

Section IV Assessment 3 - Professional Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

1. Brief Description of Assessment

Training Portfolio

Beginning in **Fall 2006**, all practicum students were required to complete 10 competency based artifacts completed over the course of a year long 400 hour practicum experience. The artifacts are aligned with NASP domains. Each individual artifact was evaluated by the practicum instructor according to rubrics (see 5b Scoring guide: Forms 2-10). Beginning in **Fall 2007**, the comprehensive assessment of these artifacts was adjusted to allow aggregated rating of overall competencies as well as individual skill assessment per artifact category (please see Assessment3 guide1, Form 1). This overall assessment of the 10 artifacts replaced the previous training e-portfolio evaluation.

Prior to 2006, the training e-portfolio was completed including:

- Organizing matrix (detailing links between school psychology competency area, program artifact chosen, NASP standard met, NASP PWC met and FSEHD conceptual framework standard met
- 5 graded artifacts referenced in self evaluation (these correspond to the 5 program areas of school psychology competency: Diagnosis & Fact-finding, Prevention & Intervention, Applied Psychological Foundations, Applied Educational Foundations, and Ethical & Legal Issues). These artifacts were chosen by the graduate student from body of work from their first 2 years of training.

Please see NASP Full submission Fall 2007 for more full description and data from 2005-2007.

Practicum Field Supervisor Evaluation

In addition, practicum students are evaluated by their practicum field supervisor (please see Assessment3 guide2 Form 2) The field supervisor evaluation form includes 25 items directly linked to NASP standards. This gives another source of data to help the practicum instructor assess how well the candidate achieved competency in each area.

Together the overall artifact assessment and field supervisor evaluations are used to determine competency to advance to internship and areas of strength and need in individual training plans.

2. Alignment with NASP Domains:

E-Training portfolio:

Program artifact	NASP Standard Met
Individual case	2.4, 2.5
School based group	2.4, 2.5
FBA	2.2, 2.5
Crisis intervention policy and procedures	2.7
School system analysis	2.6, 2.10
Research and program evaluation	2.9
E-resource webpage	2.11
Home school collaboration	2.8, 2.5
RTI/Academic Intervention Design	2.1, 2.3, 2.5
Assessment linked to intervention	2.1, 2.5

Field supervisor evaluation form:

NASP Standard	Corresponding evaluation items
2.1	1-4
2.2	5-6
2.3	7-8
2.4	9-10
2.5	11-12
2.6	13-14
2.7	15-16
2.8	17-19
2.9	20-21
2.10	22-24
2.11	25

3 and 4. Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Aggregated Training Portfolio Scores 2006-2008

Individual Rubric Results: The mean rubric score across all domains was 9.06 out of 10, indicating overall competence at pre-internship level across domains. The 2006-2008 practicum student scores showed above average competencies in systems level analysis (mean of 9.36, with range of 7.3 to 10.0), crisis and prevention plan analysis (mean of 9.09, range of 5-10), group counseling intervention (mean of 9.18, with range of 6.25-10), completing RTI or academic intervention case (mean of 9.08 with range of 7.8-10) and in constructing electronic resource site (mean of 10 with range of 7.08-10). The

practicum student scores supported competence at a satisfactory level for a pre-internship, future school psychologist with appropriate supervision in individual counseling activities (mean of 8.96, with range of 6.25-10), home-school collaboration (mean of 8.62 with range of 5.4-10), developing a research project (mean of 8.53, with range of 5.4-10), completing a functional behavioral analysis (mean of 8.82 with range of 6-10) and assessment to intervention cases (mean of 8.95 with range of 6.3-10). While overall practicum level candidates are performing at average to above average competence levels across task domains, individual scores vary from currently developing to above average.

Global Artifact Ratings

In terms of overall ratings, 18 candidates achieved a high pass. 10 practicum level candidates received a pass. No candidates were required to revise/resubmit prior to being recommended for internship placement. It is notable that the 2007-2008 cohort had considerably fewer students achieving a high pass on their E-training portfolio (85% of 2006-07 cohort compared with 46% of the 2007-2008 cohort). It is hypothesized that this is due in part to selection bias as for the 2006-2007 training portfolio scoring, candidates selected the best 5 out of the 10 artifacts they completed for their portfolio, while the revised 2007-2008 training portfolio scoring included all 10 completed artifacts

2007-08 Training Portfolio Scores

Domain Ratings: The mean score across all domains was 8.88 (out of 10) with a range of 8.00-10.00, suggesting the practicum candidates demonstrated average levels of competency across the 11 domains for pre-internship level of training. Training portfolio aggregated scores by NASP domain are reported in Table F

The highest rated domain score of 10.00 was for domain 2.11 Information technology, suggested an exceptional level of competency in using information sources and technology to enhance school psychology service delivery. The lowest rated domain score of 8.00 was for domain 2.8 Home/school/community collaboration indicating that the practicum student candidates would benefit from increased opportunities to engage families and others in the community in education and service delivery.

