

CEP 629 Internship in School Psychology	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
CEP 675 Consultation and Collaboration in School and Community Settings	X	X				X		X			
ELED 534 Developmental Reading: Pre-K to 8			X		X				X		
SPED 531 Universal Design/differentiated instruction		X	X	X	X					X	
SPED 534 Involvement of Parents and Families who have Children with Disabilities		X			X	X		X		X	

Aggregated grades per each NASP standards allows examination of acquisition of knowledge and skills according to each standard of training. A review of each course by objectives of course content helps ensure that the courses specified accurately reflect the NASP training standards.

3 and 4. Analysis and Interpretation of Data

3. Overall grades from candidates completing the program between Spring 2004 and Spring 2008 support mastery of course content across the 11 domains (cumulative average 3.85 , range 3.78-3.91). See Table A. Candidates graduating in 2008 showed knowledge competence across domains, (cumulative average 3.85, range 3.80-3.93). See Table E. Candidates graduating in 2007 showed knowledge competence across domains (cumulative average 3.8 , range 3.80-3.92). See Table F. Candidates graduating in 2006 displayed knowledge competence across domains (cumulative average 3.85, range 3.79-3.89). See Table G. Candidates graduating in 2005 displayed knowledge competence across domains (cumulative average 3.63, range 3.54-3.88). See Table H. Candidates graduating in 2004 displayed knowledge competence across domains (cumulative average 3.79, range 3.72-3.95). See Assessment Table I.

Individual course grade analysis of core School Psychology courses support content knowledge attainment at a competent to high level across graduating cohorts 2004-2008 (cumulative average 3.83 , range 3.75-3.94). See Table B.

4. Aggregated grades for graduate candidates show consistent high levels of competency in knowledge content across the 11 NASP domains as evidenced in successful completion of sequence of courses (See Table B). Data supports consistent attainment of the content knowledge across years as evidenced by the analysis of overall and domain aligned course grades per graduating cohort year.

Consistent high levels of knowledge attainment across cohorts is also seen in individual course grade analysis of the program's core School Psychology courses. It is notable that individual analysis of grades per standard highlight needs for remediation as needed. Analysis of grades by NASP domain could potentially display trends in areas of needed

attention per cohort. Also such analysis could suggest areas of need within our training model. An example of individual assessment of candidate knowledge is seen in the program response to an individual student achieving B- in two courses. A remediation plan was written for this student. It is notable that this student also failed the comprehensive exam (details of comprehensive exam as supplementary content knowledge assessment below), corroborating concerns that the knowledge and acquisition of advanced competencies was not adequate for the point in the program assessed. This provided triangulation of data supporting the effective use of grades and comprehensive exams in tracking and monitoring student progress in content knowledge acquisition.

Comprehensive Examination

1. Brief Description of Assessment

In order to earn their M.A. in Counseling, students must take and earn a passing score on a comprehensive examination. The examination is taken during or after the semester in which 30 hours of specific course work are completed in accordance with the student's plan of study. This course work includes:

- CEP 531 Human Development Across Cultures
- CEP 532 Theories and Methods of Counseling
- CEP 533 Psychology of Students with Exceptionalities
- CEP 534 Quantitative Measurement and Test Interpretation
- CEP 536 Biological Bases in Mental Health
- CEP 537 Introduction to Group Counseling
- CEP 538 Clinical Practicum I
- CEP 552 Psychological Perspectives on Teaching and Learning
- CEP 554 Research Methods in Applied Settings
- CEP 605 Practicum in School Psychology

The Comprehensive Examination is a two part case based written exam. The first part aligns with RIC's conceptual framework advanced competency-Knowledge. This section assesses a candidate's knowledge of human development, counseling theory and methods, and individual, group and system level interventions. The second part of the exam aligns with the conceptual framework advanced competencies of Practice, Professionalism and Diversity. The Comprehensive Exam is scored by two faculty members. If there is a discrepancy in scoring, a third reader is used.

