

University of Wisconsin – River Falls
School Psychology Program – Ed.S. degree
Program Assessment Report

2018

Report Completed by: Scott A. Woitaszewski, Program Director
October 1, 2018

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction to the Program.....	PAGE 3
II.	Assessment Plan Activities in Report Cycle.....	PAGE 3
	a. External accreditation	
	b. Dates of the assessment cycle	
	c. Program learning outcomes	
	d. Engagement with internal stakeholders	
	e. Engagement with external stakeholders	
	f. Assessment of activities related to out-of-classroom learning	
	g. Changes in learning outcomes, assessment methods, and curriculum	
	h. Changes in how learning outcomes connect to UWRP strategic goals	
	i. Status of action plans identified in prior assessment report	
III.	Assessment Activity Results.....	PAGE 12
	a. Direct assessment results by learning outcome	
	b. Discussion of out-of-classroom results	
	c. Indirect student assessment results	
	d. Indirect alumni assessment results	
	e. Indirect professional assessment results	
IV.	Action Plans.....	PAGE 18
	a. Where/how performance is not meeting program expectations	
	b. Actions to maintain/improve learning outcome performance	
	c. Actions to maintain/improve out-of-classroom learning experiences	
	d. Actions to maintain/improve indirect student assessment	
	e. Actions to maintain indirect alumni assessment	
	f. Actions to maintain/improve indirect professional assessment	
	g. Actions to maintain/enhance the process for assessment	
	h. Action plan summary table	

APPENDIXES A – I are listed at the end, on pages 21 to 51. These are the assessment tools used in the School Psychology Ed.S. Degree Program.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is important to start by indicating clearly that the School Psychology Program at UWRF is ONE program with TWO degrees. This Assessment Plan addresses the Ed.S degree portion of that program (31 credits), which is earned after completing years three and four of the four-year program. A separate Assessment plan addresses the M.S.E. degree (35 additional credits) which is earned during the first two of years of the training program. Graduates cannot become licensed school psychologists until completing both degrees (66 total graduate credits). In summary, we are ONE program with two degrees earned as students progress through to program completion.

The School Psychology Program and department are part of the College of Education and Professional Studies. The program is dedicated to providing students with professional, specialist-level training (66 total graduate credits), while providing schools with high quality school psychologists. To that end, the school psychology program conducts ongoing evaluations of student progress and learning outcomes. The evaluation process begins at the time of application and continues each year until program completion (typically four years). Additionally, the program surveys graduates to assess the quality of training, and to determine appropriate areas of emphasis within training. The program uses assessment data to provide feedback to students, to monitor program effectiveness, and to make changes to the program, as needed. The program is committed to educating professional school psychologists with comprehensive knowledge and skills, particularly in the areas of collaboration, data-based decision-making and culturally responsive practice.

Department Mission & Vision

Vision: All children and youth thrive in school, at home, and throughout life.

Mission: The UWRF School Psychology Program prepares the next generation of school psychologists to address the academic, social, emotional, behavioral, and mental health needs of children and youth in accordance with the *NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists*, the *Wisconsin DPI Pupil Services Domains*, and through the promotion of the *NASP Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services*.

Program Core Values

Advocacy: UWRF SPSY engages in actions and activities that seek to influence positively outcomes directly affecting the profession and the children, youth, families, and schools served.

Collaborative Relationships: UWRF SPSY partners with faculty, staff, practitioners, cooperating professionals, key stakeholders, and others to develop and achieve shared goals.

Continuous Improvement: UWRF SPSY sets challenging objectives and measures the effectiveness of organizational processes and professional practices.

Integrity: UWRF SPSY understands and honors individual, cultural, and other contextual differences in our own interactions and as they shape the development of program candidates.

Social Justice: UWRF SPSY promotes and enacts social justice throughout the program, the profession, practicum and internship experiences, and on the job.

Student-Centered: UWRF SPSY strategically selects goals and activities focused on the needs of program candidates, the profession, and the children, youth, and families we serve.

Program Strategic Goals

Through regular discussion, reflection, and long-range planning, the school psychology program

has set the following strategic goals: (a) Address critical shortages in school psychology including but not limited to increasing the number of graduates from underrepresented groups in society and in the profession, (b) Develop leadership skills and qualities of school psychologists, (c) Advance the role of school psychologists as qualified behavioral and mental health specialists, (d) Advance the recognition and implementation of the NASP Practice Model, and (e) Prepare school psychologists who actively promote and enact social justice in their own work and through advocacy with key stakeholders.

II. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES IN REPORT CYCLE

External Accreditation

The UWRP School Psychology Program is Nationally Accredited by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). In July 2013, the program was re-evaluated by NASP and received FULL NASP re-approval for the longest period offered (7 years, until the year 2020). As such, graduates of our program are considered graduates of a program offering the strongest level of training possible. They are eligible for licensure in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and most other jurisdictions. All graduates are eligible for the National Certified School Psychologist (NCSP) designation. As of October 2018, the program faculty is preparing for a resubmission for accreditation in March, 2020.

Learning Outcomes

The following specific learning outcomes have been developed to ensure a program of study aligned with the program's mission, vision, core values, and strategic goals. The learning outcomes of the UWRP school psychology Ed.S. degree reflect the domains required of all programs approved by NASP and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI), with added emphasis on student collaboration and culturally responsive skill building. Each outcome is measured by an instrument included in the program's Candidate Assessment System. The Candidate Assessment System is a set of evaluation forms or rubrics developed by the school psychology program faculty, and available to students on the program web page and in the student program policies and procedures handbook.

The following specific learning outcomes have been evaluated for five or more years (with sub-outcomes and measurement tools noted). In order to clearly make the link between the assessment tools being used and the learning outcomes stated, **the specific assessment tool is highlighted, in red and parentheses**, following each learning outcome objective. As well, it should be noted that the program Exit Survey includes items that assess each of the learning outcomes.

1. Graduates will be able to demonstrate culturally responsive competencies. (*LINKED TO UWRP STRATEGIC GOAL – Global Education & Engagement*)
 - **Objective A:** Graduates will demonstrate emerging or proficient diversity values and dispositions (*Diversity Values & Dispositions Evaluation during internship – See Appendix A*).
 - **Objective B:** Graduates will demonstrate emerging or proficient knowledge and skills related to individuals, families, and schools with diverse characteristics, cultures, and backgrounds (*Field-Based Supervisor Evaluation during practicum and internship – See Appendix B*).

2. Graduates will be able to collaborate successfully and problem-solve with those with whom they interact in the field (e.g., parents, supervisors, other practicing educators). (*LINKED TO UWRF STRATEGIC GOAL – Innovations & Partnerships*)
 - **Objective A:** Graduates will be able to demonstrate emerging or proficient consultation and collaboration skills. (*Field-Based Supervisor Evaluation during practicum and internship; University-Based Supervisor Observation Ratings- See Appendix C*).
 - **Objective B:** Graduates will be able to demonstrate emerging or proficient professional work characteristics (e.g., organization, communication skills). (*Professional Work Characteristics Rating during internship- See Appendix B*)

3. Graduates will be able to demonstrate a positive impact on the students, parents, teachers, and/or others who are served. (*LINKED TO UWRF STRATEGIC GOAL – Distinctive Academic Excellence*)
 - **Objective A:** Graduates will be able to collect and analyze pupil intervention data reflecting measureable student progress. (*Intervention Case Study Appraisal Rubric during internship – See Appendix D*)
 - **Objective B:** Graduates will demonstrate an overall level of emerging or proficient positive impact on others in schools. (*Field-Based Supervisor Evaluation during practicum and internship – See Appendix B*).

4. Graduates will be able to demonstrate a broad foundation of knowledge and skills that are aligned with the training domains of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI). (*LINKED TO UWRF STRATEGIC GOAL – Distinctive Academic Excellence*)
 - **Objective A:** Graduates will be able to demonstrate proficient knowledge about school psychology (*Pass PRAXIS II exam*).
 - **Objective B:** Graduates will be able to show evidence of multiple school psychology skills and roles (*Approved Portfolio Assessment Rubric – See Appendix E*).
 - **Objective C:** Graduates will be able to collect and evaluate research/program evaluation data in order to ensure use of evidence-informed practices in schools (*Program Evaluation Project Report Rubric – See Appendix F*)

Specific Courses for all Learning Outcomes & Course Map Visuals

The specific Ed.S. program learning outcomes are supported across all Ed.S. courses. See Table 1 for a matrix of outcomes, courses, level of learning, knowledge/skills, and assessment measure/timing.

