

**Section IV Assessment 5: Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions: Comprehensive, Performance-Based Assessment of Candidate Abilities Evaluated by Faculty during Internship**

**1. Description of Assessment:**

Intern Assessment Procedures beginning 2007-8:

Internship assessment procedures were modified beginning with the 2007-8 academic year. As with previous years, interns were required to complete an E-performance portfolio which included (a) School Psychology Praxis Test Score sheet documenting a passing score, (b) Individualized Training Plan (c) Self-reflection, and (4) Internship Logs. In contrast to previous years, students were required to complete 5 integrated artifacts, a home-school field collaboration reflection paper, and present a poster at a professional conference. The artifacts were designed to document competence and skills aligned with NASP domains. Intern portfolio artifacts were evaluated by a school psychology faculty member using a 4 point Likert Scale Rubric (see 5b. Scoring Guide). To improve the evaluation process and facilitate objective scoring, rubric items provided operational definitions outlining the targeted critical competencies and were linked directly to the NASP domains.

Intern Assessment procedures for 2004-2007

Interns were required to complete an Performance e- portfolio which includes a CV, School Psychologist Praxis Test score sheet documenting passing score, Individualized Training Plan and outcome data summaries, Field supervisor summative evaluation, internship log of 1200 hours and the candidate's reflection of his/her professional development linked to artifacts from their experiences during the internship year documenting competencies across school psychology areas of competence (Diagnosis & Fact finding, Prevention & Intervention, Applied Psychological Foundations, Applied Educational Foundations and Ethical & Legal Issues). It is noted that the organizing matrix and competencies are consistent from the Training e-Portfolio to the Performance e-Portfolio. Intern portfolios are evaluated by school psychology faculty members using a 5 point Likert scale ranging from (0) No data, or insufficient information to (4) above average competence / mastery. Portfolio ratings comprise three separate categories (1) NASP domains, (2) NASP professional work characteristics and (3) Rhode Island College Feinstein School of Education and Human Development (FSEHD) advanced program conceptual framework standards (Knowledge, Diversity, Practice and Professionalism as defined within a reflective practitioner model of training).

## **2. Alignment with NASP domains:**

### **Intern Assessment Procedures beginning 2007-8:**

Interns were required to complete five integrated artifacts that encompass the key competencies presented in NASP domains. The five artifacts included (1) Comprehensive Assessment and Case Report (NASP domains: 2.1, 2.3, & 2.5), (2) Behavioral Consultation Case with Outcome Data and Summary Report (NASP domains: 2.1 & 2.2), (3) Counseling Case with Outcome Data and Summary Report (NASP domains: 2.1 & 2.4), (4) Response to Intervention/Academic Intervention Case with Outcome Data and Summary Report (NASP domains: 2.1, 2.3, & 2.7), and (5) Program/Policy Evaluation and Professional Practice with Outcome Measures and Summary Report (NASP domains 2.6, 2.9, & 2.10). In addition, students were required to complete a Home-School Field Collaboration Reflection (NASP domain: 2.8) and prepare/present a poster highlighting a completed case to demonstrate the use of technology in the dissemination of evidence-based outcomes (NASP domain 2.11). Posters were presented at the First Annual Rhode Island College School Psychology Research Symposium.

Scoring procedures were improved by (a) using a rubric that identified and operationally defined the critical skills and (b) providing a clear link between those skills and NASP domains. This modification allowed for increased objectivity and consistent assessment of candidate competency (See Section IV Assessment 5 - Scoring Guide). It also provided documentation of the intern's ability to integrate multiple skills when providing services within their districts.

Three types of ratings were computed to analyze interns' skills. The first type of data presents the overall grade on the portfolio, which was based on an average score across all five of the artifacts. Grades from the internship portfolios were used to determine student eligibility for graduation. Next, a global rating on each artifact was obtained. Finally, mean ratings on individual rubric items were computed providing a more detailed analysis of student performance. If more than one rubric item was linked to a NASP domain (e.g., multiple rubric items were connected to domain 2.1), the intern's scores were averaged. (See Assessment Tool and Scoring Rubric for full description of the assessment tool and scoring procedures).

