
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 (Interns)	Scores of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 4.0</math> for Interns</li> </ul>
	Supervisor Ratings	Scores of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 2.0</math> for First Year students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 3.0</math> for Second Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 4.0</math> for Interns</li> </ul>
	Portfolio	Scores of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 2.0</math> for First Year students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 3.0</math> for Second Year Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 4.0</math> for Interns</li> </ul>

## 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 six completers was 169.86 with individual scores ranging from 161 to 183. 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.

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

<b>Principal</b>	<b>2014-2015 (n=6)</b>	<b>2015-2016 (n=7)</b>	<b>2016-2017 (n=6)</b>
<b>Professional Practices, Practices that Permeate all Aspects of Service (2.1, 2.2)</b>	72%	76%	74%
<b>Direct and Indirect Services for Children, Families, &amp; Schools (2.3, 2.4)</b>	79%	88%	79%
<b>Systems-Level Services (2.5, 2.6, 2.7)</b>	78%	71%	82%
<b>Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery (2.8, 2.9, 2.10)</b>	64%	71%	80%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>79%</b>

#### *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 3 illustrates the results of this exam. First year students are required to obtain a 40% or greater in each area of the written examination. Second year students must meet or exceed a 50% on each area of the written examination. All students met the benchmark goal set by the program, with the exception of Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery.

Table 3. Students' Knowledge and Skills for the School Psychology Program

Principal	2015-2016		2016-2017	
	First Year (n=6)	Second Year (n=6)	First Year (n=8)	Second Year (n=4)
Professional Practices, Practices that Permeate all Aspects of Service (2.1, 2.2)	42%	46%	39%	40%
Direct and Indirect Services for Children, Families, & Schools (2.3, 2.4)	50%	56%	52%	53%
Systems-Level Services (2.5, 2.6, 2.7)	46%	65%	60%	63%
Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery (2.8, 2.9, 2.10)	51%	63%	50%	43%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>

### *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 = .86). 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. This target was achieved. Table 4 shows the results from this oral examination.

Table 4. Results of School Psychology Oral Exam

	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017	
	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year
<b>2.1 Data-based Decision Making and Accountability</b>	2.81	3.24	2.56	3.43	2.70	3.78	3.20	3.85
<b>2.2 Consultation and Collaboration</b>	-	3.28	-	3.43	-	3.83	-	3.27
<b>2.3 Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills</b>	-	3.33	-	3.57	-	4.25	-	3.88
<b>2.4 Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills (2.4)</b>	3.05	3.06	2.83	3.43	2.40	4.0	3.06	3.75
<b>2.5 School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning</b>	-	3.17	-	3.00	-	3.83	3.27	3.00
<b>2.6 Preventive and Responsive Services</b>	-	3.06	-	3.43	-	4.06	-	3.18
<b>2.7 Family-School Collaboration Services</b>	-	3.28	-	3.43	-	3.70	-	3.92
<b>2.8 Diversity in Development and Learning</b>	2.71	3.5	2.67	3.57	2.40	4.08	3.31	3.14
<b>2.9 Research and Program Evaluation</b>	-	3.33	-	3.57	-	4.25	-	3.32
<b>2.10 Legal, Ethical, &amp; Professional Practice</b>	2.68	3.06	2.33	3.29	2.40	3.33	3.18	3.75
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>3.51</b>

*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 5. All students across all cohorts met or exceeded the benchmark set. This target was achieved.



