

UWRF School Psychology Program Assessment Plan - *M.S.E. Degree*

Completed by Scott Woitaszewski, Program Director

October 2018

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 M.S.E. degree (35 credits), which is earned after the first two years of our four year program. A separate Assessment plan will address the Ed.S. degree (31 additional credits) which is earned after the fourth year of training. 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. LEARNING OUTCOMES - Master of Science in Education (M.S.E. degree)

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 UWRF school psychology M.S.E. 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 UWRF STRATEGIC GOAL – Global Education & Engagement*)
 - Objective A: Graduates will be able to show evidence of multiple school psychology skills and roles, including in the area of diversity and socially just practices (*Approved 2nd – Year Portfolio Assessment Rubric*).
 - Objective B: Graduates will be able to demonstrate emerging skills and characteristics related to diversity and socially just practices, as perceived by faculty ratings (*Passed Readiness for Practicum Evaluation*)
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 show evidence of multiple school psychology skills and roles, including in the area of collaboration (*Approved 2nd – Year Portfolio Assessment Rubric*).
 - Objective B: Graduates will be able to demonstrate emerging skills and characteristics related to collaboration, as perceived by faculty ratings (*Passed Readiness for Practicum Evaluation*)

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 show evidence of multiple school psychology skills and roles, including in the area of emerging positive impact on others (*Approved 2nd – Year Portfolio Assessment Rubric*).
 - Objective B: Graduates will be able to demonstrate emerging skills and characteristics related to assisting others’ positive growth, as perceived by faculty ratings (*Passed Readiness for Practicum Evaluation*)

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 show evidence of emerging knowledge/skills across multiple school psychology graduate education domains covered during the M.S.E. degree (*Approved 2nd – Year Portfolio Assessment Rubric*).
 - Objective B: Graduates will be able to demonstrate foundational school psychology skills, as perceived by faculty ratings (*Passed Readiness for Practicum Evaluation*)

III. PROFILE OF WHERE LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE BEING ACHIEVED

Specific Courses for all Learning Outcomes & Course Map Visuals

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

Table 1. UWRF School Psychology M.S.E. Learning Outcome by Course Matrix

Learning Outcome	Primary Course(s) where Outcome Addressed	Level of Learning	Specific Knowledge/Skills Addressed (NASP)	Assessment Measures (Artifacts) &
LEARNING OUTCOME 1: Graduates will demonstrate culturally responsive competencies.				
Objective A – Graduates will be able to show evidence of multiple school psychology skills and roles, including in the area of diversity and socially just practices	SPSY 701 SPSY 651 COUN 612 SPED 530	Foundational knowledge	Diversity in Development & Learning (NASP #8)	2 nd Year Portfolio Assessment Rubric – Spring of Year 2, Formally part of SPSY 747
Objective B – Graduates will be able to demonstrate emerging skills and characteristics related to diversity and socially just practices, as perceived by faculty ratings	SPSY 701 SPSY 651 COUN 612 SPED 530	Foundational knowledge	Diversity in Development & Learning (NASP #8)	Readiness for Practicum Evaluation – Spring of Year 2, Formally part of SPSY 747
LEARNING OUTCOME 2: Graduates will be able to collaborate successfully and problem-solve.				