2. Alignment to NASP Standards

The Comprehensive Examination aligns with NASP Standards 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7 and 2.8. Part I of the comprehensive exam addresses 2.5. After discussing the model of counseling chosen, candidates are asked to delineate the situations, setting and types of clients for which/whom this model is most and least effective (documented by research findings). This highlights the importance of consideration of individual diversity in choosing appropriate models of counseling for the situation, setting and each individual's unique characteristics and needs.

Part II of the comprehensive exam is a child or adolescent mental health case application

which addresses 2.1, 2.4, 2.7 and 2.8. In questions 1, 2 and 3 candidates are asked to conceptualize the case, explain specific goals to be developed and identify counseling techniques to be used (2.4, 2.7). In question 4, candidates are asked to discuss what would be used to document that the interventions have been effective (2.1). In question 5, candidates are asked to identify community resources to augment interventions (2.8).

3 and 4. Analysis and Interpretation

3. Aggregated data for the Comprehensive Exam over the past four years is presented in Tables J and K. It is notable that in Fall 2007, a new rubric for scoring the comprehensive exam was adopted. In the Fall of 2004, 7 candidates completed the Comprehensive exam. Of these 5 students achieved a High Pass and 2 students achieved a Pass, no students failed. The overall mean was 39.25 (out of a possible 44) with a standard deviation of 3.60. The range was 33 -40. In the Spring of 2004, 1 student completed the exam, with a score of High Pass (overall average score of 35). In Fall of 2005, 6 students completed the exam. Of these, 2 students achieved a High Pass and 4 students achieved a Pass. No students failed. The overall mean was 34.9 with a standard deviation of 1.41. The range of scores was 31-43. In Spring of 2006, 3 students took the exam. Of these 3, 1 achieved a High Pass and 2 achieved a Pass. No students failed. The mean was 33.83 with a standard deviation of 3.70. The range was 29-39. In Fall 2006, 15 students completed the exam. 3 students achieved a High Pass, 11 students achieved a Pass and 1 student failed. The mean was 32.28 with a standard deviation of 3.97. The range of scores was 23-37.5. In the Spring, 2007, 2 students completed the exam. 1 student achieved a Pass, 1 student failed. The mean was 29.2 with a standard deviation of 5.12. The range of scores was 21-35. In the Fall, 2007, 14 students completed the exam, 1 student achieved a High Pass, 12 students achieved a Pass, 1 student failed. The mean was 32.1 with a standard deviation of 3.9. The range of scores was 26-42. In the Spring, 2008, one student completed the exam and achieved a Pass (mean score 31.5).

4. With the exception of one student who failed the exam 2x and one student who failed the 1st time retook the exam and passed, all students from 2004-2008 have achieved passing scores on the Comprehensive Exam. In order to do so, they showed at minimum, overall adequate content knowledge of the areas delineated above.

Specific to the NASP standard 2.5, on Part I question 4, candidates scored an average of 2.50 out of 3 (see Table L). This suggests that students (on average) displayed at least adequate discussion of counseling models effectiveness when considering issues of individual diversity in clients and particular settings and situations.

Specific to NASP Standards 2.4 and 2.7, on Part II, questions 1,2 and 3, students displayed average to above average discussion in conceptualizing a child/adolescent mental health case and formulating appropriate goals and interventions (mean 3.54 out of 5 rating averaged over the 3 questions). Specific to Standard 2.1., on Part II question 4, students displayed average discussion of use of outcome assessment and measuring intervention efficacy (mean 3.44 out of 5 rating). Specific to Standard 2.8, on Part II, question 5, students showed adequate discussion of community resources to access in order to collaborate or augment own interventions(mean 2.26 out of 3 rating).

Section IV Assessment 2 – Content Knowledge Course Grades /Comprehensive Examination

Course Grades

5a. Assessment Tool

GPA is monitored by checking student grade reports on a semester basis. Student grade reports are provided to the Program Director by the records office. At RIC grades are computed on a 4.0 scale according to the following college standard:

A	93-100	C+	79-77
A-	92-90	C	76-73
B+	89-87	C-	72-70
B	86-83	D	69-65
B-	82-80	F	64 and below

Data is entered and aggregated by NASP standard according to course alignment.