### **Intern Assessment Procedures 2004-2007**

During the 2004-5 academic year, portfolios received one global rating to evaluate the interns' performance as related to the NASP domains. The rating was based on a 3 point Likert scale (1 = unacceptable; 2 = acceptable; 3 = Exemplary). During 2005-06, a significant revision was made to the instrument to improve the evaluation process. From 2005-2007, candidates were evaluated on each of the 11 NASP standards separately, thus providing 11 ratings. Faculty members evaluated the portfolio artifacts presented with the organizing narrative (documenting how the artifact links with domains) to determine demonstrated competency in each of the 11 NASP domains.

### **3 and 4 Analysis and Interpretation of Data**

#### 2007-8 Interns:

*Mean Score/Grade on Portfolio:* The overall mean rating was 9.66 (out of 10.0) with a range of 9.4 to 9.9, indicating that the interns demonstrated high levels of competency across the 11 domains (See Table 1).

*Domain Ratings – Global Artifact Ratings:* The mean rating was 9.69 (out of 10.0) with a range of 9.10 to 10, suggesting the interns demonstrated high levels of competency across the 11 domains. The highest rated domain score of 10.0 (out of 10.0) was received for domain 2.8 (Home/School/Community Collaboration) and domain 2.11 (Information Technology). These findings indicate that interns were successful in developing cross-setting partnerships and using technology and information sources to enhance service delivery. The lowest mean rating of 9.10 (out of 10.0) was received on domain 2.5 (Student Diversity in Development and Learning). This finding suggests that interns may benefit from additional experience in selecting assessment measures, implementing interventions, and evaluating the effectiveness of those interventions in a manner that is sensitive to individuals with diverse characteristics (See Table 2)

*Domain Ratings – Individual Rubric Items:* The mean rating across all domains was 3.90 (out of 4.0) with a range of 3.125 to 4.0, suggesting the interns demonstrated high levels of competency across the 11 domains. The highest rated domain score of 4.0 (out of 4.0) was received for both domain 2.8 (Home/School/Community Collaboration) and domain 2.11 (Information Technology). These findings indicate that interns were highly successful in developing cross-setting partnerships and using technology and information sources to enhance service delivery. The lowest mean rating of 3.7 (out of 4.0) was associated with domains 2.1 (Data-based Decision-Making and Accountability) and 2.9 (Research and Program Evaluation), indicating that interns may continue to benefit from additional experience and training related to progress monitoring and evaluation methods. However, ratings on all domains suggest high levels of competence and skill demonstration (See Table 3).

#### 2006-07 Interns:

*Domain Ratings:* The mean rating was 3.69 with a range of 3.54 to 3.86, suggesting the interns were approaching competency across the 11 domains. The highest rated domain with mean scores of 4.0 were domain 7 (Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health) and domain 8 (Home/School/Community Collaboration). These findings suggest that the interns supported prevention and intervention efforts at their sites and developed meaningful cross-setting partnerships. The lowest mean ratings were received on domains 2 (Consultation and Collaboration) and 4 (Socialization and Development of Life Skills), indicating that interns were approaching mastery in these areas.

*Additional Ratings:* The mean rating for professional work characteristics was 3.83 with a range of 3.0 to 4.0. The highest mean ratings (4.0) were characteristics 3 (Effective

interpersonal relations) and 6 (Initiative and dependability). The lowest mean ratings (3.66) were characteristics 1 (Respect for human diversity) and 5 (Adaptability

2005-06 Interns:

*Domain Ratings:* The mean rating for the portfolio was 3.94 with a range of 3.77 to 4.0. Eight of the domains received a mean rating of 4.0 including domains 2 (Consultation and Collaboration), 3 (Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive Academic Skills), 4 (Socialization and Development of Skills), 6 (School and Systems Organization, Policy Development, and Climate), 7 (Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health), 8 (Home/School/Community Collaboration), 10 (School Psychology Research and Development) and 11 (Information Technology) which suggests the interns demonstrated a mastery level of competence. The remaining three domains received a mean rating of 3.85. These findings suggest that the interns were approaching mastery in these areas.

*Additional Ratings:* The mean rating for each of the six professional work characteristics (e.g., Respect for Human Diversity, Communication Skills, Effective Interpersonal relations, Ethical responsibility, Adaptability, & Initiative and dependability) was 4.0 suggesting that the interns possess the essential qualities to interact in professional settings.