Table 1. UWRP School Psychology Ed.S. Learning Outcome by Course Matrix










































Learning Outcome	Primary Course(s) where Outcome Addressed	Level of Learning	Specific Knowledge/Skills Addressed (NASP)	Assessment Measures (Artifacts) & Timing
LEARNING OUTCOME 1: Graduates will demonstrate culturally responsive competencies.				
Objective A – Graduates will demonstrate emerging or proficient diversity values and dispositions	SPSY 775 SPSY 776	Emerging skills	Diversity in Development & Learning (NASP #8)	<i>Diversity Values & Dispositions Evaluation during internship – End of Year 4 (See Appendix A)</i>
Objective B – Graduates will demonstrate emerging or proficient knowledge and skills related to individuals, families, and schools with diverse characteristics, cultures, and backgrounds	SPSY 771 SPSY 772 SPSY 775 SPSY 776	Emerging skills	Diversity in Development & Learning (NASP #8)	<i>Field-Based Supervisor Evaluation during practicum and internship – During Year 3 or Year 4 (See Appendix B)</i>
LEARNING OUTCOME 2: Graduates will be able to collaborate successfully and problem-solve.				
Objective A – Graduates will be able to demonstrate emerging or proficient consultation and collaboration skills	SPSY 769 SPSY 742 SPSY 740	Emerging Skills	Consultation & Collaboration (NASP #2)	<i>Field-Based Supervisor Evaluation during practicum and internship; University-Based Supervisor Observation Ratings – During Years 3 and 4 (See Appendixes B & C)</i>
Objective B – Graduates will be able to demonstrate emerging or proficient professional work characteristics (e.g., organization, communication skills).	SPSY 771 SPSY 772 SPSY 775 SPSY 776	Emerging Skills	Consultation & Collaboration (NASP #2)	<i>Professional Work Characteristics Rating during internship – End of Year 4 (See Appendix B)</i>

LEARNING OUTCOME 3: Graduates will be able to demonstrate a positive impact on others.				
Objective A – Graduates will be able to collect and analyze pupil intervention data reflecting measureable student progress.	SPSY 752 SPSY 771 SPSY 772 SPSY 775 SPSY 776	Emerging Skills	Data-based Decision Making (NASP #1); Interventions & Mental-Health Services (NASP #4); Prevention & Responsive Services (NASP #6)	<i>Intervention Case Study Appraisal Rubric during internship – End of Year 4 (See Appendix D)</i>
Objective B – Graduates will demonstrate an overall level of emerging or proficient positive impact on others in schools	SPSY 752 SPSY 722 SPSY 771 SPSY 772 SPSY 775 SPSY 776	Emerging Skills	Data-based Decision Making (NASP #1); Interventions & Mental-Health Services (NASP #4); Prevention & Responsive Services (NASP #6)	<i>Field-Based Supervisor Evaluation during practicum and internship – During Year 3 or Year 4 (See Appendix B)</i>
LEARNING OUTCOME 4: Grads will be able to demonstrate a broad foundation of knowledge/skills aligned with NASP.				
Objective A – Graduates will be able to demonstrate proficient knowledge about school psychology	SPSY 732 and all other Ed.S. courses prior to the internship	Advanced Knowledge & Emerging Skills	All NASP graduation education domains (NASP #1 to NASP #10)	<i>PRAXIS II exam results – End of Year 3</i>
Objective B – Graduates will be able to show evidence of multiple school psychology skills and roles	All Ed.S. courses	Advanced Knowledge & Emerging Skills	All NASP graduation education domains (NASP #1 to NASP #10)	<i>Approved Final Portfolio Assessment Rubric – End of Year 4 (See Appendix E)</i>
Objective C - Graduates will be able to collect and evaluate research/program evaluation data in order to ensure use of evidence-informed practices in schools	SPSY 798	Emerging Skills	Research & Program Evaluation (NASP #9)	<i>Program Evaluation Project Report Rubric – End of Year 3 (See Appendix F)</i>
Ed.S. Student Exit Survey	NA	Emerging Skills	Measures All Learning Outcomes	<i>End of Ed.S. Completion (May/June of graduation year) (See Appendix G)</i>

Ed.S. Graduate – Employer Survey	NA	Proficient Skills	Measures All Learning Outcomes and other general progress characteristics	<i>Two years post-Ed.S. (May/June) (See Appendix H)</i>
Ed.S. Graduate – Alumni Survey	NA	Proficient Skills	Measures All Learning Outcomes and other general progress characteristics	<i>Two years post-Ed.S. (May/June) (See Appendix I)</i>

Additionally, every course in the UWRf Ed.S. Program is connected to at least one graduate education training domain required by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), the overseer of school psychology program accreditation. Specific assignment artifacts are collected in those classes to help measure those specific graduate education domains. See Table 2. The non-field experience courses are checked with the NASP domain with which they are MOST associated. Many courses address multiple domains and not all possible domains are checked.

Table 2. MATRIX for UW-RF M.S.E. COURSES by NASP DOMAINS

	1. Data Based Decision-Making	2. Consultation and Collaboration	3. Interventions and instruction support to develop academic skills	4. Interventions and mental health services to develop social and life skills	5. School-wide practices to promote learning	6. Preventive and responsive services	7. Family-school collaboration services	8. Diversity in Development and learning	9. Research and program evaluation	10. Legal, ethical, and professional services	Credits
 = This course is a significant indicator of the NASP graduate education domain checked.  = This is a field experience course; the course has strong potential to meet the domain checked.											
SPSY 732: Early Childhood & Autism											2
SPSY 722: School Crisis Prevent & Interv											1
SPSY 740: Legal/Ethical Issues											3
SPSY 798: Independent Research											1
SPSY 742: Advocacy & Public Policy											1
SPSY 752: Advanced School Interventions											2
SPSY 769: Consultation/Collaboration											3
SPSY 771: Practicum I											4
SPSY 772: Practicum II											4
SPSY 775: Internship in SPSY I											5

SPSY 776: Internship In SPSY II	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	5
											31

Engagement with Internal Stakeholders

Data results are communicated to faculty, current students, alumni and, annually, to the program's advisory council. All assessment results are saved internally on the network password-protected T: drive. Additional electronic posting of data results, national accreditation review results, and program accomplishments is done through the program webpage and/or Facebook page. The program bulletin board in the Wyman Education Building is also used to communicate this information.

Engagement with External Stakeholders

The school psychology program is committed to providing training that is aligned with the ten domains of education and practice and the practice model of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). Additionally, the pupil services standards developed by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) are integrated into the program curriculum and expectations. In order to measure candidate knowledge and competency development, data are collected through multiple methods at multiple points in the training program. Candidates meet with their advisors each semester to discuss progress. The program faculty utilizes the data to assist students with program progress and to make program modifications, as needed.

Assessment Activities Related to Out-of-Classroom Activities

Many out-of-classroom experiences are available to UWRF School Psychology Program students. Most importantly, extensive data – from eight distinct assessment measures - are collected and analyzed related to student progress during the 3rd year Practicum experience and the 4th year Internship experience. Those data will be reviewed later in this report.

Several other out-of-classroom opportunities are available for all program students. Each year the program chooses student leaders who work with the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), the Wisconsin School Psychologists Association (WSPA), and the Minnesota School Psychologists Association (MSPA). Over the last eight years, the program student group (Sigma Psi Tau) and UWRF have hosted several nationally known scholars in our field (e.g., Steve Brock, Melissa Reeves, Susan Jacob, Lisa Kelly-Vance) as well as many presidents of the National Association of School Psychologists (Rhonda Armistead, Gene Cash, Patti Harrison, Phil Lazarus, Amy Smith, Sally Baas, Melissa Reeves, John Kelly). Interaction with such scholars adds to the learning of current students, alumni and other educators invited from our community. Numerous other opportunities for leadership are open to all students (e.g., graduate assistantships, program open house assistants, faculty grant collaborators, cohort representatives). The faculty oversees those roles, monitoring students and providing feedback as needed.

Changes in Learning Outcomes, Assessment, and Curriculum

Over the last three years, all stated learning outcomes in the Ed.S. Program have stayed the same. They are viewed as appropriate and reflective of the required national and state standards. As well, the assessment system and curriculum have remained consistent.

Changes in how Learning Outcomes Connect with UWRF Strategic Goals

The school psychology program and its learning outcomes are aligned with the strategic goals of UW-River Falls. The following statements indicate those connections and include specific data results from the last three years. No significant changes have occurred in the link between program learning outcomes and UWRF strategic goals.

Distinctive Academic Excellence. All of the school psychology program Ed.S. candidates have passed the PRAXIS II Exam in School Psychology over the last three years (33/33 – 100%). Additionally, all have passed the final internship portfolio with full credit ratings (35/35 – 100%); all have passed the final summative internship field-based supervisor evaluation with section averages (out of 15) of 14.54 (2016), 14.54 (2017), and 13.03 (2018) respectively, for the last three cohorts; and all have passed the final internship intervention case study project (out of 61 possible points with cohort means of 51.8 (2016), 50.8 (2017), and 57.8 (2018)). Finally, all Ed.S. Program students have passed the required program evaluation project, completed in the 3rd Year, with cohort means of 21 (2016), 21 (2017), and 24.75 (2018). A new rubric was created for the 2018 program evaluation assessment, moving it from 21 possible points to 25. Altogether, these multiple sources of data reflect outstanding academic excellence among three cohorts of Ed.S. level school psychology program students.

Global Education and Engagement. All of the school psychology program Ed.S. candidates over the last three years have shown excellent overall diversity dispositions, as measured by the diversity dispositions rating rubric. Cohort means for the diversity measure (out of 5 possible points) were 4.86 (2016), 4.77 (2017), and 4.31 (2018). Additionally, the practicum formative evaluation includes diversity content. Ratings from the last three cohorts of practicum show developing diversity dispositions, with means of 6.5 (Fall 2015), 6.9 (Fall 2016), and 6.2 (Fall 2017). Of additional note, related to global education, the School Psychology program has connected with the UWS Scotland campus in Dalkeith. The program's required Crisis Prevention and Intervention course (SPSY 722) was taught there in the summer of 2015 and the summer of 2018. The experience in Scotland provided participating program students an opportunity to gain additional perspectives about the diverse mental health and academic achievement of young people [LO1]. Additionally, the current program student body and faculty have become increasingly diverse in background, culture, age, and experience (with recognition that this must remain an important goal requiring continuous improvement).

Innovation and Partnerships. Many unique experiences and partnerships are available to UWRF School Psychology Program students. Importantly, the program provides two distinct and diverse practicum placements for each practicum student every year. This requires as many as 25-30 unique school district supervised experiences each year. The practicum and internship field-based supervisor evaluations, already reviewed in the previous sections, support a strong connection between our students and those sites. Additionally, each year the program has student leaders working with the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), the Wisconsin School Psychologists Association (WSPA), and the Minnesota School Psychologists Association (MSPA). Over the last eight years, the program student group (Sigma Psi Tau) has hosted several nationally known scholars in our field (e.g., Steve Brock, Melissa Reeves, Susan Jacob) as well as many presidents of the National Association of School Psychologists (Rhonda Armistead, Gene Cash, Patti Harrison, Phil Lazarus, Amy Smith, Sally Baas). Interaction with such scholars

adds to the learning of current students, alumni and other educators invited from our community. The program partners with numerous field-based practicum and internship supervisors working in a full range of schools across western Wisconsin and eastern Minnesota, where extensive student collaborative problem-solving is expected [LO2].