5b. Scoring Guide

It is a program requirement that all students maintain a B average throughout the program. Grades are also used on an individual basis to monitor for any potential concerns in knowledge attainment. If a student receives lower than a B in any course, they must meet with their advisor prior to taking any additional courses. This results in a remediation plan to address noted deficits with a timeline and options if remediation is not attained.

Comprehensive Exam

5a. Assessment Tool

Form 1: Comprehensive Exam Case Study

<p style="text-align: center;">RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">FEINSTEIN SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Department of Counseling & Educational Psychology</p>
--

COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION – SPRING 2007

To successfully pass the comprehensive examination, students must pass both part I and part II of the examination.

I. PHILOSOPHY OF COUNSELING (120 minutes)

Make a comprehensive statement presenting clearly and fully the counseling model to which you most subscribe. **You are required to address all four questions.**

- | | |
|--|---|
| (1) Counseling Model | Discuss the key assumptions, major concepts, and formulations you make about human nature according to the counseling model to which you most subscribe, (include the main contributors of this model.) |
| (2) Goals (30 min.) | Identify clearly the goals of this counseling approach. |
| (3) Counseling Process (30 minutes) | Discuss the techniques associated with this counseling approach |
| (4) Applications (30 minutes) | Delineate the situations, settings and/or types of clients for which/whom this counseling model is most and least effective (document by research findings when appropriate). |

II. CASE APPLICATION (120 minutes)

Use the case study below as a vehicle to demonstrate this counseling approach. Answer the following:

- (1)** Give the specifics of how you conceptualize (i.e., explain) the case according to the counseling model you discussed in Part I.
- (2)** Discuss and explain the specific goals you would develop.
- (3)** Discuss and explain the counseling techniques you would use.
- (4)** Discuss how you would know if your interventions have been effective.
- (5)** Identify the community resources you would use to foster/augment your interventions.
- (6)** Identify potential obstacles you may encounter in your work with this client

Case Study

Paul is a fourteen-year old middle school student. This is his first year in the seventh grade. He has been a marginal student, academically and socially, for most of his school career. He has been retained twice (in first grade, and fourth grade). On those rare occasions when he chooses to do school work, his teachers report that his reading and writing skills appear to be deficient. At best, he is functioning on the fourth grade level in these areas, with somewhat higher, although inconsistent mathematics skills. Paul has never been referred for a formal, special education evaluation.

It is currently November. Since the beginning of school, Paul has been truant nine times, and generally late for school on every day that he has attended. He has frequently been referred to the office for disobedience and general disruptiveness in class. He has been suspended from school on two occasions this year, both times for initiating fights in the cafeteria. He is currently out of school, pending review by the administrators on a weapons charge (possession of a knife).

Paul is the third of four children in his family. His seventeen-year old brother is a resident in the county detention facility, awaiting trial for stealing a car. This oldest brother quit school at sixteen, and left town—whereabouts unknown. His younger sister, age eight, is struggling through her second round in second grade. Paul's parents separated during his initial year in fourth grade, after several years of stormy times. His father does not live with the family, and has been chronically unemployed for at least eight years. Paul has no contact with his father. Paul's mother is employed in a factory, and, for the past two years has worked the four-to-twelve shift. For the first of those years, Paul was responsible each evening for his sister, but now his sister spends most evenings at her maternal grandmother's house.

Paul is a loner. When school finishes each day, Paul take the bus downtown and wanders through the shopping area. He eats dinner at his grandmother's house, then spends several hours at a local video arcade, watching others play, or playing games himself with money that he has 'found' in his mother's purse or other locations in his house. He watches TV until his mother and sister come home, then goes to bed around 1:-- a.m. Paul and his mother never discuss his academic performance. Paul's mother is becoming increasingly frustrated with Paul's behavior, and increasingly angry at having to go to school to "bail him out' of discipline situations.