Table 5. Results of First and Second Year School Psychology Student Portfolios

	2015-2016			2016-2017		
	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	First Year	Second Year	Third Year
<b>Data-based Decision Making and Accountability (2.1)</b>	2.40	3.00	4.71	3.57	3.50	4.67
<b>Consultation and Collaboration (2.2)</b>	-	3.80	5.00	3.83	3.50	4.67
<b>Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills (2.3)</b>	-	4.00	4.14	-	4.50	4.83
<b>Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills (2.4)</b>	2.60	3.50	4.14	3.67	4.00	4.50
<b>School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning (2.5)</b>	2.80	4.85	4.85	3.57	3.75	5.00
<b>Preventive and Responsive Services (2.6)</b>	-	4.00	4.71	-	3.50	4.83
<b>Family-School Collaboration Services (2.7)</b>	2.60	4.85	4.85	3.57	4.00	4.83
<b>Diversity in Development and Learning (2.8)</b>	2.80	3.00	4.85	3.71	4.25	4.83
<b>Research and Program Evaluation (2.9)</b>	2.20	4.71	4.71	-	3.50	5.00
<b>Legal, Ethical, &amp; Professional Practice (2.10)</b>	2.40	3.00	4.29	3.86	3.88	4.83
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>2.54</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>4.63</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>4.76</b>

*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. Refer to Table 6 for the results of these ratings.

Table 6. Results of First and Second Year Practicum Supervisor Ratings

Domain/Year	2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017	
	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year	First Year	Second Year
<b>Data-based Decision Making and Accountability</b>	3.62	3.98	2.47	3.51	3.00	4.28
<b>Consultation and Collaboration</b>	3.59	4.06	2.35	3.59	3.00	4.05
<b>Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills</b>	3.85	3.72	2.40	3.83	3.00	4.60
<b>Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills</b>	3.99	3.66	3.40	4.10	3.00	3.92
<b>School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning</b>	3.56	3.77	3.46	3.57	3.67	4.84
<b>Preventive and Responsive Services</b>	3.51	3.41	2.09	3.99	3.09	4.58
<b>Family-School Collaboration Services</b>	3.27	3.83	2.97	3.75	3.00	4.62
<b>Diversity in Development and Learning</b>	3.92	3.80	3.11	3.68	3.17	4.63
<b>Research and Program Evaluation</b>	2.74	3.82	2.23	3.90	3.17	4.59
<b>Legal, Ethical, &amp; Professional Practice</b>	3.32	3.84	2.54	3.56	3.62	3.98
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>4.41</b>

***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 6 interns (all degree seeking students completing level II certification training) who completed their one academic year internship in Spring 2017 produced a mean composite rating of 4.23 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 7.

All six of the interns met the criterion set. This target was achieved. 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.

Table 7. School Psychology Internship Supervisor Rating Results by Average for Professional Skill Domains

<b>Domain/Year</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2106</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>
<b>Data-based Decision Making and Accountability</b>	4.34	4.26	4.15
<b>Consultation and Collaboration</b>	4.10	4.22	4.16
<b>Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills</b>	4.45	4.32	4.46
<b>Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills</b>	4.29	4.17	4.42
<b>School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning</b>	4.16	4.13	4.90
<b>Preventive and Responsive Services</b>	4.35	4.19	4.38
<b>Family-School Collaboration Services</b>	4.24	4.42	4.77
<b>Diversity in Development and Learning</b>	4.20	4.44	4.77
<b>Research and Program Evaluation</b>	3.91	3.87	4.56
<b>Legal, Ethical, &amp; Professional Practice</b>	4.13	4.27	3.97
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>4.22</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>4.23</b>

***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 and practicum ratings averaged 4.33 and internship ratings averaged 4.66. This target was achieved. Mean ratings for each NASP Domain are displayed in Table 8. 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 there needed to be some introduction to the “ENRICH” program that the state of South Carolina uses. Second, students felt that they needed more training in the different kinds of meetings they would be leading as a school psychologist (e.g., Manifestation Determination Review, Eligibility, Reevaluation Review, etc.). Third, while the students felt confident with their assessment skills, they wanted more instruction on evidence-based interventions for children with Borderline Intellectual Functioning and other cases where children do not qualify for special education services in their districts. Finally, the students requested more information on assessments and evaluations for children and adolescents with Emotional Disturbance.