Status of Action Plans Identified in Previous Assessment Report

At the time of the previous Assessment Report (2015), several action steps were developed and addressed. Those action steps are noted below, along with comments on action progress.

1. Program publicizing, marketing, and recruitment. Increased emphasis on recruitment and retention of a more diverse pool of students.

PROGRESS: The program has made this action step a strong priority over the last three years. Most importantly, the program created a new scholarship for diverse and underrepresented graduate students (the Stovall Scholarship). That scholarship will begin being given in 2019. Additionally, the program sought out and secured and updated promotional video, continued holding prospective student Open House events (2x a year), and increased communication with campus visits with prospective students. On average, over 100 prospective students communicate with the program director each year. The number of applicants, overall, has increased to an average of 60 applicants per year (with the goal of adding 12 new students from that applicant pool). The average of 60 over the last three years, and the 80 applications in 2018 were record highs for the program. The incoming 2018 cohort included 6/16 students (38% of the cohort) identifying as having diverse cultural characteristics (e.g., racial or ethnic, sexual orientation, etc.).

2. Curriculum. Emphasis on progressive curriculum must continue.

PROGRESS: No new classes have been developed over the last three years. However, The hiring of Dr. Anne Zaslofsky in 2018 is viewed as a vital step in the history of our program. Previously, our program as lacked progressive curricula and experience related to academic achievement assessment and intervention. Dr. Zaslofsky will bring those skills to the table for our students. Additionally, the SPSY 722 School Crisis course has been earmarked for a transition to a more comprehensive course (from 1-credit to 2-credits). Additionally, many improvements to existing courses have been put into place. For example, the practicum experience (SPSY 771/772) now includes two new partnerships with area school districts in which the practicum students and the three core faculty members lead a school-wide mental health screening and intervention process. That new experience began in the 2017-18 academic year and is again in place for 2018-19.

3. Increase diversity awareness in program documentation, materials, application, etc. (e.g., recognition of transgender applicants in terminology used)

PROGRESS: One clear change has been the initiation and implementation of a new “Chosen Name & Pronoun” survey of current students. Twice annually, current students in the program are contacted with a request for their chose name and pronouns. This process allows the faculty to show respect for students who are or may be gender-diverse. In the fall of 2018, the faculty made plans to contact admissions about language used in the program application, developed by

the UW system, with the goal of ensuring more inclusive language for demographic characteristics requested on the application. This work is considered in-progress.

4.Improve/increase the role of the advisory council

PROGRESS: The advisory council was re-introduced in the Fall of 2017. Through the leadership of faculty member, Dr. Todd Savage, the council was developed, formalized, and met twice during the 2017-18 academic year. As of the Fall of 2018, the council consists of about 20 alumni, current students, current faculty members, field-based supervisors, and other friends of the program. One major goal of the council was to increase the number of scholarships available to current students. That goal has already seen progress (See Action Step 1 – the Stovall Scholarship).

5. More consistent use of the employer survey and alumni survey.

PROGRESS: A new employer survey developed and has been used annually, in 2016-2017-2018. The survey is sent to all Ed.S. graduate, two years after their graduation. The data have been used as indirect data supporting the progress of our students. Alumni surveys have not been used during this time. The program has set a goal to add the alumni survey during the 2018-19 academic year.

6.Technology in the Curriculum. The program should consider the role of improved technology in delivering the curriculum.

PROGRESS: The program purchased 10 new iPads in the summer of 2018, and has a goal to add four more annually for the foreseeable future. The program director became a Canvas mentor and early adopter of Canvas in 2018. The program has had conversations with other departments on campus about the possibility of developing a distance education classroom at the Hudson Center. All of these advancements have been added in attempt to meet the changing needs of students, including recruiting and securing students at an increased distance from River Falls and Hudson.

7. Involve students in field experiences earlier in the program

The current structure of our program makes this goal challenging. However, the program has added new experiences to the practicum over the last two years. For example, the practicum experience (SPSY 771/772) now includes two new partnerships with area school districts in which the practicum students and the three core faculty members lead a school-wide mental health screening and intervention process. That new experience began in the 2017-18 academic year and is again in place for 2018-19.

III. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITY RESULTS

UWRF school psychology students have been assessed comprehensively through the collection of data from multiple sources at multiple training points, as described in detail in the Program Assessment Plan. This section includes the available data results.

The current Candidate Assessment System was put into place in 2008, with minor revisions to assessment tools since that time. As previously noted, the program is emphasizing eight of these assessments, as required by NASP, our national program approving organization. See Table 3 for a listing of these eight components within the *Candidate Assessment System*. While we have additional assessments (e.g., alumni surveys, employer surveys), the eight listed in Table 3 (plus the supplemental exit survey) form our primary assessments. Each assessment rubric or form can be located on our [program webpage](#). Summaries of aggregated data from each of the eight primary assessment instruments are reviewed next.

Direct Assessment Results

PRAXIS II School Psychology Exam. In the spring of the practicum year, the school psychology program students take the PRAXIS II content exam, published by ETS. The candidate must pass the exam (a passing score = 147+). This minimum passing score is required for program graduation, for school psychology licensure in the state of Wisconsin, and for eligibility for the NCSP credential offered through NASP.

While PRAXIS score data are available going back to 2006, only data from the most recent three years are included here. The analysis involves cohort groups for spring 2016 ($n = 10$ students), spring 2017 ($n = 11$ students), and spring 2018 ($n = 12$ students). The mean scores and, in parentheses, percentage of students who passed per the NASP passing score for their year are as follows: 2016 = 169.8 (100%), 2017 = 169.4 (100%), and 2018 = 166.6 (100%).

Collectively, the aggregated results show that of 33 program candidates taking the PRAXIS II examination from 2016 to 2018, 100% passed the exam, which is well above the 80% threshold set by NASP as evidence of students receiving training consistent with national expectations and standards. The data trend suggests students from the UW-River Falls School Psychology Program have acquired a strong and appropriate knowledge base in school psychology, consistent with the NASP domains, as measured by the PRAXIS II exam.

Portfolio Assessment Rubric. In the spring of the internship year (4th Year), a university-based intern supervisor (faculty member), evaluates the intern's electronic portfolio, completed during the spring of the internship year. The portfolio includes artifacts that demonstrate skill in all NASP and Wisconsin DPI standards. The intern must meet a passing score of 40 or greater (100% on this standardized system).

The analysis involves cohort groups for spring 2016 ($n = 10$ students), spring 2017 ($n = 11$ students), and spring 2018 ($n = 12$ students). All candidates in each of those cohorts cohort passed with a score of 40, reflecting strong evidence of candidate knowledge and skills within all 10 domains for 33 total interns. While some domains and interns were stronger than others, all recent interns have earned passing portfolio ratings in all domains and the total score.

Practicum Field-Based Supervisor Formative Evaluation. In the fall of the practicum year (3rd Year), a formative evaluation is completed by the student's field-based supervisor. This assessment instrument is used to evaluate the progress of practicum candidates at the end of the fall semester during the practicum year (3rd Year). More specifically, the student's

knowledge, skills, and other characteristics associated with successful school psychology practice are measured.

The assessment tool has a Total Score possibility of 84 points. Cohort means are as follows: 65.2 for Fall of 2015 ($n = 10$), 71.2 for Fall of 2016 ($n = 11$ students), and 66.0 for Fall of 2017 ($n = 12$ students).

Given the data from the most recent three years of practicum candidate field-based supervisor FORMATIVE evaluations, there is strong evidence supporting average to above average knowledge and skills in all graduate training domains. Because this is a formative evaluations, it is viewed as a baseline for the 1800 total hours of field experiences each school psychology program student will receive (practicum plus internship). Candidates would not be expected to be at the level of proficiency at this stage. These data provide a helpful baseline for where UWRF candidates begin developing their applied skills and can be compared to internship summative evaluation data to see progress over time (reviewed next).

Internship Field-Based Supervisor SUMMATIVE Evaluation. This instrument is used to evaluate student knowledge, skills, and other characteristics associated with successful school psychology practice and is based on the 10 NASP training domains. The evaluation is used summatively following the completion of the spring semester. Each domain has a total possible score of 15 points on the evaluation. An upper/mid-range item domain score of 12 indicates an emerging/developing range of functioning for an intern and is what would be expected of an intern at the end of the internship experience.

The analysis of this assessment involved three cohort groups from the spring 2016 ($n = 14$ students), spring 2017 ($n = 10$ students), and spring 2018 ($n = 11$ students). The mean scores are as follows, along with percentage of the cohort who met the expected “developing/emerging” performance criteria: 2016 cohort mean = 14.54 (99% with average domain mean of 12+); 2017 cohort mean = 14.54 (96% with average domain mean of 12+); and 2018 cohort mean = 13.03 (79% with average domain mean of 12+). The lower values for 2018 can be traced almost entirely to two struggling interns (out of 11 total) and for whom extensive supervision and extra oversight was implemented.

Given the data collected from these three years of intern evaluations, there is moderate to strong evidence the internship field-based supervisor ratings reflect above average knowledge and skills within all 10 domains. While some domains and some interns remained stronger than others, all domains and all interns were rated as at least average, with the majority of all interns and domains being rated as above average to very well-developed.

Internship University-Based Supervisor FINAL Observation. The UWRF university-based internship supervisor utilizes a performance-based observation rubric during/following each visit to the internship site of each intern. At least two on-site observations are conducted annually. The data included here were collected from the FINAL university-based observations. This assessment tool includes 24 possible points, with a score of 22 or higher being considered “Outstanding skill, knowledge, and effort observed - level is similar to an independent, well-respected and highly-motivated licensed school psychologist.”