5b. Scoring Guide

Beginning fall 2007, a newly developed rubric was adopted to assist in valid and reliable scoring of the comprehensive exam.

Form 3: Comprehensive Exam Rubric

Comprehensive Examination Scoring Form

Comp Exam Number _____	Exam Outcome :	High Pass
Part I Score _____ Pass Fail (Pass = 11 or above)		Pass
Part II Score _____ Pass Fail (Pass = 16 or above)		Fail
Total Score _____	Students must pass both Part I and Part II. A total score of 34 or above is considered a High pass.	

At the end of each question, circle the score you give for the examinee's answer. If you rate a question less than "2", write in detail the reason for the response weakness.

Part I Philosophy of Counseling					
Counseling Model – Philosophy & Concepts					
0	1	2	3	4	5
No response	Incomplete identification and missing multiple key concepts; major inaccuracies	Inadequate identification of key concepts; conceptual inconsistencies or minor inaccuracies	Philosophy adequately identified with perspective on human development; key concepts are included; clear presentation of information	Philosophy thoroughly identified with perspective on human development; key concepts are elaborated with links to model	Well integrated identification of philosophy and perspective on human development with illustrative examples; relationship of key concepts are clearly articulated
Comments:					
Counseling Goals					
0	1	2	3	4	5
No response	Incomplete identification and missing multiple goals; major inaccuracies	Inadequate identification of goals; conceptual inconsistencies or minor inaccuracies	Goals consistent with model are adequately identified; clear presentation of information	Goals consistent with model are thoroughly identified; goals are elaborated upon with links to model	Well integrated identification of goals with illustrative examples; relationship among goals is clearly articulated
Comments:					
Counseling Techniques					
0	1	2	3	4	5
No response	Incomplete identification and missing multiple techniques; major inaccuracies	Inadequate identification of techniques; conceptual inconsistencies or minor inaccuracies	Techniques consistent with model are adequately identified; clear presentation of information	Techniques consistent with model are thoroughly identified; techniques clearly linked to model	Well integrated identification of techniques with illustrative examples; rationale for the techniques is clearly articulated
Comments:					
Applications					
0	1	2	3		
No	Minimal discussion of	Adequate discussion of settings; clients	Comprehensive discussion of		

response	application and/or major inaccuracies	& problems for which the model is most and least effective are identified; clear presentation of information	application with relevant research identified
Comments:			

Part I Score _____

Comments:

Part II – Case Application

Case Conceptualization

0	1	2	3	4	5
No response	Incomplete identification of key theoretical concepts; incomplete identification of presenting problem(s) and/or identified problems are inconsistent with theory chosen; inaccurate or no discussion of application of key concepts to explain presenting problems and development of presenting problem	Inadequate identification of theoretical key concepts; the problem(s) identified are inconsistent with the theory chosen; discussion of factors is irrelevant to theoretical model; inadequate application of key concepts to explain presenting problems and development of presenting problem	Key theoretical concepts identified; the presenting problem(s) identified are consistent with the theory chosen; adequate application of key concepts to explain presenting problems and development of presenting problems; clear presentation of information	Thorough identification of key theoretical concepts; the presenting problem(s) identified are consistent with the theory chosen; thorough application of key concepts to explain presenting problems and development of presenting problems with links to counseling model	Well integrated identification of key theoretical concepts; the presenting problem(s) identified are consistent with the theory chosen; well integrated application of key concepts to explain presenting problems and development of presenting problems, with links to counseling model and illustrative examples

Comments:

Goals

0	1	2	3	4	5
No response	Incomplete identification of goals (i.e., multiple key goals missing); major inaccuracies	Inadequate identification of goals; conceptual inconsistencies or minor inaccuracies	Goals consistent with model and client history are adequately identified; clear presentation of information	Goals consistent with model and client history are thoroughly identified; goals are elaborated upon with links to model	Well integrated identification of goals consistent with model and client history; illustrative examples provided; relationship among goals within theoretical framework is clearly articulated