Table 8. Mean Ratings across NASP Domains for School Psychology Option

	2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017	
	Courses	Internship	Courses	Internship	Courses	Internship
<b>Data-based Decision Making and Accountability</b>	3.66	3.44	4.59	4.54	4.61	4.89
<b>Consultation and Collaboration</b>	3.63	3.46	4.62	4.68	4.13	4.38
<b>Interventions and Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills</b>	3.66	3.39	4.61	4.61	4.36	4.67
<b>Interventions and Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills</b>	3.65	3.33	4.75	4.66	4.22	4.61
<b>School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning</b>	3.67	3.57	4.59	4.71	3.89	4.42
<b>Preventive and Responsive Services</b>	3.61	3.36	4.67	4.49	4.36	4.67
<b>Family-School Collaboration Services</b>	3.58	3.28	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.31
<b>Diversity in Development and Learning</b>	3.67	3.57	4.45	4.62	4.56	4.89
<b>Research and Program Evaluation</b>	3.03	3.37	4.49	4.54	4.57	4.93
<b>Legal, Ethical, &amp; Professional Practice</b>	3.65	3.50	4.73	4.69	4.55	4.86
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>4.61</b>	<b>4.59</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>4.66</b>

**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 9.

Results from these data indicate that each cohort met or exceeded the minimum criterion that was set. First year students averaged 60% on their reports; second year students averaged 68% on their reports; interns averaged 89% on their reports.. The target was achieved.

Table 9. Evaluation Report Means

	2015-2016			2016-2017		
	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	First Year	Second Year	Third Year
<b>Background</b>	59%	73%	77%	57% (2.86)	75% (3.77)	95% (4.74)
<b>Behavioral Observations</b>	56%	66%	77%	58% (2.90)	56% (2.80)	83% (4.13)
<b>Data Analysis and Interpretation Percentage</b>	59%	70%	89%	58% (2.90)	70% (3.50)	93% (4.67)
<b>Synthesis</b>	58%	66%	81%	56% (2.82)	66^ (2.75)	91% (4.56)
<b>Application</b>	61%	66%	79%	76% (3.80)	60% (3.00)	76% (3.78)
<b>Style, Clarity, &amp; Communication</b>	60%	73%	87%	54% (2.72)	89%(4.46)	99% (4.94)
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>60% (3.00)</b>	<b>68% (3.38)</b>	<b>89% (4.47)</b>

*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 10.

Results from these data indicate that each cohort met or exceeded the minimum criterion that was set. First year students averaged 75% on their case studies; second year students averaged 75% on their case studies; interns averaged 78% on their case studies. This target was achieved.

Table 10. Case Study Means

	<b>2015-2016</b>			<b>2016-2017</b>		
	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	First Year	Second Year	Third Year
<b>Problem Identification</b>	88%	84%	80%	76%	68%	78%
<b>Problem Analysis</b>	99%	81%	95%	78%	74%	77%
<b>Intervention</b>	100%	95%	97%	80%	97%	99%
<b>Evaluation</b>	93%	65%	80%	66%	61%	56%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>78%</b>

**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 (See Table 11). The six 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. By these evaluative criteria, all students exceeded the benchmark set. This target was achieved.

Table 11. Students’ Knowledge and Skills for the School Psychology Program

<b>Principal</b>	<b>2014-2015 (n=6)</b>	<b>2015-2016 (n=7)</b>	<b>2016-2017 (n=6)</b>
<b>Foundations of School Psychological Service Delivery</b>	64%	71%	80%

***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 *Ethical, Legal, & Professional Foundations*. By these evaluative criteria, all students exceeded the benchmark set. This target was achieved. See (Table 12).

Table 12. Results of School Psychology Written Exam

	<b>2013-2014</b>		<b>2014-2015</b>		<b>2015-2016</b>		<b>2016-2017</b>	
	First Year	Second Year	First Year	First Year	Second Year	First Year	First Year	Second Year
<b>Ethical, Legal, &amp; Professional Foundations</b>	65%	61%	52%	65%	61%	52%	60%	60%

***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. This target was achieved. Table 13 illustrates the results from the oral examination.