Objective A – Graduates will be able to show evidence of multiple school psychology skills and roles, including in the area of collaboration	SPSY 620 SPSY 745 SPSY 795 SPSY 747	Developing skills	School-wide practices to promote learning (NASP #5); Data-based Decision Making (NASP #1); Research & Program	2 nd Year Portfolio Assessment Rubric – Spring of Year 2, Formally part of SPSY 747
Objective B – Graduates will be able to demonstrate emerging skills and characteristics related to collaboration, as perceived by faculty ratings	SPSY 620 SPSY 745 SPSY 795 SPSY 747	Developing skills	School-wide practices to promote learning (NASP #5); Data-based Decision Making (NASP #1); Research & Program	Readiness for Practicum Evaluation – Spring of Year 2, Formally part of SPSY 747
LEARNING OUTCOME 3: Graduates will be able to demonstrate a positive impact on others.				
Objective A – Graduates will be able to show evidence of multiple school psychology skills and roles, including in the area of emerging positive impact on others	SPSY 622 COUN 789 COUN 732 SPSY 746	Developing skills	Data-based Decision Making (NASP #1); Interventions & Mental-Health Services (NASP #4); Prevention & Responsive	2 nd Year Portfolio Assessment Rubric – Spring of Year 2, Formally part of SPSY 747
Objective B – Graduates will be able to demonstrate emerging skills and characteristics related to assisting others’ positive growth, as perceived by faculty ratings	SPSY 622 COUN 789 COUN 732 SPSY 746	Developing skills	Data-based Decision Making (NASP #1); Interventions & Mental-Health Services (NASP #4); Prevention & Responsive Services (NASP #6)	Readiness for Practicum Evaluation – Spring of Year 2, Formally part of SPSY 747
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 show evidence of emerging knowledge/skills across multiple school psychology graduate education domains covered during the M.S.E. degree	All M.S.E. courses – See Table 2	Foundational Knowledge & Developing Skills (needed prior to practicum during the Ed.S. degree)	All NASP graduation education domains (NASP #1 to NASP #10)	2 nd Year Portfolio Assessment Rubric – Spring of Year 2, Formally part of SPSY 747
Objective B – Graduates will be able to demonstrate foundational school psychology skills, as perceived by faculty ratings	All M.S.E. courses – See Table 2	Foundational Knowledge & Developing Skills (needed prior to practicum during the Ed.S. degree)	All NASP graduation education domains (NASP #1 to NASP #10)	Readiness for Practicum Evaluation – Spring of Year 2, Formally part of SPSY 747

How Out-Of-Classroom Experiences Impact All Learning Outcomes

The majority primary/critical out-of-classroom experiences (practicum and internship) in the overall School Psychology Program do not occur during the M.S.E. degree portion. Rather, they occur during the Ed.S. degree portion of the program. However, in an effort to reinforce foundational knowledge and developing skills during the M.S.E. portion (first two years of the four-year total program), students experience numerous out-of-class opportunities and options that address all M.S.E. learning outcomes. See Table 3 for annual or ongoing examples and associated data.

Table 3. Out-of-Classroom Experiences – Annual/Ongoing Examples

M.S.E. out-of-classroom experience	Type of experience	Timing	Learning Outcomes Addressed
School Psychology Awareness Week workshop	<i>Speaker brought in annually to replace one class meeting for all fall classes</i>	<i>2nd week of November – numerous years in row</i>	<i>LO1 (frequent diversity topics – e.g., bilingual assessment in Fall 2018), LO4</i>
Conference travel (NASP, WSPA, MSPA)	<i>Conference options locally, regionally, and nationally. Small stipends provided to students who choose to travel</i>	<i>WSPA Fall – October MSPA – January NASP – February WSPA Spring - March</i>	<i>LO1, LO2, LO3, LO4 (wide range of school psychology topics)</i>
NASP president on campus – presentation	<i>The president of the National Association of School Psychologists has presented directly to our students.</i>	<i>Late January; numerous years in a row</i>	<i>LO1, LO2, LO3, LO4 (wide range of school psychology topics)</i>
Sigma Psi Tau Student Group	<i>Leadership options for program students</i>	<i>Officer voting in the spring; serve one year following</i>	<i>LO2 (excellent leadership and collaboration experiences); LO3 (frequent volunteer or service work to promote the field)</i>
NASP, WSPA and MSPA Student Representatives	<i>Leadership options for program students</i>	<i>Application process in spring; serve one year following</i>	<i>LO2 (excellent leadership and collaboration experiences); LO3 (frequent volunteer or service work to promote the field)</i>

Out-of-Classroom Experiences & External Stakeholder Expectations

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). The pupil services standards developed by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) are also 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.

The following Candidate Assessment System procedures were developed to ensure the program effectively evaluates the stated learning outcomes that reflect NASP and Wisconsin DPI Standards/Graduate Education Domains. While numerous candidate assessments are utilized and resulting data are gathered during each year of the UWRF four-year program, eight assessments (See Table 1) and their data outcomes are aggregated regularly for various external accreditation, approval, and program prioritization processes. Table 1 includes electronic links to the eight assessments, as well as ninth assessment, the program Exit Survey. The 2010 NASP graduate education domains evaluated by each assessment are summarized in the second column. Table 2 shows the connection between NASP and Wisconsin DPI training expectations for school psychology programs. The white boxes in this matrix indicate overlap between the standards expected by each agency.