Comments:

Techniques

0	1	2	3	4	5
No	Incomplete of	Inadequate	Techniques	Techniques	Well integrated

response	techniques (i.e., multiple key techniques missing); major inaccuracies	identification of techniques; conceptual inconsistencies or minor inaccuracies	consistent with model are adequately identified; clear presentation of information	consistent with model are thoroughly identified; techniques clearly linked to model	identification of techniques with illustrative examples; rationale for the techniques is clearly articulated and research, when appropriate, is cited
Comments:					
Evidence of Outcome					
0	1	2	3	4	5
No response	Incomplete discussion, i.e., missing major areas of evidence indicating intervention's effectiveness; major inaccuracies	Inadequate discussion of evidence indicating intervention's effectiveness; minor inaccuracies	Adequate discussion of evidence indicating interventions are effective; clear presentation of information	Thorough discussion of evidence indicating interventions are effective; evidence is clearly linked to model	Well integrated discussion of evidence indicating interventions are effective; includes illustrative examples and research, when appropriate, is cited
Comments:					
Community Resources					
0	1	2	3		
No response	Minimal discussion of resources and/or major inaccuracies	Adequate discussion of resources that foster or augment interventions; clear presentation of information	Comprehensive discussion of resources that foster or augment interventions		
Comments:					
Obstacles					
0	1	2	3		
No response	Minimal discussion of obstacles and/or major inaccuracies	Adequate discussion of obstacles; clear presentation of information	Comprehensive discussion of obstacles with explicit links to model and client history		
Comments:					

Part II Score _____

Comments:

PRIOR to Fall 2007

COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION SCORING FORM

Comp Exam Number _____	Exam Outcome (circle one) HIGH PASS PASS FAIL
------------------------	---

Part I Score _____ Pass Fail (Pass = 11 or above)

Part II Score _____ Pass Fail (Pass = 16 or above)

Total Score _____

At the end of each question circle the score you would give for the examinee's answer. If you rate a question less than "2", write in detail the reason for the response weakness. A score of 11 for Part I, and 16 for Part II, are the minimum passing scores. Students must pass both Part I and Part II. A total score of 34 or above is considered a High Pass.

I.	1.	Philosophy & Concepts	0	1	2	3	4	5
			No Response	Poor				Excellent
		Comments:						
	2.	Counseling Goals	0	1	2	3	4	5
			No Response	Poor				Excellent
		Comments:						
	3.	Counseling Techniques	0	1	2	3	4	5
			No Response	Poor				Excellent
		Comments:						
	4.	Applications	0	1	2	3		
			No Response	Minimal Discussion	Adequate Discussion	Comprehensive Discussion		
		Comments:						

COMMENTS:

Part I Score _____

II.	1.	Case Conceptualization	0	1	2	3	4	5
		Comments:	No Response	Poor				Excellent
	2.	Goals	0	1	2	3	4	5
		Comments:	No Response	Poor				Excellent
	3.	Techniques	0	1	2	3	4	5
		Comments:	No Response	Poor				Excellent
	4.	Evidence of Outcome	0	1	2	3	4	5
		Comments:	No Response	Poor				Excellent
	5.	Community Resources	0	1	2	3		
		Comments:	No response	Minimal Resources	Adequate Resources	Several Resource		
	6.	Obstacles	0	1	2	3		
		Comments:	No Response	Minimal Discussion	Adequate Discussion	Comprehensive Discussion		

COMMENTS:

Part II Score _____

**Section IV Assessment 2 – Content Knowledge
Course Grades /Comprehensive Examination**

Course Grades

5c. Aggregated Candidate Data

Table A: Cumulative GPA 2004-2008 Graduates

Year of program completion	N	Cumulative GPA (out of 4.0)
2008	13	3.85
2007	6	3.80
2006	7	3.85
2005	8	3.63
2004	11	3.79

Table B: Core School Psychology Course Grades per Cohort (2004-2008 Graduates)