Table 13. Results of School Psychology Oral Exam

Domain/Year	2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017	
	First Year	First Year	Second Year	First Year	First Year	Second Year
<b>Legal, Ethical, &amp; Professional Practice</b>	2.33	2.68	3.06	2.33	3.84	3.75

***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. Third year students are expected to achieve or exceed a criterion rating of 4.0 on the portfolio. All students met or exceeded the benchmark set. This target was achieved. Table 14 below indicates the results of these ratings of the portfolio.

Table 14. Results of First and Second Year School Psychology Student Portfolios

	2014-2015			2015-2016			2016-2017		
	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	First Year	Second Year	Third Year
<b>Legal, Ethical, &amp; Professional Practice</b>	2.81	3.36	3.63	2.40	3.00	4.29	3.86	3.88	4.83

***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. Table 15 indicates the results of these ratings.

Table 15. Results of First and Second Year Practicum Supervisor Ratings

Domain/Year	2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017	
<b>Legal, Ethical, &amp; Professional Practice</b>	3.32	3.84	3.32	3.84	3.62	3.98

***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 six interns (all degree seeking students completing level II certification training) who completed their one academic year internship in Spring 2016 produced a mean composite rating of 4.27 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 16. All six of the interns met the criterion set.

Table 16. School Psychology Internship Supervisor Rating Results by Average for Professional Skill Domains

Domain/Year	2014-2015	2015-2106	2016-2017
<b>Legal, Ethical, &amp; Professional Practice</b>	4.13	4.27	3.97

*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 17 indicates that this benchmark was met. This target was achieved.

Table 17. Mean Ratings across Domains for School Psychology Option

	2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017	
	Courses	Internship	Courses	Internship	Courses	Internship
<b>Legal, Ethical, &amp; Professional Practice</b>	3.65	3.50	4.73	4.69	4.55	4.86



**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 4.0 or greater on this measure for third year students. As can be seen in Table 18, the overall average is above a 4.0 indicating that the program met this benchmark. This target was achieved.

Table 18. Research Project Means by Area

Area	2015-2016		2016-2017	
	Second Year	Third Year	Second Year	Third Year
<b>Overall Quality of Presentation</b>	3.88	4.71	4.44	4.67
<b>Overall Breadth of Knowledge</b>	4.00	4.86	3.00	4.50
<b>Quality of Response to Questions</b>	4.42	4.00	4.50	4.50
<b>Review of Literature</b>	3.82	4.18	3.60	4.38
<b>Significance</b>	3.67	4.71	4.75	5.00
<b>Rationale</b>	3.56	4.81	4.00	4.58
<b>Research Design and Implementation</b>	3.08	4.43	3.83	4.78
<b>Contribution to Discipline</b>	3.00	3.56	3.50	4.63
<b>Quality of Writing</b>	4.18	4.37	4.13	4.89
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>4.66</b>

***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 exceed a criterion of 4.0 on this portion of their portfolio. Table 19 shows that all students exceed the benchmark set. This target was achieved.

Table 19. Results of Student Portfolios

	2015-2016			2016-2017		
	First Year	Second Year	Third Year	First Year	Second Year	Third Year
<b>Research and Program Evaluation (2.9)</b>	2.20	4.71	4.71	-	3.50	5.00

***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 six interns who completed their one academic year internship in Spring 2016 produced a mean composite rating of 3.87 on a 5 point scale. Mean internship supervisor ratings computed in relation to NASP training Domains and other skill competency areas are shown in Table 20. This year, interns did not meet the benchmark set for Research and Program Evaluation.

Table 20. School Psychology Internship Supervisor Rating Results by Average for Professional Skill Domains

Domain/Year	2014-2015	2015-2106	2016-2017
<b>Research and Program Evaluation</b>	3.91	3.87	4.56

***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 21 indicates that this benchmark was met, but was one of the lower scores for both courses and internship.