IV. VENUES FOR ASSESSING LEARNING OUTCOMES

Venues for all Direct Measures (and associated M.S.E. courses)

Previously in this document, in Table 1, all M.S.E. learning outcomes, associated courses, level of learning, type of skill/knowledge gained (NASP graduate education domain), and the overall direct assessment (artifact) measure involved were outlined. The reader is referred to that table for a review. Altogether, Table 1 reflected how the M.S.E. curriculum meets all four Learning Outcomes and Table 2 covers how the M.S.E. covers all 10 NASP graduate education domains, covering a variety of foundational knowledge and developing skills. These two tables are evidence of the comprehensive approach to school psychology training involved in the M.S.E. program. A specific Readiness for Practicum evaluation occurs at the end of the M.S.E. (spring of 2nd year) to ensure students have the foundational knowledge and developing skills necessary to move into practicum, and the Ed.S. portion of the overall program.

Specific Artifacts for all Learning Outcomes

Previously in this document, in Table 1, all M.S.E. learning outcomes, associated courses, level of learning, type of skill/knowledge gained (NASP graduate education domain), and the overall direct assessment (artifact) measure involved were outlined. The reader is referred to that table for a review.

Specific Venues & Artifacts for all Out-Of-Classroom Learning Experiences.

As previously noted, the comprehensive practicum and internship experiences required for the OVERALL program (four-year sequence) do NOT occur during the M.S.E. portion of the program (the first two years). Rather, they occur in years 3 and 4, during the Ed.S. portion of the program. As such, formal artifacts/assessments for out-of-classroom learning experiences are not typically part of the M.S.E. degree. Students who do engage in the out-of-classroom opportunities summarized in Table 3 often earn certificates of completion when completing these activities. Those certificates and documentations are encouraged as optional portfolio artifacts.

Indirect Student Survey Feedback for all Learning Outcomes (and other feedback requested)

M.S.E. graduate exit survey data are collected annually, in May/June following the granting of the M.S.E. degree. These surveys allow graduates to state their perceptions of their ability to meet the four stated Learning Outcomes as well as graduate feedback/ratings on numerous other related program issues (e.g., program structure, other university services, faculty leadership, etc.). See Appendix C for a full copy of the M.S.E. student exit survey.

Indirect Alumni Feedback

M.S.E. alumni survey data are not collected, as students do not actually complete the overall program until two years after earning the M.S.E (they remain Ed.S students after completing the M.S.E. degree). We only use alumni surveys two years after students complete the Ed.S. This is the logical thing to do as we are best viewed as one program with two highly related degrees earned along the way. We ask alumni to evaluate the entire program (M.S.E/Ed.S.) two years after earning the Ed.S. degree.

Indirect Employer Feedback

M.S.E. employer survey data are not collected, as students do not actually complete the overall program until two years after earning the M.S.E. Students do not immediately start working as school psychologists, and continue as Ed.S. program students, after earning the M.S.E. As such, we only use employer surveys two years after students complete the Ed.S. This is the logical thing to do as we are best viewed as one program with two highly related degrees earned along the way. There are no employers to survey after the students earn the M.S.E. because they are not yet employed.

V. PROCESS FOR ASSESSMENT

Scope and Depth of Program Assessment Cycle

Three key assessment measures are collected during the M.S.E. program. In addition to the notes below, they are summarized in Table 1, along with other related details.

- 1) *2nd Year Student - Portfolio Assessment Rubric* - In the spring of the 2nd year, student advisers evaluate the student electronic portfolios. The portfolio includes artifacts that demonstrate the student's emerging knowledge and skills in the foundational aspects of the NASP and Wisconsin DPI standards. To graduate with the M.S.E., students must meet a passing threshold score. (See Appendix A).
- 2) *Readiness for Practicum Evaluation* – In the spring of the 2nd Year, students are evaluated by faculty members on their readiness to proceed into applied field work (the practicum placement). The evaluation includes questions related to important foundational school psychology skills and interpersonal and personal dispositions. Students must be evaluated as ready by multiple faculty members in the department. (See Appendix B).
- 3) *M.S.E. graduate exit survey* – This 32 question survey covers the program's learning objectives, program structure, course delivery options, and other university services. Both likert scale and open-ended questions are included. (See Appendix C).