	CEP 601	CEP 602	CEP 603	CEP 604	CEP 675	CEP 605	CEP 629
2008	3.93	3.93	3.94	3.92	3.92	3.94	4.0
2007	3.3	3.85	3.94	3.95	3.78	3.83	4.0
2006	3.91	3.81	3.91	3.91	3.85	3.77	3.77
2005	3.77	3.41	3.6	3.53	3.9	3.85	4.0
2004	3.88	3.56	3.67	3.65	3.85	4.0	3.96
MEAN	3.76	3.75	3.81	3.79	3.86	3.88	3.94

Table C: Mean grades Aligned to NASP Domains per Cohort (2004-2008 Graduates)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
2008	3.80	3.93	3.88	3.81	3.83	3.89	3.80	3.92	3.81	3.849	3.85
2007	3.76	3.75	3.75	3.77	3.82	3.89	3.78	3.91	3.90	3.85	3.89
2006	3.83	3.80	3.80	3.81	3.83	3.83	3.79	3.84	3.89	3.84	3.81
2005	3.64	3.75	3.75	3.60	3.62	3.84	3.54	3.88	3.70	3.70	3.71
2004	3.78	3.84	3.84	3.76	3.75	3.87	3.72	3.95	3.88	3.78	3.79
Mean	3.78	3.93	3.88	3.80	3.83	3.89	3.80	3.91	3.81	3.85	3.85

Table D: Grades by Course Aligned to NASP Domains (2004-2008)
 OVERALL GRADES BY COURSE ALIGNED TO NASP DOMAINS
 SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY GRADUATES 2004-2008

n=45	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
CEP 531				3.88	3.88			3.88			
CEP 532				3.79	3.79					3.79	3.79
CEP 533				3.79	3.79		3.79				
CEP 534	3.8								3.8		
CEP 536	3.66			3.66	3.66		3.66				
CEP 537	3.85			3.85	3.85		3.85				
CEP 538	3.79			3.79	3.79		3.79				
CEP 544	3.93				3.93		3.93	3.93		3.79	
CEP 551	3.64			3.64	3.64		3.64		3.64		
CEP 552	3.76		3.76	3.76	3.76		3.76				
CEP 554	3.59								3.59		
CEP 601	3.82		3.82	3.82	3.82					3.82	
CEP 602	3.7			3.7	3.7		3.7			3.7	3.7
CEP 603					3.81	3.81				3.81	3.81
CEP 604	3.84		3.84		3.84					3.84	
CEP 605	3.92	3.92	3.92	3.92	3.92	3.92	3.92	3.92	3.92	3.92	3.92
CEP 629	3.95	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94
CEP 675	3.89	3.89			3.89	3.89		3.89			
ELED 534			3.95		3.95				3.95		
SPED 531		3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94					3.94	3.94
SPED 534		3.94			3.94			3.94		3.94	
MEAN	3.78	3.93	3.88	3.80	3.83	3.89	3.80	3.91	3.81	3.85	3.85

Table E: Grades aligned to NASP Domain- 2008 Graduates

Program Completers-2008 n=13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
CEP 531				3.92	3.92			3.92			
CEP 532				3.9	3.9					3.9	3.9
CEP 533				3.82	3.82		3.82				
CEP 534	4								4		
CEP 536	3.81			3.81	3.81		3.81				
CEP 537	3.95			3.95	3.95		3.95				
CEP 538	3.93			3.93	3.93		3.93				
CEP 544	3.9				3.9		3.9	3.9		3.9	
CEP 551	3.95			3.95	3.95		3.95		3.95		
CEP 552	3.52		3.52	3.52	3.52		3.52				
CEP 554	3.92								3.92		
CEP 601	3.93		3.93	3.93	3.93					3.93	
CEP 602	3.93			3.93	3.93		3.93			3.93	3.93
CEP 603					3.92	3.92				3.92	3.92
CEP 604	3.93		3.93		3.93					3.93	
CEP 605	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94	3.94
CEP 629	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
CEP 675	3.92	3.92			3.92	3.92		3.92			
ELED 534			3.91		3.91				3.91		
SPED 531		3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9					3.9	3.9
SPED 534		3.7			3.7			3.7		3.7	
MEAN	3.80	3.93	3.88	3.81	3.83	3.89	3.80	3.92	3.81	3.849	3.85