2006-07 Training Portfolio Scores

Domain Ratings: The mean score across all domains was 9.27 (out of 10) with a range of 8.67-9.92, suggesting the practicum candidates demonstrated above average levels of competency across the 11 domains for pre-internship level of training. Training portfolio aggregated scores by NASP domain are reported in Table G. The highest rated domain score of 9.92 (out of 10) was received for both domain 2.6 (School and systems organization, policy development and climate) and 2.10 (School psychology practice and development). These findings indicate that the practicum student candidates were highly successful in understanding schools as systems and investigating policies and practices to enhance learning environments as well as having knowledge of various service models and professional, legal and ethical standards. The lowest mean rating of 8.67 (out of 10) was received for domain 2.2 (Consultation and collaboration) indicating that the practicum student candidates will benefit from additional experience and training related to collaborative planning and decision making within the schools and using various

models of consultation. It is notable that average performance across domains suggest average to above average levels of competence and skill demonstration.

Aggregated Field Supervisor Ratings of Practicum Student Candidates (2005-2008)

Field supervisor ratings across NASP domains for the past three years revealed a mean rating of 3.62 with a range of 3.14 to 3.85). This finding suggests that the practicum student candidates demonstrated satisfactory to above average competencies across all 11 domains. The highest mean rating (3.78 out of 4) was on Domain 2.2 Consultation and collaboration indicating that field supervisors viewed the practicum students at highly competent in working and planning collaboratively with others in the school setting. The lowest mean rating was on Domain 2.6 School and systems organization, policy development and climate (mean of 3.28 out of 4) indicating that the field supervisor's viewed practicum student candidates as perhaps benefitting from additional exposure to knowledge of general education, special education and ways schools function as a system.

2007-2008 Field Supervisor Ratings of Practicum Student Candidates

Field supervisor ratings across NASP domains revealed a mean rating of 3.46 with a range of 3.14 to 3.65. This finding suggests that the practicum student candidates demonstrated satisfactory to above average competencies across all 11 domains. Aggregated field supervisor ratings of the 2007-08 practicum students are listed in Table H. Domain 2.11 (Information Technology) received the highest rating (3.65) indicating that all practicum students effectively use information sources and technology in their professional practice. The lowest mean rating of 3.14 were obtained on Domain 9 (Research and program evaluation). It is hypothesized that this is in part to the continued challenge of bridging the research-practice gap to allow our students opportunities for quality field based research in the schools. All but one individual student average was above 3.0 supporting competency at satisfactory to above average for a pre-internship student. One student received an average rating of 2.5 suggesting overall level of competence is below average with the need for more supervision and practice to attain desired skill level. It is notable that the practicum supervisor recommended this student for internship placement with strong support and supervision. .

2006-07 Field Supervisor Ratings of Practicum Student Candidates

The mean rating across all domains was 3.81 (out of 4) with a range of 3.36-4.0. This finding suggests that the practicum student candidates demonstrated satisfactory to above average competencies across all 11 domains. Aggregated field supervisor ratings of the 2006-07 practicum students are listed in Table I. The highest mean rating was on Domain 2.2 Consultation and collaboration (mean of 3.92) indicating that field supervisors viewed the practicum students at highly competent in working and planning collaboratively with others in the school setting. The lowest mean rating was on Domain 2.3 Effective instruction and development of cognitive/academic skills (mean of 3.39) indicating that the field supervisors viewed the practicum students as potentially benefitting from more experience planning and using interventions to develop academic and cognitive skills.

2005-2006 Field Supervisor Ratings of Practicum Student Candidates

The mean rating across all domains was 3.59 (out of 4) with a range of 3.17-3.83. This finding suggests that the practicum student candidates demonstrated satisfactory to above average competencies across all 11 domains. Aggregated field supervisor ratings of the 2005-06 practicum students are listed in Table J. The highest mean rating was on Domains 2.4 Socialization and development of life skills, 2.7 Prevention, crisis intervention and mental health and 2.9 Research and program development (mean 3.83) indicating a high level of perceived competence in counseling interventions, mental health and using and disseminating research. The lowest mean rating was on Domain 2.6 School and systems organization, policy development and climate (mean 3.17) indicating that the field supervisor's viewed practicum student candidates as perhaps benefiting from additional exposure to knowledge of general education, special education and ways schools function as a system.

Overall analysis of practicum student candidates

Together the training portfolio scores of artifacts across domains and field supervisor ratings give multi source data on individual performance. It is notable that at times the data is divergent. These cases are reviewed by full school psychology faculty and field supervisor to determine appropriate course of action/remediation and recommendation to advance to internship.

Section IV Assessment 3 - Professional Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

5a. Assessment Tool

The practicum artifacts completed by each candidate over a two semester course (CEP 605 School Psychology Practicum) include:

- Individual case (NASP 2.4, 2.5)
- School based group (NASP 2.4, 2.5)
- Functional behavioral assessment (NASP 2.2, 2.5)
- Crisis intervention policy and procedure analysis (NASP 2.7)
- School system and organizational analysis (NASP 2.6, 2.10)
- Research or program evaluation project (NASP 2.9)
- E-resource webpage (NASP 2.11)
- Home-school collaboration (NASP 2.8, 2.5)
- RTI/academic intervention design case (NASP 2.1, 2.3, 2.5)
- Assessment linked to intervention (NASP 2.1, 2.5)

Descriptions of each artifact follow with individual rubrics to assess competency attached.