The analysis of this assessment involved three cohort groups from the spring 2016 ($n = 14$ students), spring 2016 ($n = 10$ students), and spring 2018 ($n = 11$ students). The mean scores are as follows, along with percentage of the cohort who met the expected “outstanding skill” performance criteria: 2016 cohort mean = 22.7 (86% with a score of 22+); 2017 cohort mean = 21.1 (40% with a score of 22+); and the 2018 cohort mean = 21.3 (45% with a score of 22+).

Overall, across three cohorts totaling 35 students, the data suggest that intern-level candidates, in their final semester of their graduate educations, have consistently revealed very strong skills in several NASP domains. The most recent cohort means and scores reflect slightly less developed knowledge and skill than the two previous cohorts; however, it is the director’s opinion that the faculty are holding more recent cohorts to a higher level of performance expectations. This can also reflect the reality that interns have adequate emerging skills but most will need extensive mentoring after graduation to reach proficiency. All things considered, the trend suggests program interns are “holding steady” with expected levels of knowledge and skill at the end of their training.

Intervention Case Study Appraisal Rubric. In the spring of the internship year (4th Year), a university-based intern supervisor (faculty member), evaluates the intern’s final intervention case study. The intern must meet a passing threshold score. This assessment includes 61 total possible points, with a score of 52 (85%) or higher being considered passing for all interns on the evaluation updated in 2018 (not used prior).

The analysis of this assessment involved three cohort groups from the spring 2016 ($n = 14$ students), spring 2017 ($n = 10$ students), and spring 2018 ($n = 11$ students). The mean scores are as follows: 2016 cohort mean = 51.8; 2017 cohort mean = 50.1; and the 2018 cohort mean = 57.8 (100% passed).

Given the overall success of three years of UWRF interns, as measured by the *Intervention Case Study Appraisal Rubric* total score, an adequate level of progress with student intervention is evident. Most interns had a clear positive impact on a child/student when all case study data were considered. Indeed, a trajectory of increased ratings has occurred over the last three years with cohort rubric means moving from 50.17 to 52.00 during that time. The program has prioritized systematic intervention design, implementation, and measurement in the curriculum and introduced additional content in these areas (e.g., direct training during assessment and intervention courses; creation of a new advanced intervention course).

Program Evaluation Project Rubric. In the spring of the practicum year (3rd Year), the student completes a program evaluation project report, presents the results to faculty and students, and submits the project for professional publication or presentation. The student written manuscript must be passed with the Program Evaluation Project Rubric.

The analysis of this assessment involved three cohort groups from the Spring of 2016 ($n = 10$ students), Spring of 2017 ($n = 11$ students), and Spring of 2018 ($n = 12$ students). The mean scores are as follows, along with percentage of the cohort who pass the assignment: 2016 cohort mean = 21.0 (100% passed); 2017 cohort mean = 21.0 (100% passed); and the 2018 cohort mean

= 24.75 (100% passed).

The strong research/program evaluation rubric ratings given by faculty research advisors across three cohorts (total $N = 33$) are interpreted as reflecting an effective research system for school psychology candidates at UWRP. Given the significant amount of data analysis required in the research project, positive rubric results reflect strong data-based decision making and accountability. Likewise, given the extensive coursework knowledge and applied research experience that are part of this project, the strong rubric results reflect excellent research and program evaluation knowledge and emerging competencies, as well.

Diversity Values & Dispositions Rating. In the spring of the internship year, intern field-based supervisors complete this diversity evaluation. Interns are assessed for their developing skills, as they relate to inclusivity and work with diverse clients, educators, and schools. As reflected by a rating within an area/section of “4” or greater, the intern is expected to have “developing or emerging” knowledge, skills, and dispositions by the end of the internship.

The analysis of this assessment involved three cohort groups from the spring 2016 ($n = 14$ students), spring 2017 ($n = 10$ students), and spring 2018 ($n = 11$ students). The mean scores are as follows, along with percentage who showed a total rubric item mean of 4.0 or greater (i.e., “developing/emerging”): 2016 cohort item mean = 4.9 (97% developing/emerging values); 2017 cohort mean = 4.8 (94% developing/emerging values); and the 2018 cohort mean = 4.3 (77% developing/emerging values). The lower 2018 values can be traced almost entirely to two struggling interns (out of a total of 11), and for whom extensive supervision and extra oversight was implemented.

While assessing student values and dispositions is inherently challenging, we believe these data provide adequate evidence, in conjunction with other sources of data, that our interns meet program expectations for diversity values and dispositions.

Discussion of Out-of-Classroom Assessment Results

Multiple out-of-classroom assessments were already included in the previous section. Indeed, seven of the eight assessments are directly related to the practicum field experience (3rd year) or the internship field experience (4th year). Even the Program Evaluation Appraisal is associated with completing a project within the practicum field placement. Only the PRAXIS II exam is not directly associated with an out-of-classroom field experience. As a collective whole, the out-of-classroom data are interpreted to reflect strong developing and emerging skills for the vast majority of the intern candidates over the last three years. As previously noted, the 2018 cohort included two candidates who tended to struggle at a level that was below expectations at times. Those candidates received extra supervision and were required to complete extra expectations. With support, those candidates were able to graduate and were considered to have a minimum level of developing/emerging skills.

Indirect Assessment of Students, Alumni, and Employers of Ed.S. Graduates

Ed.S. Student Exit Survey. For the last three years, a consistent exit survey was completed by Ed.S. graduates, at the end of the entire 4-year program (i.e., at the end of the internship). See Appendix X for a copy of the survey. This survey was optional but highly encouraged. It was administered electronically, with Qualtrics, and was anonymous. Not all potential participants completed a survey. The analysis of the Ed.S. graduates who did complete the survey involved exit surveys returned from the 2016 cohort ($n = 10$), the 2017 cohort ($n = 8$) and the 2017 cohort ($n = 8$). When asked about their ability to meet the four learner outcomes, 97% of the Ed.S. graduate responses from across the three cohorts endorsed “agree” or “strongly agree.” These findings suggest that the vast majority of Ed.S. graduates, and the collective whole of three cohorts overall, perceive themselves to have well developed knowledge and skill related to the four broad learner outcomes supported by the program (culturally responsive practice, collaborative skills, ability to make a positive impact on others). See Table 3 for additional details.

TABLE 3. Ed.S. Degree Graduates - Three-Year Trends of Exit Survey Outcomes

OUTCOME	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slight Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Total Observations
Graduates will be able to demonstrate culturally responsive competencies	13	11	2	0	0	0	26
Graduates will be able to collaborate successfully and problem-solve with those with whom they interact in the field	13	13	0	0	0	0	26
Graduates will be able to demonstrate a positive impact on the students, parents, teachers, and/or others who are served	12	14	0	0	0	0	26
Graduates will be able to demonstrate a broad foundation of knowledge and skills that are aligned with the training domains of the National Association of School Psychologists	13	12	0	0	1	0	26

(NASP) and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI)							
NUMERICAL & PERCENTAGE RESULTS	51/104 (49.03%)	50/104 (48.07%)	0/104 (0%)	2/104 (1.92%)	1/104 (00.96%)	0/104 (0%)	104 (100.00%)

Employer Survey – Per the Action Plan developed from the last Ed.S. Program Assessment Report in 2015, an Employer Survey was developed and implemented first in 2016. See Appendix A for a copy of the survey. Three years of employer survey trends are reported here (2016, 2017, 2018). See Table 4 below for details. Table cells highlighted in pink suggest below expectations values (below 4.0 as a cohort). Table cells highlighted in green suggest above expectation values (above 4.5 as a cohort).

TABLE 4. Ed.S. Degree Graduates – Three-Year Trends for Employer Surveys

Survey Question	2016 survey of 2014 grads (n = 4)	2017 survey of 2015 grads (n = 11)	2018 survey of 2016 grads (n = 8)	Three-Year Mean (n = 23)
Interpersonal Collaboration	4.5	4.8	4.0	4.43
Implement variety of Assess	3.8	4.6	4.3	4.23
Individualized Interventions	4.0	4.6	3.9	4.16
Eval Efficacy of Interventions	4.0	4.7	4.1	4.26
Implement Counseling	4.0	4.4	4.0	4.13
Knowl/Respect for Diversity	4.8	4.9	4.3	4.66
Knowl/Respect of Ethics	4.3	4.9	4.3	4.50
Leadership Skills	4.3	4.5	4.1	4.30
Legal/Due Process Knowledge	3.8	4.5	4.4	4.23
Evidence-Based Practice	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.33
Assist School-wide Prevention	4.0	4.5	4.4	4.30
Variety of Child Needs Ability	4.0	4.8	4.7	4.50
TOTAL MEAN	4.1	4.6	4.2	4.33

The three year trends from the twelve Likert-scale questions noted in Table 4 reflect three strength themes of our graduates, as rated by employers two years after those graduates earned their Ed.S. degrees, completing the four-year program. Those strength themes are: knowledge and respect for diversity, knowledge and respect for professional ethics, and the ability to meet the needs of a variety of children. Many open-ended question responses support those themes, too, including, as examples:

“The UWRF program has a solid reputation and graduates are some of the most highly skilled we work with.”

“Our district employs almost all UWRF graduates. I think the best thing about the program is they give you a wide variety of exposure and then acknowledge that they can't teach you everything. School Psych jobs are all so different. I appreciate that if they

haven't covered something before, the psychs know how to do quality research and/or teach themselves. I have never heard any of our psychs say "I don't know how" to do something; instead they say "I don't know now but let me research it and I will get back to you when I am ready to do it."

These themes support the fact that our graduates continue to meet learning outcomes, especially Learning Outcome #1 (Graduates will be able to demonstrate culturally responsive competencies), and Learning Outcome #3 (Graduates will be able to demonstrate a positive impact on the students, parents, teachers, and/or others who are served). This is outstanding longer-term data supporting the overall effectiveness of our program. Counseling skills and, sometimes, legal or due process knowledge may be considered an area for growth that is consistent with other assessment data.