Table F: Grades aligned by NASP Domain-2007 Graduates

Program Completers-2007 n=6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
CEP 531				4	4			4			
CEP 532				3.83	3.83					3.83	3.83
CEP 533				4	4		4				
CEP 534	3.88								3.88		
CEP 536	3.72			3.72	3.72		3.72				
CEP 537	3.78			3.78	3.78		3.78				
CEP 538	3.8			3.8	3.8		3.8				
CEP 544	3.83				3.83		3.83	3.83		3.83	
CEP 551	3.68			3.68	3.68		3.68		3.68		
CEP 552	3.3		3.3	3.3	3.3		3.3				
CEP 554	4								4		
CEP 601	3.3		3.3	3.3	3.3					3.3	
CEP 602	3.85			3.85	3.85		3.85			3.85	3.85
CEP 603					3.95	3.95				3.95	3.95
CEP 604	3.95		3.95		3.95					3.95	

CEP 605	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83
CEP 629	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
CEP 675	3.78	3.78			3.78	3.78		3.78				
ELED 534			4		4				4			
SPED 531		3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9						3.9
SPED 534		3.7	4			4			4			4
MEAN	3.76	3.75	3.75	3.77	3.82	3.89	3.78	3.91	3.90	3.85	3.89	

Table G: Grades aligned by NASP Domain-2006 Graduates

Program Completers-2006 n=7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
CEP 531				3.95	3.95			3.95			
CEP 532				3.75	3.75					3.75	3.75
CEP 533				3.83	3.83		3.83				
CEP 534	3.9								3.9		
CEP 536	3.81			3.81	3.81		3.81				
CEP 537	3.96			3.96	3.96		3.96				
CEP 538	3.81			3.81	3.81		3.81				
CEP 544	3.83				3.83		3.83	3.83		3.83	
CEP 551	3.86			3.86	3.86		3.86		3.86		
CEP 552	3.4		3.4	3.4	3.4		3.4				
CEP 554	4								4		
CEP 601	3.91		3.91	3.91	3.91					3.91	
CEP 602	3.81			3.81	3.81		3.81			3.81	3.81
CEP 603					3.91	3.91				3.91	3.91
CEP 604	3.91		3.91		3.91					3.91	
CEP 605	3.77	3.77	3.77	3.77	3.77	3.77	3.77	3.77	3.77	3.77	3.77
CEP 629	3.79	3.79	3.79	3.79	3.79	3.79	3.79	3.79	3.79	3.79	3.79
CEP 675	3.85	3.85			3.85	3.85		3.85			
ELED 534			4		4				4		
SPED 531		3.85	3.85	3.85	3.85					3.85	3.85
SPED 534											
MEAN	3.83	3.80	3.80	3.81	3.83	3.83	3.79	3.84	3.89	3.84	3.81

Table H: Grades aligned by NASP Domain-2005 Graduates

Program Completers-2005 n=8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
CEP 531				3.77	3.77			3.77			
CEP 532				3.41	3.41					3.41	3.41
CEP 533				3.15	3.15		3.15				
CEP 534	3.55								3.55		
CEP 536	3.51			3.51	3.51		3.51				
CEP 537	3.76			3.76	3.76		3.76				
CEP 538	3.68			3.68	3.68		3.68				
CEP 544											
CEP 551	3.17			3.17	3.17		3.17		3.17		