One Individual Case Artifact: Cases for this course will be based on referrals from the school psychologist in your local school systems with program instructor approval. You may work with several clients. However, you only need to audiotape and complete this artifact for one of those cases. You will be experiencing the counseling process from the initial referral, assessment of needs and implementation of the intervention to follow-up on intervention efficacy. There is a minimum requirement of 5 meetings with your case. Your portfolio artifact should consist of the following:

1. Consent form from parents and an assent from the participating child. Consent and Assent forms must include explicit permission to audiotape.
2. A comprehensive record review
3. Classroom observation
4. Overall description of individual including an analysis of how diversity issues affect the clinical process.
5. Documentation and analysis of ethical or legal issues raised by the intervention.
6. Five audiotape sessions with accompanied documentation for each tape (will include but not be limited to process notes, self-evaluation, analysis of ecological systems and treatment plan).
7. Intervention efficacy outcome measure.

One School-based Group Intervention Artifact: You may work in partnership for this intervention. The nature of your intervention and its target curriculum will be determined by your initial needs assessment.

1. Needs assessment-data from teacher interview and classroom observation
2. Pre-assessment-formal assessment of students' current functioning on target curriculum.

3. Overall description of group members including an analysis of how diversity issues with the group affect group processes.
4. Overall explanation of curriculum and list of individual target sessions with rationale based on the results of the pre-assessment.
5. Documentation and analysis of ethical or legal issues raised by the intervention.
6. Document at least five intervention sessions. Content will include but not be limited to: explanation of session, session goals, session activities that target stated goals, self-evaluation and goal evaluation.
7. Post-assessment to measure intervention efficacy.

Functional Behavioral Assessment Artifact: This artifact offers the opportunity to collaborate in designing and implementing a behavioral plan for a student whose background differs from your own. . The portfolio artifact will include but need not be limited to the following:

1. Documented referral
2. Documented discussion with teacher and parent/caregiver
3. Documented class observation with either an event recording or time sampling of the target behavior.
4. Functional behavioral assessment
5. Planned intervention
6. Evaluation of intervention efficacy.
7. Documentation and analysis of ethical or legal issues raised by the intervention.

Crisis Intervention Policy and Procedure Artifact

This artifact asks you to obtain and analyze your school system's policies and procedures for crisis intervention and response (to include suicide assessment, child abuse and mandate reporting procedure, threat statements, terrorist attacks, violence, etc.) Include a written critique regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the policy as you see them and in relation to nationally recognized standards. Special emphasis should be given to the role of the school psychologist in crisis response in the schools.

School System Analysis Artifact

This artifact allows you to get to know your district in depth! You will conduct an examination of the school's "systems". Provide information about the demographics about your site. Interview the appropriate persons (such as supervising school psychologist or his/her designees, administrators etc.) for information about organizational chart, personnel, management models, goals and objectives of the school system, and specific ways school psychological services are administered, implemented, and evaluated within the particular school system.

Research and Program Evaluation Artifact

Identify an action research or program evaluation question of interest. Document related research base. Describe your study or evaluation plan. Write letter of consent semester: Document how you would collect and analyze the data. Discuss application to the field of school psychology. ***Alternatively you can complete this artifact in conjunction with an actual research project proposed or ongoing. ***

E-resource list and class facilitator opportunity

At the beginning of the semester, you will sign up for a topic. You will be responsible for compiling a list of resources relevant to the topic to be shared via our Wetpaint class website. You will also be responsible for leading a class based discussion on your topic

focusing on its relevance for school practice. Please provide a 1-2 pg handout with the following sections:

I: Prevalence and population facts

II: Role of school psychologist in addressing/managing issue

III: Brief review of related legal/ethical issues involved (anything particular to Rhode Island of note?)

Home-School Collaboration Artifact

1. Provide reason for referral and background information pertinent to case conceptualization
2. Describe problem solving approach chosen
3. Document research supporting your choice of intervention
4. Describe process of home-school collaboration
5. Document outcome
6. Reflect on overall experience. Include discussion of how your approach works within school district (i.e. is it similar to approach usually used? Was it easy to implement? Was it viewed positively by others in the system?)

RTI/Academic Intervention Design Artifact

1. Identify problem (include what observations led you to believe it was a problem and what factors support that this problem is amenable to intervention)
2. Document data collection and analysis of problem
3. Identify at least 3 evidence based interventions that might be effective in addressing this problem
4. Select an intervention and document rationale for selection
5. Set timeline for intervention
6. Describe plan to assess efficacy of intervention, include
7. Document intervention implementation
8. Clearly report outcome (using both graphs and narrative)
9. Reflect on overall experience. Include analysis of use of evidence based interventions in your setting (i.e. strengths and challenges of approach)

Assessments linked to Interventions Artifact

- 2 comprehensive assessments will be completed including:
 - interviews of child, caregiver and teacher
 - observations
 - informal assessment
 - formal assessment measures
 - evidence based recommendations
 - written and oral feedback to parties involved (including child, caregiver, teacher)

At least one assessment must be an initial evaluation!