Assessment of Modes of Delivery, Locations, and Duration of Courses

The M.S.E. graduate exit survey includes several questions related to modes of delivery, location, materials, and timing of courses. See the Exit Survey in Appendix C, questions 4 to 10. Additionally, advocacy council feedback is considered in making any changes to course structure. The Advocacy Council meets at least one time annually, in the spring, where an agenda is created and minutes kept.

Accountability Structure of the Program's Assessment Process

The school psychology program and its learning outcomes are aligned with the strategic goals of UW-River Falls. Program assessment results will show how the program's learning objectives connect to Distinctive Academic Excellence, Global Education and Engagement, and Innovation and Partnerships. Additionally, the program is beholden to the Graduate Education Domains and Standards for Practice required by the National Association of School Psychologists. The following roles are part of the assessment process:

- 1) School Psychology Program Director – Oversees data collection each semester from all assessment measures and artifacts, ensures assessment reports for the university and for NASP are comprehensive and accurate.
- 2) Other Program Faculty Members – As assigned, other program faculty members assist with the advocacy council process, data collection, data analysis, and assessment report writing.
- 3) Department Chair – The chair of the Department of Counseling & School Psychology communicates regularly with the School Psychology Program Director (weekly meetings and frequent other communications). Together, they ensure a comprehensive, accurate, and proper assessment process for the program.
- 4) Advocacy Council – An advocacy council – including alumni, current students, field-based supervisor representatives, and other program partners – are made aware of the program's assessment plan and data results. General feedback is gathered annually, at scheduled meetings. Specific feedback is gathered as needed, when curriculum revision or other program changes take place.
- 5) National Association of School Psychologists Approval Board – The program director communicates with NASP approval board members to ensure a comprehensive assessment process. This may be done via attending approval meetings at national conferences, phone calls, and email exchange.

Steps for Reviewing, Aggregating, and Analyzing Assessment Findings

The following specific steps are taken to ensure a comprehensive assessment process:

- 1) All direct assessment measures and artifacts are built into specific courses and syllabi, ensuring their completion.
- 2) Assessment data review is built into every program meeting agenda. Data results are discussed on an ongoing basis, when aggregated. Analysis is contextual and developmental in nature, with students expected to build on foundational knowledge, developing skills, and emerging skills during the program.
- 3) Based on assessment results, the program faculty set annual goals for curriculum revision, curriculum delivery options, and other changes to enhance the success of student learning outcomes.
- 4) Data are aggregated into separate cohort data tables in a password protected Excel spreadsheet. Learning Outcome data on assessments have been collected and aggregated since at least 2008 and, for some of the assessments, since 2006. Data are stored electronically on a university network drive, where they are accessed by the program director, faculty, and department associate. New data are added each semester. Analysis and interpretation of the data occurs annually for the university and periodically for the UW system program audit and review and for the NASP national approval processes. The results of these analyses guide program enhancement and growth. Program progress is

discussed regularly and actions steps are addressed during bi- monthly program faculty meetings.

Process for Maintaining Data and Documenting Actions Across the Assessment Cycle

- 1) Assessment data are pulled from course platform sites (e.g., D2L, Canvas) and transferred to the program's network drive and summarized in a single password protected spreadsheet for data aggregation purposes. The spreadsheet is saved on the program's network drive and backed up on a flashdrive maintained by the program director.
- 2) The spreadsheet is updated each semester, after new data are entered. Trends are monitored informally in between formal assessment requirements.
- 3) An informal summary of some assessment results (e.g., employer survey data) are often communicated annually to the Department Chair, the College Dean, and the University Chancellor.
- 4) Formal assessment results are completed on the schedules required for PP-PAR at UWRF and for the National Association of School Psychologists accreditation process.
- 5) Action steps are noted on program meeting agenda minutes. Ongoing planning and action are noted in "old business" or "new business" on program meeting agendas. Program meeting agendas and minutes are saved on the program's UWRF network drive and date back numerous years.

How Changes will be Implemented & Documented

As previously noted, assessment data review is built into every program meeting agenda. Data results are discussed on an ongoing basis, when aggregated/as completed. The program faculty, in collaboration with the department chair, determines necessary action steps collaboratively, based on assessment data findings. Ongoing planning and action are noted in "old business" or "new business" on program meeting agendas. Additionally, a program goal and action step planning sheet template is included in Appendix D. This planning sheet is included in each program meeting agenda (starting Fall 2018), and updated as needed. Action steps are noted on program meeting agenda minutes and stored on the program's network drive. Program meeting agendas and minutes date back numerous years.