Table 21. Mean Ratings across Domains for School Psychology Option

	2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017	
	Courses	Internship	Courses	Internship	Courses	Internship
<b>Research and Program Evaluation</b>	3.03	3.37	4.49	4.54	4.57	4.93

## 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, and internship supervisor ratings, with all meeting the overall benchmarks set. More emphasis was placed on Research and Program Evaluation during this academic year and students met or exceeded our benchmarks in this area. Although no statistically significant weaknesses were seen this year, students performed lowest across domains in the areas of Consultation and Collaboration as well as Legal, Ethical Standards, and Professional Practice. To address the issue regarding Consultation and Collaboration, the course that covers this topic has been moved to the second semester of the first year. To address the issues regarding Legal, Ethical Standards, and Professional Practice, the course has been made a 15-week course that coincides with the 600A Practicum.

To address student concerns regarding training on the “ENRICH” program that the state of South Carolina uses for the special education referral process, the Program Director has obtained a trial copy of the program and students will be required to utilize ENRICH for all their second year cases.

To address the concern regarding the different kinds of meetings that they are responsible for leading, the school psychology faculty will hold at least one “mock” of a Manifestation Determination Review, Eligibility, and a Reevaluation Review meetings in conjunction with SSP students and faculty members of the Master of Education in Learning Disabilities in the School of Education.

In the second assessment course, evidenced-based interventions for children who do not qualify for special education services will be taught in order to address student concerns in this area.

Finally, in order to provide more experience in the evaluation process for children and adolescents with Emotional Disturbance, a requirement will be added to Pre-Internship Practicum (700E), requiring students to complete at least one assessment with a child suspected of an emotional disturbance. By requiring students to complete this type of evaluation, they will also be integrating their knowledge from their previous assessment classes due to the state’s requirement that a review of records, classroom observations, interviews, self-report rating scales, parent and teacher ratings, and a personality measure must be administered for the evaluation to be deemed comprehensive. In addition, students must design, implement, and monitor a behavioral intervention plan for a period of at least six-weeks. Due to the level of complexity of the evaluation, students who are successful will have integrated multiple skill from the seven NASP Domains (2.1, 2.2., 2.4., 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.10) providing not only the experience requested in this area, but also practice in the other areas as well.

### **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 2017-2018 academic year we will continue to develop our assessment instruments for this outcome, specifically writing each criterion’s answers as more behavioral or observable.

**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 = 18) meeting the overall benchmarks set. However, this area was one of the weaker areas of the program this year. Thus, the course has been moved from a 5-week summer course to a 15-week course that is taken during the first semester of enrollment in the program.

**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. We will continue to emphasize the research and program evaluation aspect for our students.

## Appendix

### 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):

- 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

#### 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 is currently under review by the Behavior Analyst Certification Board and we anticipate the first classes toward this additional certification to be offered in January 2018.

**Faculty Retirement**

Dr. Samuel F. Broughton retired at the end of the 2014-2015 school year. Dr. Bridger retired at the end of the 2015. Coordination of the school psychology program has been passed on to Dr. Crystal R. Hill-Chapman. Dr. Traci Taber has been hired to try to fill the need that Dr. Broughton's departure created. Although Dr. Doris Paez has been hired to try to fill the need that Dr. Bridger's departure created, she resigned in February of this year. Dr. Susan Craft Astary has been hired as her replacement. With the addition of the new BCBA program, Dr. Taber will no longer be considered full-time with the school psychology program. Thus, an additional faculty member will be needed 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 1:8.

# 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 22. Student Learning Outcomes, Measures, and Benchmarks

Student Learning Outcome	Measures	Benchmark
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
	Supervisor Ratings	Scores of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 3.0</math> for Practicum Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 4.0</math> for Interns</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• <math>\geq 3.0</math> for Practicum Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 4.0</math> for Interns</li> </ul>
Students will apply ethical standards to evaluate psychological science and practice.	Ethics Supervisor Rating	Scores of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>\geq 3.0</math> for Practicum Students</li> <li>• <math>\geq 4.0</math> for Interns</li> </ul>

## 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 eight 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, 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.