Section IV Assessment 3 - Professional Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

5b. Scoring Guide

A school psychology faculty member grades each artifact individually according to skill based competency in specified areas (for individual rubrics, please see CEP 605 syllabus in Attachment E, pp.) The artifacts are aligned with NASP standards to help assess areas of strength and need in each individual as they prepare for ongoing training and supervision in internship. The students receive a final evaluation based on each skill area and NASP standard (rated from 0-10). Students also receive an overall score based on compilation of their individual artifacts rated from high pass to revise/resubmit prior to recommendation to internship (see Table 1)

Form 1: Practicum portfolio scoring guide 2007-2008:

Program artifact	NASP Standard Met	Score
Individual case	2.4, 2.5	
School based group	2.4, 2.5	
FBA	2.2, 2.5	
Crisis intervention policy and procedures	2.7	
School system analysis	2.6, 2.10	
Research and program evaluation	2.9	
E-resource webpage	2.11	
Home school collaboration	2.8, 2.5	
RTI/Academic Intervention Design	2.1, 2.3, 2.5	
Assessment linked to intervention	2.1, 2.5	

Portfolio evidence suggests:

___0-4.9___ Competence for practice is considered in need of further formal training. Students seems to lack overall basic professional maturity. Further skill development through academics is needed in this domain. Do not recommend to internship at this time.

___5.0-6.9___ Competence for practice is currently developing, but additional close supervision and experience needed in this domain.

___7.0-8.9___ Competence is at a satisfactory level for a preinternship, future school psychologist with appropriate supervision.

___9.0-10___ Competence is above average and shows exceptional skill development for preinternship training.

OVERALL TRAINING PORTFOLIO:

High pass _____ (90 or above)

Pass _____ (70 or above)

Revise/resubmit after the following conditions met. (below 70)

Form 2: Individual case artifact rubric

Individual Case Artifact Rubric

CATEGORY	1	2	3	4	
Consent	No consent documented/inadequately documented	n/a	n/a	Consent clearly documented (including caregiver, client and audio-tape)	X
Background information	Vague, incomplete information	Identified minimal background needed through record review, classroom observation, interview	Well documented background info from appropriate variety of sources (records, observation, interview)	Detailed, integrated description of background from variety of sources	X
Case conceptualization	No discussion provided	Incomplete case conceptualization	Clear case conceptualization including legal issues and impact of diversity	Detailed, integrated case conceptualization including legal/ethical issues and impact of diversity	X
Outcome measure	No outcome measure used	Limited use and documentation of outcome measure to assess efficacy of intervention	Appropriate use and documentation of outcome measures to assess efficacy of intervention	Excellent use and documentation of outcome measures to assess efficacy of intervention	X
Taped session	5 sessions not completed and documented	5 sessions completed, limited written analysis	5 sessions completed w/ clear case notes, theoretical orientation/strategies and self evaluation	Detailed and integrated case documentation and self evaluation of at least 5 sessions	X
Reflection	No reflection on experience	Limited self reflection	Adequate self reflection	Insightful, reflection on counseling experience	X

Form 3: School based group artifact rubric

Group artifact

CATEGORY	1	2	3	4	
Consent	No consent documented/inadequately documented	n/a	n/a	Consent clearly documented (including caregiver and client assent)	X
Needs assessment	Vague, incomplete information	Identified minimal background needed to establish need/appropriateness for group	Appropriately documented needs for group members from variety of sources	Detailed, integrated documentation of needs of group members from variety of sources	X
Group member description	No discussion provided	Incomplete information provided	Adequate description justifying group makeup	Detailed and comprehensive description justifying group make up	X
Outcome measure	No outcome measure used	Limited use and documentation of outcome measure to assess efficacy of intervention	Appropriate use and documentation of outcome measures to assess efficacy of intervention	Excellent use and documentation of outcome measures to assess efficacy of intervention	X
Curriculum used	No description of curriculum used or group session content	Limited description of curriculum or group session content	Adequate description of curriculum/overall session content (including rational, theoretical or evidence base for choice and activities used)	Detailed, integrated discussion of curriculum or overall group session content	X
Description of sessions	5 sessions not completed and documented	5 sessions completed, limited written analysis	5 sessions completed w/ clear explanation of session, session goals, session activities that target stated goals and self evaluation	Detailed documentation of (at least) 5 sessions explanation of session, session goals, session activities that target stated goals and self evaluation	X
Reflection	No reflection on experience	Limited self reflection	Adequate self reflection	Insightful, reflection on group counseling experience	X

Form 4: FBA Artifact Rubric

Behavioral consultation artifact

CATEGORY	1	2	3	4	
Referral	No documentation of referral	Incomplete documentation provided	Adequate documentation provided	Clear, articulate and integrated documentation of referral	X1
Observation	Vague, incomplete information	Minimal description and documentation of observation/s and method used	Adequate description and documentation of observation/s and method used	Detailed, integrated documentation of observation/s and method used	X 2
Other information obtained	No information provided	Incomplete information provided	Adequate additional information sought and provided	Detailed and comprehensive supporting information sought and provided	X 2
FBA	No or inadequate FBA described	Incomplete FBA	Appropriate and complete FBA	Clear, comprehensive FBA	X 5
Behavior plan	No behavior plan offered or implemented	Limited description of behavior plan	Adequate behavior plan conceptualized and implemented consistent with FBA findings	Comprehensive beh. plan conceptualized and implemented consistent with FBA findings	X 4
Outcome measure	No outcome measure used	Limited use and documentation of outcome measure to assess efficacy of beh plan	Adequate use and documentation of outcome measure to assess efficacy of beh. plan	Excellent use and documentation of outcome measures to assess efficacy of beh plan	X 4