Alumni Surveys – The program has not utilized Alumni Surveys (beyond the immediate student exit surveys). The program has set a goal to begin implementing a new measure, in 2019, for all Ed.S. graduates, two years post-graduation. M.S.E Alumni Surveys will not be implemented, for reasons already noted in the M.S.E. program assessment report.

IV. ACTION PLANS

Where & How Performance is not Meeting Program Expectations

In totality, the data analyzed over the last three years suggest the Ed.S. Degree program is meeting learner outcomes in a very strong manner, overall. Multiple sources of data, as discussed throughout this report, support that conclusion. Students are learning new knowledge, developing skills, and they are making a positive impact on others during their field experiences. The program's recent national accreditation status through the year 2020 also reflects support of those conclusions.

Actions Needed to Maintain or Improve the Program

Specific needs identified through the M.S.E. assessment tools and the exit survey data include:

- Continue to emphasize progressive content in the program curriculum. Consider improvement in counseling skills and legal/due process content.
- Continue emphasis on recruitment and retention of a more diverse pool of students
- Continue the role of the advisory council
- Continue the role of technology in the program
- Involve students in field experiences earlier in the program (first two years) (OUT-OF-CLASSROOM LEARNING EXPERIENCES)

Table 5 reflects a summary of action steps expected for the school psychology program as a whole

Actions the Program is Taking to Enhance or Maintain Assessment

NA at this time.

Table 5. Action Plan Summary Table

Program Goal or Action Step	Based on What Assessment Data	Leadership	Timeframe	Date and Plan for Re-evaluation?
Continue to emphasize progressive content in the program curriculum. Meet with the program faculty to conduct a course x content matrix. Address gaps. Submit program and course change documentation to the university.	Exit Survey Feedback; Advisory Council Feedback	Program Director	2018-19 academic year (approval of any agreed upon changes by spring 2019)	Fall 2019
Continued emphasis on recruitment and retention of a more diverse pool of students. Devise additional scholarships and other outreach plans	Cohort Data; Program Learning Outcome Data	Program Director; Advisor Council	Ongoing; indefinite	Fall 2019
Increase diversity awareness in program documentation, materials, application, etc. (e.g., recognition of transgender applicants in terminology used)	Currently lacking	Todd Savage; Program Director; Department Chair	Fall 2018	Fall 2019
Continue the role of technology in the program (e.g., on-line coursework, integration of iPads in the curriculum, distance learning classroom at Hudson Center). Discussion options within the department and with other department leaders.	Exit Survey Feedback	Program Director; Department Chair	Spring 2019; indefinite	Fall 2019
Involve students in field experiences earlier in the program	Exit Survey Feedback; Readiness indicators	All faculty must explore opportunities in each class	Fall 2019; indefinite	Fall 2019

Appendix A

UW-RF School Psychology Training Program Diversity Values and Dispositions Evaluation

Candidate: _____

Rater: _____

Year in Program: 1st 2nd 3rd (Practicum) or 4th (Intern)

Date: _____

RATING INSTRUCTIONS:

Please rate the candidate on each item using the scale below. Comments on any particular strength or challenging characteristic may be written in the box at the end of the rubric.

Please, note: all practicum and internship candidates should be rated on ALL items (i.e., do not use NA for practicum and intern level students).

RATING SCALE:

Rate the candidate's diversity values and dispositions with this scale:

- 1: This value/disposition is a significant challenge; significant development needed
- 2: Minimal development for this value or disposition
- 3: Average value or disposition
- 4: Developing or emerging value or disposition; nearing proficiency
- 5: Proficient; candidate demonstrates highly developed value or disposition

Being Respectful

Valuing other's experiences, contributions, and expertise 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Valuing diversity and cultural differences, in general 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Listening 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Empathizing 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Engaged in active learning 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Thinking of others and our impact on others 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Being Inclusive

Demonstrating a willingness and desire to relate to and to work with all people (e.g., students, parents, teachers, community members) 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Considering others (e.g., when making decisions) 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Including people in the process of learning, research, service, etc.	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Willing to challenge one's own beliefs that classify a group of persons as pejorative in some way	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
<u>Being Collaborative and Cooperative</u>	
Working cooperatively and effectively with others	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Being responsive to others	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Demonstrating an interest and ability to learn from others about their experiences of culture and diversity	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Engaging in dialogues, rather than debates, regarding multiculturalism and diversity issues	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Working together, to understand one another	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
<u>Being Open</u>	
Being open to new ideas and learning in general	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Engaging in perspective-taking	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Demonstrating flexibility	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Being receptive and responsive to feedback	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Seeking help in understanding others, when needed	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Taking risks to promote professional growth/development	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Engaging in self-disclosure that is relevant to professional effectiveness	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
<u>Being Inquisitive</u>	
Showing interest and a curiosity about people and their diverse cultural life experiences	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Seeking additional knowledge and experiences related to diversity and multicultural issues	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Demonstrating a desire to learn about others	1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Scientifically-minded (applying ethical/professional	

standards and scientific findings) to diversity/multicultural issues 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Self-aware and Introspective

Awareness of personal and professional strengths 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Awareness of personal and professional areas of growth 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Demonstrating an awareness of one's biases/prejudices and ignorance 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Reflecting on one's impact on others and the tasks at hand 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Reflecting on how one is affected by others 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Engaging in critical thinking (e.g., different perspectives) 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Evaluating one's feelings, decisions, actions, and how one relates to others 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Culturally-Aware

Learning about, understanding, and accepting people from a variety of diverse and cultural backgrounds 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Providing culturally-relevant services to people based on theoretical and research knowledge 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Being aware of how one's own cultural background may impact her or his assessment practices, consultation interactions, or interventions with persons from diverse backgrounds 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Being aware of how different cultures view what is normal, acceptable, and okay 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Understanding the process and interpersonal dynamics necessary to be effective with persons from diverse backgrounds 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Demonstrating an interest in and a commitment to conducting or consuming research on multicultural and diversity issues 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Socially-Just

Engaging in active support and advocacy to promote

equality and justice for underserved, oppressed, and/or marginalized groups of people 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Committed to service and community efforts for diverse populations 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Aware of power and privilege dynamics on various levels 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Actively addressing institutional barriers 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Professional Growth and Improvement

Demonstrating a desire to learn and improve one's knowledge base, research, and service skills 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Seeking actively feedback regarding one's performance 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Willingness to abandon nonproductive strategies in an attempt to self-correct 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Applying the ethical and professional standards of the profession to one' work 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Applying scientific findings to professional work 1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Comments/Recommendations:

Appendix B

University of Wisconsin – River Falls School Psychology Program Intern Evaluation of Knowledge & Emerging Skills

School Psychology Intern: _____ Check One: ___FORMATIVE ___SUMMATIVE

Supervisor completing this evaluation: _____ Date: _____

RATING INSTRUCTIONS:

Please, evaluate the intern's knowledge and skill development by circling the appropriate rating next to each question on the following pages. Item content is based on the 2010 NASP standards for graduate education of school psychologists (see:

http://www.nasponline.org/standards/2010standards/1_Graduate_Preparation.pdf for additional details).

Use the scale provided while considering the intern's *progress relative to expectations for a graduating intern level school psychologist*. **Please, note:** The intern should be rated on ALL items (i.e., do not indicate "NA"). If you are unsure about the intern's progress on an item, please discuss the item content with others who may know.

PROVIDING FEEDBACK:

Feedback to the candidate should be provided about her or his development relative to graduating intern expectations. Written comments on any particular strength or challenging characteristic may be included in the box at the end of this form. Please, communicate with other supervisors about the intern's progress, as needed.

PASSING CRITERIA:

The Intern Evaluation of Knowledge & Skills appraisal rubric has 165 total points. Passing levels are as follows:

<i>Semester</i>	<i>Item Passing Level</i>	<i>TOTAL rubric passing level</i>
Fall - Formative	Minimum rating of 2	60% (100+)
Spring -Summative	Minimum rating of 3	80% (132+)

Ratings of 2 (minimal) and 3 (average) are normative at the beginning of the internship, with growth expected thereafter. At the time of the formative evaluation and beyond, a non-passing level TOTAL score may necessitate the development of a "Professional Growth Plan" (see Appendix Y of the Program Handbook) or other new goals for the candidate. Individual items that are not passed should be discussed and should guide new goal setting.

RATING SCALE:

- 1:** The intern has been significantly challenged by a lack of knowledge or skill in this area
2: Some knowledge or skill development
3: Average knowledge or skill development
4: Emerging knowledge or skill; nearing proficiency
5: Proficient; the intern has demonstrated highly developed knowledge or skill; similar to other school psychology internship completers.