Table 23. Internship Supervisor Ratings by Domain for Clinical/Counseling Interns

Professional Skill Area/Year	Mean Supervisor Ratings					
	2011-2012 n = 6	2012-2013 n = 8	2013-2014 n = 8	2014-2015 n = 6	2015-2016 n=8	2016-2017 n=11
Communication/Collaboration	4.60	4.90	4.50	4.90	4.43	4.30
Interviewing and Psychological Assessment	4.30	4.70	4.50	4.70	3.58	4.54
Therapeutic Interventions	4.40	4.70	4.30	4.60	4.40	4.02
Group or Family Treatment	4.60	4.90	4.50	4.90	3.52	4.81
Consultation and In-Service Training	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.90	3.75	4.34
Professional Behavior	4.70	5.00	4.70	4.90	4.44	4.46
<b>OVERALL RATING</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>4.80</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>4.90</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>4.41</b>

#### *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 4.41 (see Table 24). Ratings in all areas of students' internship experiences in the MSAP program, clinical/counseling option exceeded the benchmark of 4.0.



Table 24. Student Ratings of Internship

Question	2014-2015 (n=11)	2015-2016 (n=8)	2016-2017 (n=11)
I found the practicum guidelines published in the <i>Clinical/Counseling Psychology Handbook</i> to be:	4.29	4.44	4.20
I found the practicum contract between the site/agency, University, and intern to be	4.29	4.67	4.20
I found the <u>Intern Evaluation Form</u> feedback to be	4.29	4.78	4.70
I found my contacts with the University practicum faculty supervisor to be	4.29	4.78	4.20
I found the practicum seminar (PSY 600) to be	4.00	4.33	4.00
I found the resources at my site/agency for providing relevant experiences to allow me to meet my contract obligations to be	4.57	4.67	4.70
I found the amount of supervision provided by site supervisor to be	4.57	4.78	4.70
I found the quality of supervision provided by my site supervisor to be	4.57	4.56	4.60
<b>OVERALL RATING OF INTERNSHIP</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>4.63</b>	<b>4.41</b>

*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 for the eighth year; this process was first begun in the Spring 2008 semester. 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. Table 25 displays the training program quality ratings by interns. The overall, mean program rating was 4.37, compared to 4.56 last year. Ratings in all areas indicated a positive evaluation of students’ experiences in the MSAP program, clinical/counseling option meeting the faculty’s expectation of 4.0 across all areas.

Table 25. Training Program Quality Ratings

	2014- 2015 (n = 6)	2015- 2016 (n=8)	2016- 2017 (n=11)
I found the course requirements of the program to be:	4.60	4.63	4.88
I found the prerequisite requirements and course sequencing to be:	4.40	4.75	4.33
I found the quality of teaching in my courses to be:	4.40	4.75	4.22
I found the quality of texts and readings in my courses to be:	4.00	4.50	4.11
I found the audiovisual material and technology resources available for each course to be:	4.00	4.88	4.56
I found the practicum experiences required by the program to be:	5.00	4.38	4.11
I found the number of practicum hours required by the program to be:	4.40	4.50	4.66
I found the sites selected for practicum experiences to be:	4.20	4.50	4.22
I found practicum site supervisors to be:	4.40	4.50	4.56
My preparation for internship resulting from my course work was:	4.40	4.50	4.00
My preparation for internship resulting from my practicum work was:	5.00	4.50	4.88
I found the advice and guidance of my faculty adviser to be:	4.80	4.38	4.11
I found the advice and guidance provided in general by the faculty to be:	4.60	4.63	4.22
I found the availability/responsiveness of the faculty to be:	4.40	4.50	4.33
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>4.47</b>	<b>4.56</b>	<b>4.37</b>

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 included revolved around three main themes: (1) "quality" faculty, who gave "quality instruction"; (2) student-professor relationship; (3) small class sizes. Areas for suggested improvement included an increased focus on diversity and limited number practica sites.