Reflection	No reflection on experience	Limited self reflection	Adequate self reflection including any legal/ethical issues, organizational issues, self evaluation etc.	Insightful, reflection on overall experience
-------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------	--	--

X 2

Date Created: **Oct 19, 2007 09:43 am (CDT)**

Form 5: Crisis Intervention Artifact Rubric

CATEGORY	1	2	3	4		COMMENT
Description of crisis intervention policy	Vague, incomplete description	Adequate description provided	Comprehensive description provided	Detailed description with illustrating examples provided	X 4	
Procedures used	Vague, incomplete information	Some procedures included	Comprehensive covering of procedures used provided (includes suicide assessment, threat statements, terrorist attacks, etc)	Detailed, integrated description of procedures used provided	X 6	
Role of school psychologist	Vague, incomplete information	Role in crisis intervention identified	Comprehensive description of role provided	Detailed, integrated description of role provided	X 6	
Analysis of crisis policy and procedures	No analysis provided	Minimal analysis provided	Comprehensive analysis of strengths and weaknesses	Detailed and integrated analysis of strengths and weaknesses	X 5	
Overall presentation	Unclear presentation with spelling, grammar and syntax errors throughout	Minor flaws in organization and presentation of information	Clear presentation with few errors	Presentation is error free and enhances understanding of content	X 4	

Form 6: School System Analysis Rubric:

School System Analysis Rubric

CATEGORY	1	2	3	4	
Description of school system	Vague, incomplete description	Description of school provided	Comprehensive description of school provided	Detailed description of school with illustrating examples provided	X 4
Organization of school system	Vague, incomplete information	Organization of school identified	Comprehensive description of school organization provided	Detailed, integrated description of school organization provided	X 4
School psychological services	Vague, incomplete information	Psychological services and delivery system identified	Comprehensive description of psychological services and system delivery provided	Detailed, integrated description of psychological services and system delivery provided	X 4
Related service delivery systems	Vague, incomplete information	Related services identified	Comprehensive description of related services	Detailed, integrated description of related services	X 4
Analysis of system	No analysis provided	Minimal analysis provided	Comprehensive analysis of school system	Detailed and integrated analysis of school system	X 5
Overall presentation	Unclear presentation with spelling, grammar and syntax errors throughout	Minor flaws in organization and presentation of information	Clear presentation with few errors	Presentation is error free and enhances understanding of content	X 4

Date Created: Oct 19, 2007 09:43 am (CDT)

Form 7: Research and Evaluation Rubric

	4	3	2	1	
1. Reflection	Insightful, well articulated self reflection including personal experience and how project relates to core educational values.	Clear reflection indicating personal experience and relevance to your project.	Brief reflection lacking EITHER personal experience or relevance to project.	Missing reflective piece.	X2
2. Lit review	Clear, well organized and comprehensive synthesis of relevant literature.	Comprehensive review of literature.	Limited review of relevant literature.	Missing or misdirected review of literature.	X6
3. Research question defined	Clearly articulated research questions aligned with purpose of study, intervention used and outcomes anticipated.	Research questions identified.	Unclear research questions.	Missing research questions.	X3
4. Project description	Detailed and comprehensive description of setting, participants, collaborators, and intervention used.	Clear description of setting, participants, collaborators, and intervention used	Incomplete description of setting, participants, collaborators , and intervention used (missing more than 1 element)	Incomplete description of setting, participants, collaborators, and intervention used (missing more than 2 elements)	X6
5. Data collection	Description of plan for data collection includes	Clear description of data collection plan with	Limited data collection methods discussed.	Significantly flawed or missing data collection	

plan, including discussion of validity	multiple data collection methods and methods to improve validity of data sources.	some indication of validity checks.		plan.	X5
6. Results and application to field of school psychology	Comprehensive discussion of hypothesized results aligned with data collection sources and research questions. Direct application to the field of school psychology.	Clear discussion of hypothesized results and how it relates to the field of school psychology.	Limited discussion of results or limited application to field.	Missing either results or application sections.	X3

Form 8: Home School Collaboration

	4	3	2	1	
1. Area of need identified (referral concern, target behavior or issue identified)	Complete and integrated background information including why this area chosen for intervention	Complete background information demonstrating need for intervention in this area	Some background information missing to substantiate choice of intervention area	No background information provided	X3
2. Description of problem solving model and related research base	Comprehensive description of problem solving model grounded in evidence base of related topic	Description of problem solving model and evidence base	Beginning description of problem solving model and evidence base of topic	Missing description of problem solving model or evidence base	X7
3. Description of process	Detailed and clear documentation of process	Complete documentation of process	Some details of process	Vague description	

			missing	of process X7
4. Documented outcome	Efficacy of intervention data clearly shown by multiple methods	Outcome measure clearly measures efficacy of intervention	Outcome data incomplete or inadequate to assess efficacy of intervention	No outcome data reported X5
5. Reflection	Insightful reflection on overall experience highlighting role of home-school collaboration within larger school system service delivery	Adequate self reflection of overall experience and fit within overall system	Developing self reflection on experience and fit with overall system	Inadequate or missing self reflection X2