The intern...**1) DATA-BASED DECISION MAKING AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

1) Is knowledgeable of various models and methods of assessment for identifying strengths and needs	1 2 3 4 5
2) Is knowledgeable of various models and methods of assessment for measuring progress and outcomes of services	1 2 3 4 5
3) Effectively applies data results to design, implementation and evaluation of response to services	1 2 3 4 5
DOMAIN TOTAL =	

2) CONSULTATION AND COLLABORATION

4) Is knowledgeable of varied methods of consultation, collaboration, and communication	1 2 3 4 5
5) Communicates opinions and data to all appropriate parties in a supportive, problem-solving fashion.	1 2 3 4 5
6) Demonstrates effective consultation and collaboration skills during design, implementation, and evaluation of services and programs	1 2 3 4 5
DOMAIN TOTAL =	

3) INTERVENTIONS AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT TO DEVELOP ACADEMIC SKILLS

7) Is knowledgeable about biological influences on academic skills and instructional strategies	1 2 3 4 5
8) Is knowledgeable about cultural and social influences on academic skills and instructional strategies	1 2 3 4 5
9) Demonstrates skills to implement and evaluate services that support cognitive and academic skills	1 2 3 4 5
DOMAIN TOTAL =	

4) INTERVENTIONS AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES TO DEVELOP SOCIAL AND LIFE SKILLS

10) Is knowledgeable about biological, cultural, developmental, and social influences on behavior and mental health	1 2 3 4 5
11) Is knowledgeable about behavioral and emotional impacts on learning and life skills	1 2 3 4 5
12) Demonstrates skills to implement and evaluate evidence-based strategies to promote social-emotional functioning and mental health	1 2 3 4 5
DOMAIN TOTAL =	

5) SCHOOL-WIDE PRACTICES TO PROMOTE LEARNING

13) Is knowledgeable about school and systems structure, organization, and theory	1 2 3 4 5
---	-----------

14) Is knowledgeable about general and special education, technology Resources, and evidence-based school practices	1 2 3 4 5
15) Demonstrates skills to develop and implement practices that create and maintain effective and supportive learning environments for children and others	1 2 3 4 5
DOMAIN TOTAL =	

6) PREVENTIVE AND RESPONSIVE SERVICES

16) Is knowledgeable of principles and research related to resilience and risk factors in learning and mental health	1 2 3 4 5
17) Is knowledgeable of multi-tiered prevention and evidence-based strategies	1 2 3 4 5
18) Demonstrates skills to promote services that enhance mental health, safety, physical well-being, and effective crisis preparation, response, and recovery	1 2 3 4 5
DOMAIN TOTAL =	

7) FAMILY-SCHOOL COLLABORATION SERVICES

19) Is knowledgeable of principles and research related to family systems, strengths, needs and culture	1 2 3 4 5
20) Is knowledgeable of evidence-based strategies to support family influences on children's learning, socialization, and mental health	1 2 3 4 5
21) Demonstrates skills to design, implement, and evaluate services that facilitate family and school partnerships	1 2 3 4 5
DOMAIN TOTAL =	

8) DIVERSITY IN DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING

22) Is knowledgeable of individual differences, abilities, disabilities, and other diverse characteristics	1 2 3 4 5
23) Is knowledgeable of research related to diversity factors for children, families, and schools, including factors related to culture and individual and role differences	1 2 3 4 5
24) Demonstrates skills that promote effective functioning for individuals, families, and schools with diverse characteristics, cultures, and backgrounds	1 2 3 4 5
DOMAIN TOTAL =	

9) RESEARCH AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

25) Is knowledgeable of research design, statistics, measurement, varied data collection and analysis techniques, and program evaluation methods	1 2 3 4 5
26) Uses various technology resources for data collection, measurement, and analysis of problems to support effective practices	1 2 3 4 5
27) Demonstrates skills to evaluate and apply research as a foundation for service delivery	1 2 3 4 5
DOMAIN TOTAL =	

10) LEGAL, ETHICAL, AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

28) Is knowledgeable of the history and foundations of school psychology and multiple service models and methods	1 2 3 4 5
29) Is knowledgeable of the ethical, legal, and professional standards, and other factors related to professional identity and effective practice	1 2 3 4 5
30) Demonstrates skills related to providing services consistent with ethical, legal, and professional standards	1 2 3 4 5
DOMAIN TOTAL =	

OVERALL POSITIVE IMPACT ON YOUTH, SCHOOLS, AND OTHER CONSUMERS

31) Has contributed to improving student academic learning or social, emotional, or behavioral well-being	1 2 3 4 5
32) Has contributed to the success of other educators through consultation & collaboration	1 2 3 4 5

33) Has contributed to parent knowledge, skill, and/or satisfaction with their child's education	1 2 3 4 5
SECTION TOTAL =	

Evaluation Rating TOTAL Score: _____
Item content that needs development:

Additional Comments:

We have reviewed this evaluation together and have discussed steps to continue progress toward goals. Items that are not rated at a passing level are being used to help develop additional internship goals as needed.

Supervisor Signature/Date

Intern Signature/Date

Appendix C

UW-RF School Psychology Training Program Intern Observation: Performance-Based Rubric (TEAMING & COLLABORATION)

Intern name & observation site: _____

Description of activity observed: _____

Observer name and date: _____ Observation # (circle one): **1 2 3**

Category	4	3	2	1	Level
Interpersonal skills and communication	Routinely demonstrated effective interpersonal skills (e.g., strong listening, patience, and respect). Communicated information very clearly and enthusiastically. Showed dedicated interest in audience understanding.	Usually demonstrated effective interpersonal skills (e.g., strong listening, patience, and respect). Information usually explained and followed up upon effectively.	Sometimes demonstrated effective interpersonal skills (e.g., listening, patience, and respect). Was able to communicate information adequately, but at a basic level.	Rarely demonstrated effective interpersonal skills (e.g., strong listening, patience, and respect). Struggled to communicate information effectively.	
General problem-solving collaboration	Routinely solicited and helped synthesize information from others. Interjected own ideas assertively without being domineering. Demonstrated clear preference for win-win strategies and positive approaches to problem solving.	Usually demonstrated ability to interject own ideas and synthesize information from others. Not yet viewed as a clear problem-solving leader, but shows strong foundational skills.	Sometimes used information provided by others in team. Was sometimes able to collaborate effectively, but sometimes too passive or aggressive with own ideas.	Rarely utilized information from other group members during decision making. Was excessively passive or aggressive with own ideas.	
Intervention enhancement	A clear leader in helping develop appropriate goals and interventions. Demonstrated excellent awareness of varied interventions or instructional methodologies.	Demonstrated helpful awareness and effort in assisting development of goals and interventions.	Provided some help in developing goals and interventions. Ideas were somewhat helpful, but viewed as basic.	Rarely or did not help develop goals or interventions. Did not recognize the need to link data to interventions or modifications.	
Diversity values and dispositions	Routinely was respectful (valuing other perspectives, listening actively, exhibiting empathy, pacing the meeting), inclusive (thinking of others), open, collaborative, and cooperative. Adapted practice effectively and appropriately as necessary to meet the needs of others.	Often was respectful (valuing other perspectives, listening actively, exhibiting empathy, pacing the meeting), inclusive (thinking of others), open, collaborative, and cooperative. Adapted practice adequately as necessary to meet the needs of others.	Sometimes was respectful (valuing other perspectives, listening actively, exhibiting empathy, pacing the meeting), inclusive (thinking of others), open, collaborative, and cooperative. Showed some effort to adapt practice to meet the needs of others.	Did not present as being respectful (valuing other perspectives, listening actively, exhibiting empathy, pacing the meeting), inclusive (thinking of others), open, collaborative, and cooperative. Did not adapt practice to meet the needs of others.	
Data-based decision-making	Collected valuable data for understanding problems. Utilized multiple tools and techniques (as needed) in gathering the data. Recognized as a clear leader in data collection, interpretation, and data-based decision making.	Collected acceptable data for understanding problems. Chosen tools and techniques were sufficient, and data provided to team was valuable in decision making.	Collected adequate data for understanding problems, with room for improved variability. Showed some effort to connect data to interventions.	Collected data were incomplete or inappropriate for the presenting problem. Did not effectively connect data to interventions or goals.	
Professional, legal, and ethical responsibility	Clear and effective adherence to due process guidelines in all decisions affecting students. Maintained high ethical standards.	Adhered to due process guidelines in most decisions affecting students. Maintained acceptable ethical standards.	Adhered to due process guidelines in most decisions affecting students. Ethical standards were adequate.	Neglected or failed to recognize some due process guidelines. And/or did not address ethical issues appropriately.	

Appendix D

UW-RF School Psychology Training Program **INTERNSHIP** Intervention Case Study Appraisal Rubric

Candidate: _____

Rater: _____

Year in Program: 3rd (Practicum) or 4th (Intern)

Date: _____

RATING INSTRUCTIONS:

While passing levels will vary by year in the program (see table below), all ratings should be assigned with the expectations of a graduating intern in mind. Feedback to the candidate should be provided about her or his intervention skills/awareness relative to graduating intern expectations. A non-passing level TOTAL score may necessitate the development of a “Professional Growth Plan” (see Appendix Y of the Program Handbook) or other new goals for the candidate.

The Intervention Case Study rubric has 61 total points. **INTERNS must pass the intervention at a level of 85% or higher (52 out of 61 or better).**

Please rate the candidate on each item using the scale below. Comments on any particular strength or challenging characteristic may be written in the box at the end of the rubric.

RATING SCALE:

1: This intervention component is not clearly included or minimally described

2 or 3: This intervention component is adequately described or comprehensively described (assignment of 2 or 3 will depend on maximum item score – varies by item).

Section 1: Problem Identification	3	2	1	LEVEL
1.1	A summary of intervention implementation drivers is included (i.e., the development or lack thereof of underlying organizational, leadership, and competency factors in the school system).	The issue of implementation drivers is mentioned, but only minimal elaboration is included.	A summary of intervention implementation drivers is NOT included.	
1.2	Student's behavior is defined in the context of appropriate grade and/or peer expectations	The student's behavior is operationally defined.	The student's behavior is identified by not operationally defined.	
1.3		The problem is collaboratively defined.	The problem is not collaboratively defined.	
1.4	The discrepancy between current and desired level of performance is explained.	The behavior is operationally defined or quantified in terms of both current and desired level of performance	The behavior is not operationally defined in terms of both current and desired levels of performance.	
1.5	Baseline includes the student behavior and peer/grade norms and expectations with computed trend lines.	A baseline for the student is established using sufficient data.	A baseline for the student behavior is not established or has insufficient data.	
1.6		The student behavior is identified as a skill deficit or a performance deficit.	The student behavior is not identified as a skill or performance deficit.	
1.7	Parents/guardians and a multi-disciplinary intervention team participated in this intervention. Teaming best practices (or lack thereof)	Parents/guardians and teachers are involved in the problem-identification process.	Parents/guardians and teachers are not involved in the problem-identification process.	
Section 2: Problem Analysis	3 are summarized (i.e., nature of leadership, roles, purpose, etc.)	2	1	LEVEL
2.1 TOTAL	Hypotheses are generated through collaboration with teacher and/or parents.	One or more hypotheses are developed to identify the functions that the behavior serves and/or the conditions under which the behavior is occurring (two or more of the following factors: child factors, curriculum, peers, teacher, classroom, home.)	Hypotheses are not developed or are developed in only one area and/or hypotheses are not measurable.	
2.2	There are multiple sources of data that converge on each proposed hypothesis.	There is evidence that appropriate data are collected to confirm or reject the proposed hypotheses. Appropriate data include one or more of the following: record review, interview, observation, testing, self-report.	Appropriate data are not collected to confirm or reject the hypotheses.	
2.3		Hypotheses reflect an awareness of issues of diversity (e.g., physical, social, linguistic, cultural).	Hypotheses do not reflect an awareness of issues related to diversity.	
TOTAL				