Where Assessment Results and Actions Taken can be Obtained by Internal & External Stakeholders

Data results are communicated to faculty, current students, alumni and the program's advisory council. All assessment results are posted on the program's network T: drive. Additional electronic posting of the data occurs annually on the program's webpage (<https://www.uwrf.edu/CSP/SchoolPsychology/Index.cfm>). Notification of National Approval (NASP) has been communicated to program alumni and current students via email, Facebook, and on the program's bulletin board in the Wyman Education Building. Specific assessment strengths and areas for growth are provided to the program's advisory council and available to others upon request. All assessment rubrics are available for student and public review on the program's (<https://www.uwrf.edu/CSP/SchoolPsychology/Index.cfm>). These rubrics include clear rating procedures and benchmarks indicating passing levels and/or varied skill levels (e.g., needs improvement, emerging, proficient). Hyperlinks to specific assessment rubrics for the learning outcomes discussed in this document have been provided on page three of this document. When hard copy documentation is used, actual student artifacts are stored in a current student and alumni file cabinet in the Wyman Education Building, Office 257, and in an archive storage room on the ground floor of the Wyman Building at UW-River Falls. In many cases, data are stored electronically, on the program's network drive.

Additional Details (e.g., links to program mission, assessment rubrics, etc.)

The school psychology program's mission, vision, and program objectives can be found in the student handbook: <https://www.uwrf.edu/CSP/SchoolPsychology/upload/UWRF-School-Psychology-Student-Handbook-2018-19-v1-0-2.pdf>

The program's value statement concerning diversity: <https://www.uwrf.edu/CSP/Values-Statement-Addressing-Diversity.cfm>

The program's "Candidate Assessment System," with links to all rubrics used to assess student progress in the M.S.E. and the Ed.S. programs can be found here: <https://www.uwrf.edu/CSP/SchoolPsychologyStudentAssessment.cfm>

A summary of program student leadership and out-of-the-classroom experiences can be found here: <https://www.uwrf.edu/CSP/Leadership-Opportunities-for-Students.cfm>

External Accreditation & Standards

The UW-RF School Psychology Program has been accredited fully by the National Association of School Psychologists since 2013. A listing of M.S.E. courses and how they are connected to the 10 NASP Graduate Education Domains is included in Table 2.

Appendix A
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 B
Readiness for Practicum Rubric

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-RIVER FALLS
Readiness for Practicum and Ed.S. Program – Faculty Rating

School psychology faculty members and the Counseling & School Psychology Department Chair will each complete this form on behalf of each 2nd year School Psychology student. The results will be used to evaluate program progress and readiness for practicum. In some cases, the faculty may require the candidate to complete a Candidate Growth Plan before or during the practicum experience. In cases where significant improvement is required, a candidate may be denied access to practicum.

	Unacceptable	Needs Some Improvement	Adequate	Above Average	Exceptional	Cannot Rate
Initiative						
Dependability						
Verbal Communication						
Written Communication						
Flexibility/Adaptability						
Cooperation/Collaboration						
Independence						
Emotional Stability						
Leadership						
Organization						
Professional Ethics						
Willingness to work outside personal zone of comfort (i.e., desire to broaden experiences)						
Respect for Diversity						
Responsiveness to Feedback						

In your judgment, is this individual a good candidate for practicum?		YES	NO
Recommendations:			
Candidate Name:			
Faculty Signature:		Faculty signature:	
Faculty Signature:		Faculty signature:	

Appendix C

M.S.E. Graduate Exit Survey

Please respond to the following questions with your perceptions of your experience of the UW-River Falls School M.S.E. 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 M.S.E. degree, I feel prepared with a foundation for beginning practicum
 - 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 M.S.E. 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 M.S.E. 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 M.S.E. 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 M.S.E. 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 M.S.E. 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 under supervision during practicum.

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

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

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

30) I feel prepared to begin my supervised practicum and 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) As I begin my supervised practicum, 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 D
Program Goal & Action Step Planning Sheet

Program Goal or Action Step	Based on What Assessment Data	Completed by?	To be done by what date?	Date and Plan for Re-evaluation?

Action Step Plan – Updated October 2018