Form 9 RTI/Academic Intervention Rubric

CATEGORY	1	2	3	4	
Identify Problem	No documentation of problem	Incomplete documentation provided of problem	Adequate documentation provided of problem	Clear, articulate and integrated documentation of problem	X3
Data Collection and analysis of problem	Vague, incomplete information	Minimal description and documentation of data collection and analysis	Adequate description and documentation of data collection and analysis	Detailed, integrated documentation of data collection and analysis	
Interventions	No interventions were considered	Only one intervention was considered	Two interventions were considered	Three interventions were considered	X 4
					X 3

Intervention plan	None of the following: Intervention selected is evidence-based, intervention is well described, and integrity implementation documentation.	One of the following: Intervention selected is evidence-based, intervention is well described, and integrity implementation documentation.	Two of the following: Intervention selected is evidence-based, intervention is well described, and integrity implementation documentation.	All three of the following: Intervention selected is evidence-based, intervention is well described, and integrity implementation documentation.	X 7
Outcome measure	No outcome measure used	One of the following methods for measuring outcomes was used: GAS, BIRS, Effect Size (Table/Graph)	Two of the following methods for measuring outcomes were used: GAS, BIRS, Effect Size (Table/Graph)	Three of the following methods for measuring outcomes were used: GAS, BIRS, Effect Size (Table/Graph)	
Reflection	No reflection on experience	Limited self reflection	Adequate self reflection including any legal/ethical issues, organizational issues, self evaluation etc.	Insightful, reflection on overall experience	X 3

Form 10: Assessment linked to intervention

	1	2	3	4	W
Interviews	No interviews discussed in report	1 of the following individuals was interviewed: teacher, parent, child	2 of the following individuals were interviewed: teacher, parent, child	3 of the following individuals were interviewed: teacher, parent, child	X3
Informal Assessment Procedures	No informal assessments were indicated in the report	1 of the following: -Data collected were appropriately presented -Results were integrated into conceptualization -Assessment was appropriate for referral concern	2 of the following: -Data collected were appropriately presented -Results were integrated into conceptualization -Assessment was appropriate for referral concern	3 of the following: -Data collected were appropriately presented -Results were integrated into conceptualization -Assessment was appropriate for referral concern	X5
Observations	No observations were indicated in the report	1 of the following: - Data collected were appropriately presented -Results were integrated into	2 of the following: - Data collected were appropriately presented -Results were integrated into	3 of the following: - Data collected were appropriately presented -Results were integrated into	X3

		conceptualization -Observation was appropriate for referral concern	conceptualization -Observation was appropriate for referral concern	conceptualization -Observation was appropriate for referral concern	
Standardized Assessments	No standardized assessments were indicated in the report	1 of the following: -Data collected were appropriately presented -Results were integrated into conceptualization -Assessment was appropriate for referral concern	2 of the following: -Data collected were appropriately presented -Results were integrated into conceptualization -Assessment was appropriate for referral concern	3 of the following: -Data collected were appropriately presented -Results were integrated into conceptualization -Assessment was appropriate for referral concern	X5
Report Writing	None of the following: -Appropriate report organization/format -Clear/detailed information & appropriate tone -Free from grammatical concerns	1 of the following: -Appropriate report organization/format -Clear/detailed information & appropriate tone -Free from grammatical concerns	2 of the following: -Appropriate report organization/format -Clear/detailed information & appropriate tone -Free from grammatical concerns	3 of the following: -Appropriate report organization/format -Clear/detailed information & appropriate tone -Free from grammatical concerns	X6
Recommendations	None of the following: -Clear and specific -Context appropriate -Evidence-based	1 of the following: -Clear and specific -Context appropriate -Evidence-based	2 of the following: -Clear and specific -Context appropriate -Evidence-based	3 of the following: -Clear and specific -Context appropriate -Evidence-based	X3
					T

Section IV Assessment 3 - Professional Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

5b. Scoring guide con't
Form 11: Field Supervisor Evaluation Form

RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE
Feinstein School of Education and Human Development
School Psychology Program

CEP 605: Field Supervisor's Evaluation

Student: _____ **Evaluation Date:** _____

Field Supervisor: _____

Directions: The rating of this practicum student should be based upon actual observation and/or reports from teachers, students, parents, and staff. Circle the number on the scale that best describes the practicum student's functioning relative to knowledge, skill, and disposition you expect of a future school psychologist at the *preinternship* level. A description of the scale points is provided below.

RATINGS

- 0** - No data, or insufficient information to make a rating at this time.
- 1** - Competence for practice is considered to be in need of further formal training. Student seems to lack basic professional maturation in this area. Skill development without academics seems doubtful.
- 2** - Competence for practice is currently developing, but supervision and experience are expected for further skill attainment. Close supervision is required.
- 3** - Competence is at a satisfactory level for a preinternship, future school psychologist with moderate supervision.
- 4** - Competence is assessed to be above average and appropriate for a preinternship, future school psychologist, needing only developmentally appropriate supervision.