CEP 552	3.34		3.34	3.34	3.34		3.34					
CEP 554	3.9								3.9			
CEP 601	3.77		3.77	3.77	3.77					3.77		
CEP 602	3.41			3.41	3.41		3.41				3.41	3.41
CEP 603					3.6	3.6					3.6	3.6
CEP 604	3.53		3.53		3.53						3.53	
CEP 605	3.85	3.85	3.85	3.85	3.85	3.85	3.85	3.85	3.85	3.85	3.85	3.85
CEP 629	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
CEP 675	3.9	3.9			3.9	3.9			3.9			
ELED 534												
SPED 531		4	4	4	4						4	4
SPED 534												
MEAN	3.64	3.75	3.75	3.60	3.62	3.84	3.54	3.88	3.70	3.70	3.71	

Table I: Grades aligned by NASP Domain-2004 Graduates

Program Completers-2004 n=11	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
CEP 531				4	4			4			
CEP 532				3.68	3.68					3.68	3.68
CEP 533				3.57	3.57		3.57				
CEP 534	3.86								3.86		
CEP 536	3.64			3.64	3.64		3.64				
CEP 537	3.89			3.89	3.89		3.89				
CEP 538	3.6			3.6	3.6		3.6				
CEP 544											
CEP 551	3.62			3.62	3.62		3.62		3.62		
CEP 552	3.67		3.67	3.67	3.67		3.67				
CEP 554	3.96								3.96		
CEP 601	3.88		3.88	3.88	3.88					3.88	
CEP 602	3.56			3.56	3.56		3.56			3.56	3.56
CEP 603					3.67	3.67				3.67	3.67
CEP 604	3.65		3.65		3.65					3.65	
CEP 605	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
CEP 629	3.96	3.96	3.96	3.96	3.96	3.96	3.96	3.96	3.96	3.96	3.96
CEP 675	3.85	3.85			3.85	3.85		3.85			
ELED 534											
SPED 531		3.85	3.85	3.85	3.85					3.85	3.85
SPED 534											
MEAN	3.78	3.84	3.84	3.76	3.75	3.87	3.72	3.95	3.88	3.78	3.79

**Section IV Assessment 2 – Content Knowledge
Course Grades /Comprehensive Examination**

Comprehensive Exam

5c. Aggregated Candidate Data

Table J: School Psychology Program Comprehensive Exam Results

Semester	High Pass	Pass	Fail
Fall 2004 (n=7)	5	2	0
Spring 2005 (n=1)	1	0	0
Fall 2005 (n=6)	2	4	0
Spring 2006 (n=3)	1	2	0
Fall 2006 (n=15)	3	11	1
Spring 2007 (n=2)	0	1	1
Fall 2007 (n=14)	1	12	1
Spring 2008 (n=1)	0	1	0

Table K: School Psychology Program Comprehensive Exam Average Scores

Semester	Part I (out of possible 18 points)	Part II (out of possible 26 points)	Total Score (out of possible 44)
Fall 2004 (n=7)	16.25	23	39.25
Spring 2005 (n=1)	15.50	19.5	35
Fall 2005 (n=6)	15.84	19.88	34.92
Spring 2006 (n=3)	14.7	19.17	33.80
Fall 2006 (n=15)	14.48	18	32.28
Spring 2007	13.8	15.4	29.2
Fall 2007 (n=14)	13.71	18.32	31.12
Spring 2008 (n=1)	15	16.5	31.5

Table L: Comprehensive Exam Questions Delineated by NASP standards

Semester	Part I #4 (NASP 2.5)	Part II #1,2,3 (NASP 2.4, 2.7)	Part II #4 (NASP 2.1)	Part II #5 (NASP 2.8)
Fall 2004 (n=7)	Ratings out of 3 3	Ratings out of 5 4.3	Ratings out of 5 4.3	Ratings out of 3 2.5
Spring 2005 (n=1)	3	4.16	3.5	3
Fall 2005 (n=6)	2.5	3.8	3.3	2.2
Spring 2006 (n=3)	3	4.0	3.3	2.2
Fall 2006 (n=15)	2	3.2	3.6	1.4
Spring 2007 (n=2)	2	2.8	3.4	1.8
Fall 2007 (n=14)	2	3.28	3.125	2.44
Spring 2008 (n=1)	2.5	2.8	3.0	2.5
	2.50	3.54	3.44	2.26