### *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 3.75, meeting our benchmark of 3.0 (see Table 26).

Table 26. Practicum Supervisor Ratings by Domain for Clinical/Counseling Students

<b>Domain</b>	<b>2014-2015 (n = 11)</b>	<b>2015-2016 (n=23)</b>	<b>2016-2017 (n=15)</b>
<b>Communication/Collaboration</b>	4.60	3.76	4.05
<b>Interviewing and Psychological Assessment</b>	3.76	3.86	3.31
<b>Therapeutic Interventions</b>	3.83	3.27	4.01
<b>Group or Family Treatment</b>	3.96	3.82	3.00
<b>Professional Behavior</b>	4.60	3.68	4.42
<b>OVERALL RATING</b>	<b>4.34</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.75</b>

### *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 3.52 (see Table 27). 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.

Table 27. Student Ratings of Practica

<b>Question</b>	<b>2014-2015 (n=11)</b>	<b>2015-2016 (n=23)</b>	<b>2016-2017 (n=15)</b>
<b>I found the practicum guidelines published in the <i>Handbook</i> to be:</b>	3.55	4.00	3.46
<b>I found the practicum contract between the site/agency, University, and intern to be</b>	3.91	4.00	3.66
<b>I found the <u>Student Evaluation Form</u> feedback to be</b>	3.64	4.42	3.67
<b>I found my contacts with the University practicum faculty supervisor to be</b>	4.18	3.85	3.70
<b>I found the practicum seminar (PSY 600) to be</b>	4.09	3.71	3.40
<b>I found the resources at my site/agency for providing relevant experiences to allow me to meet my contract obligations to be</b>	4.00	4.71	3.33
<b>I found the amount of supervision provided by site supervisor to be</b>	4.36	4.71	3.30
<b>I found the quality of supervision provided by my site supervisor to be</b>	4.55	4.71	3.66
<b>OVERALL RATING OF PRACTICA</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>3.52</b>

**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 28 provides community supervisor ratings for the eight clinical/counseling interns who completed internships. Across all interns a mean overall rating of 4.30 was obtained, meeting our benchmark of 4.0.

Table 28. Internship Supervisor Ratings by Domain for Clinical/Counseling Interns

Professional Skill Area/Year	Mean Supervisor Ratings					
	2011-2012 n = 6	2012-2013 n = 8	2013-2014 n = 8	2014-2015 n = 6	2015-2016 n = 8	2016-2017 n = 11
<b>Communication/Collaboration</b>	4.60	4.90	4.50	4.90	4.43	4.30

***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 29 provides community supervisor ratings for the 23 clinical/counseling students completing practica. A mean overall rating of 4.05 was obtained, meeting our benchmark of 3.0.

Table 29. Practicum Supervisor Ratings by Domain for Clinical/Counseling Students

Domain	2014-2015 (n = 11)	2015-2016 (n=23)	2016-2017 (n=15)
<b>Communication/Collaboration</b>	4.60	3.76	4.05

**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. Table 30 provides community supervisor ratings for the eight clinical/counseling interns who completed internships. Across all interns a mean overall rating of 4.40 was obtained, meeting our benchmark of 4.0.

Table 30. Internship Supervisor Ratings by Domain for Clinical/Counseling Interns

Professional Skill Area/Year	Mean Supervisor Ratings			
	2013-2014 n = 8	2014-2015 n = 6	2015-2016 n=8	2016-2017 n=11
<b>Adherence to Ethical Standards</b>	4.50	4.80	4.44	4.40

***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. Table 29 provides community supervisor ratings for the 23 clinical/counseling students completing practica. A mean overall rating of 4.50 was obtained, meeting our benchmark of 3.0.

Table 31. Practicum Supervisor Ratings by Domain for Clinical/Counseling Students

Domain	2014-2015 (n =11)	2015-2016 (n=23)	2016-2017 (n=15)
<b>Adherence to Ethical Standards</b>	5.00	3.68	4.50

## **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. Additionally, interns rated the program and the internship above the 4.0 criterion set across all areas.

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.

In addition, the faculty have moved the ethics course from the students' second summer to the first summer. By moving the course to the first summer, it is hoped that students will become more aware of professional ethical standards as it applies to their practica experiences. Having it sooner in the course sequencing allows for discussion of ethical standards as they are enrolled in their practica rather than before they are on internship.