A. Personal Work-related Characteristics
Rating

1. Demonstrates respect for culturally-diverse students, parents, and staff	0	1	2	3	4
2. Communicates and listens effectively	0	1	2	3	4
3. Develops and maintains effective interpersonal relationships	0	1	2	3	4
4. Demonstrates knowledge of ethical standards and guidelines and provides services in an ethically responsible manner	0	1	2	3	4
5. Is able to adapt to change appropriately	0	1	2	3	4
6. Displays initiative and resourcefulness	0	1	2	3	4
7. Is dependable	0	1	2	3	4
8. Demonstrates tolerance for others' values and viewpoints	0	1	2	3	4
9. Interacts comfortably with culturally-diverse students, parents, and staff	0	1	2	3	4
10. Shows concern, respect, and sensitivity for the needs of students, parents, and staff	0	1	2	3	4
11. Manifests good judgment and common sense	0	1	2	3	4
12. Accepts constructive criticism	0	1	2	3	4
13. Meets difficult situations with self-control	0	1	2	3	4
14. Self-evaluates performance regularly	0	1	2	3	4
15. Relates well with children	0	1	2	3	4

B. Domains of School Psychology Training and Practice Rating

1. Selects appropriate assessment instruments/procedures validated for problem area under consideration	0	1	2	3	4
2. Systematically collects, analyses and interprets assessment data in a meaningful and thorough fashion	0	1	2	3	4

3. Links assessment results with intervention	0	1	2	3	4
4. Evaluates the effectiveness of intervention in terms of measurable positive impact on students, parents or families					
5. Works collaboratively with teachers and other school personnel	0	1	2	3	4
6. Conducts effective parent consultation and serves effectively as a liaison for school and parents	0	1	2	3	4
7. Demonstrates knowledge of human learning processes techniques to assess these processes, and instructional strategies to promote learning	0	1	2	3	4
8. Demonstrates skill in developing instructional interventions for students with diverse strengths and needs	0	1	2	3	4
9. Demonstrates knowledge of human development and techniques to assess these processes	0	1	2	3	4
10. Develops consultation, counseling, and behavioral strategies that enhance life and social skills	0	1	2	3	4
11. Develops academic and social/behavioral interventions that reflect understanding of learning differences, developmental differences, and social/cultural differences	0	1	2	3	4
12. Attends to biological, social, economic and cultural factors that can bias decision-making and instruction	0	1	2	3	4
13. Demonstrates knowledge of standards and procedures related to general education and special education	0	1	2	3	4
14. Assists schools in developing procedures and practices that promote learning, prevent problems, and create safe schools	0	1	2	3	4
15. Demonstrates skill in developing and implementing crisis prevention and intervention services	0	1	2	3	4
16. Assists school programs that promote mental health and physical	0	1	2	3	4

well-being of students

17. Demonstrates knowledge of family systems	0	1	2	3	4
18. Works collaboratively with families to support student academic and behavioral success	0	1	2	3	4
19. Demonstrates knowledge of community services that support comprehensive services to children and their families	0	1	2	3	4
20. Demonstrates knowledge of psychometric standards and applies it in selecting and using assessment instruments	0	1	2	3	4
21. Applies knowledge in research and statistics when evaluating interventions and programs	0	1	2	3	4
22. Employs a problem-solving model which emphasizes critical thinking in delivering school psychological services	0	1	2	3	4
23. Delivers services consistent with NASP standards and state-mandated regulations	0	1	2	3	4
24. Recognizes own limitations/biases and practices within area of professional competence	0	1	2	3	4
25. Accesses and utilizes information resources and technology to enhance service delivery	0	1	2	3	4

C. Professional Responsibilities
Rating

1. Observes scheduled hours and appointments at assigned school(s) in a punctual manner	0	1	2	3	4
2. Meets deadlines in responding to referrals and in submitting written reports	0	1	2	3	4
3. Writes reports in a logical and coherent style that is easily understood by teachers and parents	0	1	2	3	4
4. Maintains confidentiality when handling information and in keeping records	0	1	2	3	4

5. Keeps supervisors and administrators informed of unusual events and activities, as well as routine matters in their school(s)	0	1	2	3	4
6. Consistently follows through when additional action is needed	0	1	2	3	4
7. Delivers psychological services indicative of a reflective practitioner	0	1	2	3	4

Overall Rating of Practicum Student	0	1	2	3
4				

Comments:

Suggested Goals for Internship Year:

Field Supervisor's Signature _____

Date _____

Student's Signature _____

Date _____

(Note: The student's signature indicates *only* that the evaluation has been discussed with him or her.)

