

**NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS
SUMMARY REPORT ON PROGRAM REVIEW DECISION**

- Initial Review
 Conditional Rejoinder
 Rejoinder
 Other

Date of Review: Fall 2005
Institution: University of Kentucky
City: Lexington
State: Kentucky

Program(s) Covered by this Review:	Program Type:	Award or Degree Level(s):
School Psychology	Other Educational Personnel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Specialist <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral

SECTION I.

SPA Decision on Program(s):

NASP Approved/NCATE Nationally recognized (if unit is NCATE accredited)

Dates and terms of approval/recognition

- Fully approved by NASP and, if in a unit accredited by NCATE, nationally recognized by NCATE for the period January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2009. To retain approval/national recognition beyond the expiration date, the institution/program must submit another report. In units undergoing review by NCATE, such program reports are typically required at least two semesters prior to the accreditation review.

The program will be listed as "NASP Approved" and, if in a unit accredited by NCATE, "Nationally Recognized" for the period specified above in various NASP and NCATE web sites and publications. The program may also be designated as such in institutional and/or program publications. During this period, graduates of the program will also be automatically eligible for national certification pending documentation of a passing score on the Praxis II examination in school psychology and documentation of an internship consistent with NASP standards.

Program meets or exceeds 80% pass rate on state licensure exams: Yes

Standards Met:

1.1; 1.3 through 1.7; 2.2, 2.9, 3.1 through 3.5; 4.2

Standards Not Met:

1.2; 2.1; 2.3; 2.4; 2.5; 2.6; 2.7; 2.8; 2.10; 2.11; 4.1; 4.3

Summary of Strengths:

The mission statement is well articulated, comprehensive and consistent with NASP/NCATE guidelines. Various formative and summative assessments utilized by the program are comprehensive and well structured. The rubric developed to evaluate student portfolios is particularly well done. It appears that the students in this program are well trained in the basics of school psychology practice.

Summary of Areas for Improvement:

It is suggested that the program strengthen the following areas:

- Clearly indicate how the process of data-based decision-making is integrated across course work, practica, and internship.
 - Indicate specifically how the program uses program evaluation data to strengthen and make modification to the training curriculum.
-

**SECTION II
REPORT OF FINDINGS FOR EACH STANDARD**

Evaluation of Standards:	A	= Standard is Adequately Addressed
	NA	= Standard is Not Adequately Addressed. Consistency of Evidence Cannot be Determined
	NON	= Evidence Indicates Noncompliance with the Standard
	A*	= Standard Judged to be Adequately Addressed in Previous Review

I. PROGRAM CONTEXT/STRUCTURE

Standard	Evaluation/Comments
-----------------	----------------------------

1.1	A
-----	---

1.2	NA
-----	----

While principles and values related to diversity are in evidence throughout the curriculum, it is not clear how the program addresses diversity in the areas of recruitment and admissions as required by this standard. Additionally, the program does not provide information regarding demographic characteristics of graduates for the past two years.

1.3	A
-----	---

1.4	A
-----	---

1.5	A
-----	---

While the program acknowledges that offering formal opportunities to obtain CPD credits to practicing school psychologists has been limited over the past few years, the many informal colloquia that have been offered indicate that this standard has been met.

REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIALIST-LEVEL PROGRAMS ONLY (1.6-1.7)

1.6	A
-----	---

Inconsistent data exist in the program folio for this domain. The program folio indicates that the program requires 69 semester hours for completion. However, four of the six transcripts provided indicated only 66 semester hours for program completion. Technically, the program meets the requirements for this domain, but the data are inconsistent with program requirements.

1.7	A
-----	---

REQUIREMENTS FOR DOCTORAL PROGRAMS ONLY (1.8-1.10)

- 1.8
- 1.9
- 1.10

II. DOMAINS OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY TRAINING AND PRACTICE

NOTE: For most domains, the folio states, “within individual courses, exams and written assignments provide assessment opportunities.” Inclusion of grading rubrics for presentations, case studies, reports, etc. would provide a clearer indication of what knowledge and skills are expected and how those skills are assessed. For attainment, the program uses the Praxis exam for the purpose of program evaluation and frequently makes reference to area scores as evidence of attainment. However, these scores are not in the folio. To the extent that this material is referenced but not provided, it is difficult to use these scores as evidence of attainment. For this reason, a number of domains are rated as NA below.

Standard Evaluation/Comments

2.1 NA
 Data-based decision-making appears limited to the area of psychoeducational evaluation. It is not clear where students are taught to use data to evaluate the outcomes of interventions or counseling, based on syllabi. While Practicum Evaluation forms provide a means to determine if students are able to use data-based decision-making, the Intern Evaluation does not. It is suggested that the Intern Evaluation Form include items more specifically related to this domain.

2.2 A

2.3 NA
 The domain is adequately addressed. Evidence of attainment is lacking. Such evidence should include aggregated results on a state or national licensing examination (e.g., the Praxis II examination in school psychology), field supervisor evaluations of interns, and/or a comprehensive, performance-based measure evaluated by program.

2.4 NA

2.5 NA
 No syllabi for any of the multicultural courses were included in the folio. Thus, there is insufficient evidence that this domain is adequately addressed.

2.6 NA

2.7 NA

The domain is adequately addressed. Evidence of assessment and attainment is lacking. Such evidence should include aggregated results on a state or national licensing examination (e.g., the Praxis II examination in school psychology), field supervisor evaluations of interns, and/or a comprehensive, performance-based measure evaluated by program.

2.8 NA

Two syllabi provided as documentation that this domain is addressed are not included in the folio (EDC 550/665). Evidence of attainment is lacking. Such evidence should include aggregated results on a state or national licensing examination (e.g., the Praxis II examination in school psychology), field supervisor evaluations of interns, and/or a comprehensive, performance-based measure evaluated by program.

2.9 A

2.10 NA

2.11 NA

The program does not include assessment of this area in course work, practicum, or internship evaluation tools. Evidence of assessment and attainment is lacking.

III. FIELD EXPERIENCES/INTERNSHIP

Standard	Evaluation/Comments
-----------------	----------------------------

3.1	A
-----	---

3.2	A
-----	---

3.3	A
-----	---

3.4	A
-----	---

3.5	A
-----	---

IV. PERFORMANCE-BASED PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Standard	Evaluation/Comments
-----------------	----------------------------

4.1	NA
-----	----

It is clear that the program collects a significant amount of program evaluation data but is it unclear as to how the program uses that data to strengthen the program. Grading criteria for components of the Portfolio is not included; thus it is difficult to determine how this information is used to assess candidate competencies.

4.2 A

4.3 NA

The Masters Comprehensive examination is described as the primary evidence that students integrate all domains of knowledge make a positive impact upon clients they serve. However, the examination and corresponding scoring criteria are not provided. Additionally, there is no evidence of measurable, positive candidate impact on clients.