# Appendix

## Other Programmatic Issues

**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.

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 1 below reveal that 33 of 58 applicants were qualified for admission (57% acceptance rate), representing a decrease in the acceptance rate from the previous year (70%). Of those 33 students to whom admissions offers were made, 16 subsequently enrolled in the program (48% enrollment rate). This represents a steady enrollment from the previous year (52%).

Table 32. Data for Applied Psychology Program: Applications and Admissions Offers

	<b>Clinical/ Counseling</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Complete Applications</b>	19	18	37
<b>Incomplete Applications</b>	0	1	1
<b>Applicants Offered Admission</b>	13	16	29
<b>Students Enrolled</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>

During the 2015-2016 academic year (Fall and Spring) 16 newly accepted students enrolled in the program (10 in clinical/counseling and 6 in school psychology). As illustrated in the table below, this number compares to 19 students that entered the program the previous academic year (10 in clinical/counseling and 8 in school psychology). Average GRE scores were 149 (44<sup>th</sup> percentile) and 147 (29<sup>th</sup> percentile). The average Verbal score decreased by 1 point and the average Quantitative scores remained the same from the previous year. This year's average overall undergraduate GPA for newly enrolled students was 3.28, and the Psychology GPA was 3.44, as compared to 3.49 and 3.56 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 steady with 51 students. Fifteen students graduated from the degree program during 2015-2016 (8 clinical/counseling and 7 school). This compares to 14 the previous year. As in previous years, the overall size of the program remained relatively stable.

Table 33. Data for Applied Psychology Program: Newly Enrolled Students, Graduates, and Total Enrollment

<b>Total MSAP</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>
<b>Newly Enrolled</b>	15	19	19	16	17
<b>GRE-V</b>	149	149	150	149	149
<b>GRE-Q</b>	147	148	147	147	147
<b>GRE-W</b>	3.45	3.25	3.78	3.65	3.79
<b>GPA (CUM)</b>	3.44	3.55	3.49	3.28	3.55
<b>GPA (PSY)</b>	3.62	3.57	3.56	3.44	3.72
<b>Graduates</b>	18	14	14	15	18
<b>Total Students</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>50</b>

Table 34. Data for Clinical/Counseling Psychology Program: Newly Enrolled Students, Graduates, and Total Enrollment

<b>Clinical/Counseling</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>
<b>Newly Enrolled</b>	9	11	10	10	8
<b>GRE-V</b>	150	148	150	150	152
<b>GRE-Q</b>	148	148	146	148	150
<b>GRE-W</b>	3.57	3.29	3.85	3.60	3.75
<b>GPA (CUM)</b>	3.39	3.50	3.50	3.21	3.51
<b>GPA (PSY)</b>	3.62	3.54	3.52	3.32	3.67
<b>Graduates</b>	8	8	8	8	12
<b>Total Students</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>28</b>

Table 35. Data for School Program: Newly Enrolled Students, Graduates, and Total Enrollment

<b>School</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>	<b>2015-2016</b>	<b>2016-2017</b>
<b>Newly Enrolled</b>	6	8	9	6	9
<b>GRE-V</b>	147	150	149	148	147
<b>GRE-Q</b>	146	147	148	145	144
<b>GRE-W</b>	3.32	3.21	3.71	3.70	3.83
<b>GPA (CUM)</b>	3.49	3.59	3.47	3.35	3.59
<b>GPA (PSY)</b>	3.61	3.60	3.60	3.56	3.78
<b>Graduates</b>	10	6	6	7	6
<b>Total Students</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>



## **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.

In Summer 2012 we launched our new psychology department website ([www.fmupsychology.com](http://www.fmupsychology.com)). This website allows us to better advertise our program, including the offering of Continuing Education 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. This year the department has gained approval to offer an online application and we did in fact have significantly more completed applications than we have had in the past.

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.

### **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 clinical program has lost one student due to grade performance and the school program has lost three students this year; two for grade performance and one due to health.**

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 FMU School of Education, 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.