Section 3: Intervention	3	2	1	LEVEL
3.1		Intervention is linked to observable, measurable goal statement(s).	Intervention is not linked to observable, measurable goal statement(s).	
3.2		Intervention selection is based on data from problem analysis and hypothesis testing.	Intervention selection is not based on data from problem analysis and hypothesis testing.	
3.3		Intervention is evidence-based (e.g., research literature, functional analysis, single case design analysis).	Intervention is not evidence-based, but summary of anecdotal or other reasons for using is included.	
3.4		Intervention is developed collaboratively.	Intervention is not developed collaboratively.	
3.5		Intervention reflects sensitivity to individual differences, resources, classroom practices, and other system issues. Acceptability of intervention is verified.	Intervention does not reflect sensitivity to individual differences, resources, classroom practices, and other system issues. Acceptability of intervention is not verified.	
3.6		Logistics of setting, time, resources, and personnel are included in the intervention plan.	Logistics of setting, time, resources and personnel are not included in the intervention plan.	
3.7		Intervention selection considers unintended outcomes or limitations.	Intervention selection does not consider unintended outcomes or limitations.	
3.8		Intervention is monitored and data are provided to ensure that it was implemented as designed (Intervention Integrity). Any deliberate intervention adaptations or “intervention drift” is summarized.	Intervention Integrity is not monitored or, even if monitored, insufficient data are included.	
TOTAL				

Section 4: Evaluation	3	2	1	LEVEL
4.1	Charting includes student performance trend lines and/or goal lines.	Progress monitoring data are demonstrated on a chart.	Progress monitoring data are not demonstrated on a chart.	
4.2	An AB design (single-case design) format was used. An Effect Size (NAES) or Percentage of Non-Overlapping Data (PND) is included and shows large or moderately significant growth between the baseline and intervention phases.	An AB design (single-case design) format was used. An Effect Size (NAES) or Percentage of Non-Overlapping Data (PND) is included and shows a small level of growth between the baseline and intervention phases. The trendline may be showing good progress, but significance is not well-established.	The data showed no effect of the intervention with the AB design (the NAES or PND showed no effect or no data analysis was included).	
4.3	Responses to Intervention data are used to inform problem-solving and decision making. Single-case design was specified.	Data are used to inform further problem solving and decision making (i.e., continuation of intervention, modification of intervention, maintenance of intervention).	Data are not used to inform further problem-solving and decision making.	
4.4	Strategies for transfer/generalizing outcomes to other settings are documented as effective.	Strategies for transfer/generalizing outcomes to other settings are addressed.	Strategies for transfer/generalizing outcomes to other settings are not addressed.	
4.5	Modifications for future interventions are considered based upon collaborative examination of effective data.	Effectiveness of intervention is shared through collaboration with parents, teachers, and other personnel.	Effectiveness of intervention is not shared or communicated.	
4.6	Strategies for follow-up are developed and implemented.	Suggestions for follow-up are developed (e.g., continued progress monitoring, transition planning).	Suggestions for follow-up are not developed.	
TOTAL				
<i>Comments/Recommendations:</i>				

CASE STUDY OVERALL RATING	
Section 1 TOTAL	___/19
Section 2 TOTAL	___/8
Section 3 TOTAL	___/16
Section 4 TOTAL	___/18
RUBRIC TOTAL	___/61 P or F
Intervention Integrity Rating (separate form) (must be at least 80%)	___%
Effect Size or Percent of Non-Overlapping Data (data charts and numerical evidence must be included)	___

Appendix E
Portfolio Assessment Rubric

**UNIVERSITY OF
WISCONSIN** **River Falls**
School Psychology Program
Programmatic Portfolio Appraisal Rubric

Candidate Name: _____ Year completed: **2 3 4**

Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

PORTFOLIO EVALUATION CYCLE:

The portfolio will be evaluated at the completion of the master's degree year (2nd), the practicum year (3rd) and the internship year (4th). Portfolios must meet expected passing levels each time. Passing levels vary by year in program, as follows:

	<i>Domain Passing Level</i>	<i>TOTAL portfolio passing level</i>
<i>End of M.S.E., Year 2</i>	50% (2+)	50% (20+)
<i>End of Practicum, Year 3</i>	75% (3+)	75% (30+)
<i>End of Ed.S., Year 4</i>	100% (4)	100% (40)

RATING INSTRUCTIONS:

While passing levels will vary by year in the program, all ratings should be assigned with the expectations of the final intern portfolio in mind. Feedback should then be provided about the development of the current candidate portfolio relative to final portfolio expectations. Each NASP domain includes four total points. The total portfolio includes 40 total points. Reviewer ratings of these NASP domains also reflect perceptions of the Wisconsin DPI Pupil Services Standards, as demonstrated in the portfolio "NASP Domains by DPI Standard Matrix" (see www.uwrf.edu/csp).

EVIDENCE OF EMERGING KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS:

A standard set of required artifacts must be included in the programmatic portfolio. This set of artifacts reflects evidence (i.e., clear data) of the candidate's *competency* in one or more of the NASP graduate education domains. Additionally, the candidate's reflection statement must also show evidence of emerging knowledge and skills yet recognition of needs for growth. Together, the artifacts and the reflection statement will be used by reviewers to evaluate Domain Knowledge and Emerging Skills, with the system on the following page.

Appendix E (Portfolio Assessment Rubric), continued

PORTFOLIO STATEMENTS RATING SCALE:

Rate the strength of the candidate's knowledge and emerging skills on the following scales.

1: Knowledge and emerging skills are below expectations at this time

2: Adequate knowledge and emerging skill at this time

3: Developed knowledge and emerging skills; nearing final expected levels for a program graduate

4: Proficient knowledge and emerging skills; at expected levels for a program graduate

NASP School Psychology Training Domains	<i>Domain Knowledge and Emerging Skills</i>	<i>Pass or Fail</i>
<i>(NASP #1) Data-based Decision-Making & Accountability</i>	1 2 3 4	
<i>(NASP #2) Consultation and Collaboration</i>	1 2 3 4	
<i>(NASP #3) Interventions & Instructional Support to Develop Academic Skills</i>	1 2 3 4	
<i>(NASP #4) Interventions & Mental Health Services to Develop Social and Life Skills</i>	1 2 3 4	
<i>(NASP #5) School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning</i>	1 2 3 4	
<i>(NASP #6) Preventive & Responsive Services</i>	1 2 3 4	
<i>(NASP #7) Family-School Collaboration Services</i>	1 2 3 4	
<i>(NASP #8) Diversity & Development in Learning</i>	1 2 3 4	
<i>(NASP #9) Research and Program Evaluation</i>	1 2 3 4	
<i>(NASP #10) Legal, Ethical, & Professional Practice</i>	1 2 3 4	
COLUMN TOTAL (40 possible points)		

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

RE: Artifacts:

RE: Reflection Statement:

Portfolio Reviewer Signature

Date

Appendix F
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

River Falls

SPSY 798 Independent Research
Final Program Evaluation Report
(25 points)

Student(s) name(s): _____
Advisor/Evaluator: _____

Criteria	Potential	Earned
The paper included about 10 reader-friendly pages of narrative. It was completed in APA style 6 th edition (title page, reference section, double-spacing, proper table style, appendices as needed).	2	
General writing mechanics and style were professional and at the level of a developing graduate student. For full credit in this area, spelling, punctuation, grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, and general flow of the paper must be evaluated as very strong (i.e., no more than a few minor issues).	3	
An Introduction was included. The intro included a brief review of key/core/critical related literature. It provided evidence for the need for and purpose of the current study. Specific research questions were included and sensible given the state of the literature. Specific objectives, following the Objectives-Based approach were stated.	2	
A Method section was included. It included concise, yet sufficiently detailed summary about the project participants, materials used, and all steps or procedures. Data collection procedures were all summarized adequately.	3	
Results and Conclusions sections were included. Key findings were included and triangulation of themes/trends were noted (and any inconsistencies). Implications for educators in the district were stated.	15	
TOTAL	25	

Comments:

This performance-based assessment contributes to your ability to meet NASP Training & Practice Domain # 9 and WI DPI Pupil Service Standard #3. This rubric must be saved electronically and included in your programmatic portfolio as an artifact reflection your skills/knowledge on those domains.

Updated March 2018

Appendix G

Ed.S. Graduate Exit Survey

Please respond to the following questions with your perceptions of your experience of the UW-River Falls School Ed.S. degree (first two years in the program). It is expected this will take about 5 minutes to complete. Thank you!

- 1) Overall, the UWRF school psychology Master's program
 - Exceeded my expectations
 - Met my expectations
 - Was somewhat below my expectations
 - Was far below my expectations

- 2) Now that I have completed my Ed.S. degree, I feel prepared with a foundation for beginning a career in school psychology.
 - Very much so
 - Mostly
 - Somewhat
 - Very little

- 3) If I were starting a graduate program in school psychology again I would apply to UWRF.
 - Yes
 - No

- 4) As a whole, the timing of Ed.S. courses met my needs (e.g., time of day, terms offered, part-time course sequence)
 - Very much so
 - Mostly
 - Somewhat
 - Very little

- 5) Regarding class meetings on the main UWRF campus, I would have preferred to:
 - Have more courses there
 - The number of courses there was about right for me
 - Have fewer courses there
 - Have no courses there

6) Regarding class meetings at the Hudson Center, I would have preferred to:

- Have more courses there
- The number of courses there was about right for me
- Have fewer courses there
- Have no courses there

7) Regarding on-line or web-based work associated with program courses, I would have preferred:

- More on-line work
- The amount of on-line work was about right for me
- Less on-line work
- No on-line work

8) As a whole, the Ed.S. courses addressed critical knowledge and skills necessary for practice as a school psychologist

- Almost Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never

9) As a whole, the program materials required for Ed.S. courses (e.g., textbooks, journal articles, technology) helped facilitate learning.