College Supervisor's Signature _____

Date _____

5c. Aggregated Candidate Data

Table A:
Overall Rating on Training Portfolio 2007-2008

Year	2007-2008* n=15	2006-2007 n=13
Overall Rating	High Pass = 7 Pass = 8 Revise/resubmit = 0	High Pass= 11 Pass = 2 Revise/resubmit = 0

*revised overall scoring system used

Table B:
Mean training portfolio scores by individual artifact aggregated by year

	Artifact							
	System	Crisis	Ind.	Group	FBA	Esite	Home -school	Research
	2.6	2.7	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.11	2.5	2.9
	2.10		2.5	2.5	2.5		2.8	
2007-8	8.79	9.47	9.13	8.94	8.96	10.00	8.00	8.53
2006-7	9.92	8.7	8.86	9.41	8.67	9.5	9.23	9.13
Average	9.36	9.09	9.0	9.18	8.82	9.75	8.6	8.83

Table C:
Mean Training Portfolio aggregated scores by NASP Domain by year

	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.10	2.11
2007-8	8.66	8.96	8.74	9.03	8.71	8.79	9.47	8.00	8.53	8.79	10.00
2006-7	9.275	8.67	9.41	9.14	9.12	9.92	8.7	9.23	9.13	9.92	9.5
Average	8.97	8.82	9.08	9.09	8.92	9.34	9.09	8.62	8.83	9.36	9.75

Table D:
Training E-portfolio aggregated scores by individual artifact 2007-2008

Artifact							Home					Total
System	Crisis	Ind.	Group	FBA	Esite	Home	-school	Research	RTI	Assessment		
2.6	2.7	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.11	2.5	2.9	2.1	2.1			

11	10	6	7.2	9.4	7.7	8	9	9.25	9	9.5	83.3
12	10	10	9.1	10	9.2	10	9.25	9.5	9.5	10	96.1
13	10	10	8.8	10	9.2	10	9.25	8.75	9.5	9.5	94.4
14	10	5	9.4	8.8	7	10	8.75	8.5	9.5	8.5	83.8
Mean	9.92	8.7	8.86	9.41	8.67	9.5	9.23	9.13	9.41	9.14	

Table F:

Training Portfolio aggregated scores by NASP Domain 2007-2008

Practicum Student	NASP Domain										
	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.10	2.11
1	7.5	7.9	8.3	9.1	7.75	8.3	10	5.4	7	8.3	10
2	8.9	8.9	7.8	9.25	8.87	8.3	10	8	9.6	8.3	10
3	10	8.8	10	9.25	9.55	8.3	9.6	10	9.4	8.3	10
4	7.1	9.9	7.9	9.3	8.47	9.6	9.4	8.1	5.4	9.6	10
5	7.65	9.1	8.2	8.8	8.33	9.5	10	8	8.6	9.5	10
6	8.25	8.8	8.6	9.25	8.52	9.5	9	7.3	9.5	9.5	10
7	8.8	9.1	8.9	9.3	8.9	9.2	9.6	8.1	8.6	9.2	10
8	7.95		8.3	8.6	8.02	8.2	9.4	7	8.3	8.2	10
9	8.75	8.7	9	8.5	8.73	8.1	7.4	9.2	9.1	8.1	10
10	9	9.5	9.3	9	8.95	9.2	9.6	8.2	8.9	9.2	10
11	9	9.3	8.8	9.1	8.7	7.3	10	6.7	9.4	7.3	10
12	9.15	10	8.6	9.5	9.35	9.6	9.4	8.8	8.3	9.6	10
13	9.35	8.1	8.9	8.95	8.95	9.6	9.6	9	9.1	9.6	10
14	9.45	9	8.9	9.05	9	8.4	10	8	8.1	8.4	10
15	9	8.4	9.6	8.55	8.62	8.7	9.1	8.2	8.6	8.7	10
TOTAL	8.66	8.96	8.74	9.03	8.71	8.79	9.47	8.00	8.53	8.79	10.00

Table G:

Training Portfolio aggregated scores by NASP Domain 2006-2007

Practicum Student	NASP Domain										
	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.10	2.11
1	9.12	6	9.75	8.1	8.41	10	7.5	10	8.25	10	10

2	7.5	7.7	8	8.8	8.05	8.75	6.7	8	8.5	8.75	5
3	9.75	10	10	10	9.92	10	10	10	10	10	10
4	9.25	9.2	10	9.38	9.12	10	10	8.25	9	10	10
5	9	8.5	9	7.52	8.43	10	6.6	9	9.25	10	10
6	9.25	10	8.75	9.4	9.47	10	10	9.5	9	10	10
7	9.63	8.5	9.5	9.7	9.44	10	10	9.5	8.5	10	10
8	9.63	9.6	9.25	9.7	9.58	10	10	9.25	9.75	10	10
9	9.25	8.8	10	9.7	9.37	10	10	9.5	9.5	10	10
10	10	10	10	9.25	9.75	10	10	10	10	10	10
11	9.25	7.7	9	8.3	8.63	10	6	9	9.25	10	8
12	9.75	9.2	9.5	9.55	9.5	10	10	9.25	9.5	10	10
13	9.5	9.2	9.5	9.4	9.36	10	10	9.25	8.75	10	10
14	9	7	9.5	9.1	8.66	10	5	8.75	8.5	10	10
TOTAL	9.275	8.67	9.41	9.14	9.12	9.92	8.7	9.23	9.13	9.92	9.5