- Almost Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never

10) Comments about my perceptions of the overall program structure:

11) The library services (e.g., access to needed resources, librarian support) were:

- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
-

12) The bookstore services were

- Very good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

13) The financial assistance support was

- Very good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- NA

14) The admissions process was

- Very good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

15) The career services support was

- Very good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

16) My experience with parking on the main campus was

- Very good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

17) Comments on your perceptions of your experiences with non-program university services:

18) I have been encouraged by program faculty members to get involved in professional opportunities beyond the classroom (e.g., leadership activities, conference attendance, school psychology awareness week activities).

- Almost Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never

19) As a whole, program faculty members have encouraged and promoted multiple academic and theoretical perspectives

- Almost Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never

20) As a whole, program faculty members have encouraged and promoted diversity, inclusion, and social justice in the program

- Almost Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never

21) As a whole, program faculty members held high expectations for my overall academic performance.

- Almost Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never

22) As a whole, program faculty members were prepared for teaching the Ed.S. courses.

- Almost Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never

23) As a whole, the professional involvement and connectedness of the program faculty members enriched my learning (e.g., with NASP, WSPA, MSPA, MDE, PREPaRE)

- Almost Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never

24) As a whole, program faculty members treated me with respect.

- Almost Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never

25) As a whole, program faculty members served as positive role models for program students.

- Almost Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never

26) As a whole, program faculty members offered useful feedback on my class performance.

- Almost Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never

27) Comments about my perceptions of my experiences with program faculty members:

The following statements reflect specific program learning outcomes and objectives. Having experienced the Ed.S. program in its entirety, please choose the option that best reflects your preparation.

28) I feel prepared to engage in culturally responsive school psychology practices

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Slightly Agree

- Slightly Disagree
- Disagree
- Disagree Strongly

29) I feel prepared to collaborate successfully with a variety of individuals (e.g., with teachers, administrators, parents, other educators).

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Slightly Agree
- Slightly Disagree
- Disagree
- Disagree Strongly

30) I feel prepared to engage in skills that contribute to a positive impact on the students, parents, teachers, and others who are served.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Slightly Agree
- Slightly Disagree
- Disagree
- Disagree Strongly

31) I feel prepared to engage in practices aligned with the training domains of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI).

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Slightly Agree
- Slightly Disagree
- Disagree
- Disagree Strongly

32) Comments about your perceptions of your ability to meet program learning outcomes:

Appendix H

SUPERVISOR EVALUATION OF A RECENT UWRF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM GRADUATE

You have been provided this evaluation form because you supervise a recent graduate of the UW-River Falls School Psychology Program. In order to meet our ongoing improvement goal, we strive to obtain information from employers about the competency of our graduates. Please evaluate the individual from whom you received this evaluation link. Your ratings and comments are anonymous and will be treated confidentially. We are not asking for your name/identification nor the graduate's name/identification.

If you have questions about this survey, you may contact the UW-River Falls School Psychology Program Director at scott.woitaszewski@uwrf.edu or (715) 425-3883. Thank you for providing us this **useful feedback!**

Using the following scale, please rate the extent to which the graduate demonstrates the abilities and skills noted below.

1=NeedsSignificantImprovement

2=BelowAverage

3=Adequate

4=AboveAverage

5=Excellent

NA = indicates that this skill/ability is not applicable or has not been observed

1

2

3

4

5

× NA

	1	2	3	4	5	× NA
Interpersonal and collaborative skills with colleagues, families, and others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to implement a variety of student assessment techniques appropriately	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to develop individualized interventions for students/classes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evaluating the efficacy of important school programs/interventions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to implement a variety of counseling strategies appropriately and flexibly	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Knowledge/respect for cultural and individual diversity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Knowledge/respect for ethical codes of school psychologists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leadership skills (e.g., motivation, appropriate risk-taking, involvement)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Knowledge and implementation of legal and due process issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evidence-based practice (i.e., ability to analyze collected data OR use others' research to guide practice)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to assist with school-wide prevention or intervention efforts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to understand and work with the needs of a variety of children and youth	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Your title (e.g., special education director, lead school psychologist, principal, etc.):

Please suggest areas in which you believe this school psychologist (graduate of UWRF) needs to improve:

▲

■

▼

◀

▶

Please indicate areas in which you believe this individual is particularly strong:

Provide any additional thoughts here about this graduate or the UWRF school psychology program in general:

OPTIONAL: If you would like to be contacted by the UWRF School Psychology Program Director for further discussion, please add your name, email, and phone number here:

Appendix I

Alumni Survey Sample – 2 years post-Ed.S. graduation SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM University of Wisconsin–River Falls Alumni Survey

As a graduate of the educational specialist (Ed.S.) program in school psychology at UW-River Falls, you are an excellent resource for feedback on the training you have received. In our continuing effort at self-evaluation, we are requesting you complete the following survey to assist the program in improving the quality of training provided. This survey will be treated confidentially. Please, return it in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible. Thank you for your assistance in this regard.

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Year Entered the Program: _____ Year of Graduation: _____

Which of the following job descriptions best describes your current employer?

- Public School
- Private School
- Junior/Community College

- University
- Private Business/Agency
- Government
- Non-Profit Organization
- Other _____

Which of the following best describes your occupation?

- School Psychologist
- Counselor
- Psychologist in the Private Sector
- Not Employed
- Other _____

Which of the following best describes your satisfaction with your current position?

- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Unsatisfied
- Not Applicable

What is your current employment status?

- Full Time
- Part Time

In your current position, what percentage of your time is spent doing the following tasks? (Out of 100%)

Assessment _____ Intervention _____ Research _____
 Supervision _____ Consultation _____ Other _____

In what state(s) are you licensed or certified to practice school psychology?

- WI
- MN
- Other

Do you hold the NCSP credential administered by NASP? No _____ Yes _____ (Date/Year) _____

I am a member of these national associations:

- NASP
- APA
- APA Div. 16
- WSPA
- MSPA
- Other

List the offices you hold or have held and the name of the professional organization(s):

RATINGS – Please, rate the quality of the school psychology program in the following areas using this scale:

0 - None	1 – Inadequate	2 – Adequate (room for improvement)	3 – Good (little need for improvement)	4 - Excellent
-----------------	-----------------------	--	---	----------------------

A. General Standards

Indicate how well the program met the following standards.

Fair evaluation of students regardless of cultural/individual differences	0	1	2	3	4
Cultural/Individual differences incorporated into the curriculum	0	1	2	3	4
Field training in cultural and individual differences	0	1	2	3	4
Training integrated practice and theory	0	1	2	3	4
Faculty demonstrated and modeled professional behavior	0	1	2	3	4
Close student-faculty working/advisement relationship	0	1	2	3	4
Balance of science and practice in the program	0	1	2	3	4

Comments:

B. Sensitivity to Individual Differences

Indicate how well the program affirmed and addressed diversity in the following areas (using the same scale).

Physical/Mental Disabilities	0	1	2	3	4
Poverty	0	1	2	3	4
Gender and Gender Expression	0	1	2	3	4
Racial/Ethnic Diversity	0	1	2	3	4
Religiosity/Spirituality	0	1	2	3	4
Sexual Orientation	0	1	2	3	4

Comments:

CURRICULUM STANDARDS – Please, rate the quality of the curriculum using the following scale.

1 – Inadequate	2 – Adequate (Room for improvement)	3- Good (Little need for improvement)	4 - Excellent	
Data-based decision making (assessment to identify strengths and weaknesses)	1	2	3	4
Consultation and collaboration	1	2	3	4
Instruction and development of cognitive/academic skills	1	2	3	4
Socialization and development of like skills	1	2	3	4
Student diversity in development and learning	1	2	3	4
School and systems organization, policy development, and climate	1	2	3	4
Prevention, crisis intervention and mental health	1	2	3	4
Home/school/community collaboration	1	2	3	4
Research and program evaluation	1	2	3	4
School psychology practice and development (school psychology foundations, history, public policy, legal and ethical issues)	1	2	3	4

Comments:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT – Please, rate the quality of the program in preparing you for the following activities:

1 – Inadequate	2 – Adequate (Room for improvement)	3- Good (Little need for improvement)	4 - Excellent	
Development and maintenance of professional identity as a school psychologist	1	2	3	4
Assuming the role of a school psychologist within a human services/educational system	1	2	3	4
Adherence to current credentialing standards and laws	1	2	3	4
Professional counseling	1	2	3	4
Legal and ethical issues	1	2	3	4
Field experiences (practica, internship)	1	2	3	4
Providing supervision	1	2	3	4
Crisis intervention	1	2	3	4
Prevention	1	2	3	4

Comments:

GLOBAL RATINGS – Please, rate the overall quality of the program using the following scale:

1 – Inadequate	2 – Adequate (Room for improvement)	3- Good (Little need for improvement)	4 - Excellent	
Overall quality of teaching	1	2	3	4
Overall quality of class content	1	2	3	4
Overall quality of research training	1	2	3	4
Overall quality of practica	1	2	3	4
Overall quality of mentorship/apprenticeship	1	2	3	4
Overall quality of comprehensive exam	1	2	3	4
Overall quality of advising	1	2	3	4
Overall quality of school psychology program	1	2	3	4
How well did the program prepare you for your current employment?	1	2	3	4

Comments:

Please, respond to the following:

What were the strongest components of your training?

How current was your training?

For you, what component of the program is most in need of development?

Were there redundant courses in the program? If so, what were they?

Were there courses that were missing from the program? If so, what were they?