2004-05 Interns:

*Ratings:* The mean domain rating was 2.75 (1 = unacceptable and 3 = exemplary) with a range of 2.0 to 3.0. Due to insufficient data, no ratings are available directly linking the interns' performance with specific NASP standards.

**Section IV Assessment 5 – Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions: Comprehensive, Performance-Based Assessment of Candidate Abilities Evaluated by Faculty during Internship**

**5a. Assessment Tool**

**1. Assessment Case Report (2.1, 2.3, 2.5)**

Assessment Case / Report - Interns will conduct a comprehensive evaluation which uses *multi-faceted, comprehensive and fair* assessment tools to effectively address the referral question(s) (2.1). As part of the assessment, the interns will demonstrate knowledge of and the ability to select a variety of assessment tools that are culturally and linguistically sensitive. These tools will be used to provide information related individual strengths and weaknesses (2.5). In addition, interns will incorporate the use of both traditional assessment practices (e.g., WISC-IV, WJ-III), as well as progressing monitoring tools (e.g., CBM, DIBELS), rating scales (BASC), observations, and interviews as needed to effectively answer referral question(s) (2.1). Further, interns will provide a *direct* link between assessment results and evidence-based interventions used to enhance the student's academic, behavioral, social-emotional, or adaptive functioning (2.1). Finally, interns will collaborate with both school staff and families to develop instructional goals related to the student's educational planning. (2.3, 2.8)

**2. Behavioral Consultation Case with Outcome Data and Summary Report (2.1, 2.2)**

Behavioral Consultation Case - Interns will present a case in which he/she demonstrates 4 identified skills: (a) the ability to define the presenting issue, (b) conduct appropriate assessment measures (e.g., FBA, observations, interviews) evaluating environmental and individual variables, (c) implement an evidence-based intervention, and (d) evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention using pre/post data. Cases may include referrals dealing with behavioral, social-emotional, academic or adaptive issues (2.2) and must demonstrate the use of an evidence-based intervention (2.2) directly linked to the assessment and hypothesis. Data documenting case effectiveness is required including effect sizes, Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS) and the Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS)(2.1)

**3. Psychological Intervention Case/Counseling Case (2.1, 2.4)**

Psychological Intervention Case - Interns will present a psychological treatment plan and progress summary in which he/she demonstrates 4 identified skills: (a) the ability to define the presenting issue in measurable terms, (b) identify short and long term treatment goals/objectives, (c) implement an evidence-based intervention addressing short-term objectives, and (d) evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention using pre/post data (2.4). Cases must demonstrate the use of knowledge related to human learning processes related to behavioral, affective, adaptive or social goals (2.4) and use an evidence-based intervention (2.4). In addition, interns must collect and present data to document case effectiveness including effect sizes, GAS, BIRS (2.1)

#### **4. Response to Intervention/Academic Intervention Case (2.1, 2.3, 2.7)**

Academic Intervention Case (e.g., instructional intervention, consultation related to academic difficulties) - Cases should be *preventative* in nature, implemented at the primary or secondary level and conducted prior to formal assessment for Special Education (2.7). Interns will present an academic intervention case in which he/she demonstrates 4 identified skills: (a) the ability to define the presenting issue, (b) conduct appropriate assessment measures (e.g., CBM, observations, interviews) evaluating environmental and individual variables, (c) implement an evidence-based intervention, and (d) evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention using pre/post data. Cases must demonstrate the use of knowledge related to the human learning process and cognitive/academic skills (2.3) and document effectiveness using effect sizes, GAS, BIRS (2.1)

On *at least one* of the following artifacts (1) behavioral consultation, (2) psychological intervention/counseling, or (3) RTI/academic intervention, the intern must collaborate with other key stakeholders (e.g., family members, social workers, special education teachers, administrators, counselors) to determine goals, presenting issues, and interventions. Interns will attach a one-page reflection discussing the strengths and unique perspectives offered by the other key stakeholders and benefits of forming collaborative partnerships. **(Domain 2.8)**

On *at least one* of the following artifacts (1) behavioral consultation, (2) psychological intervention/counseling, or (3) RTI/academic intervention, the intern must use technology and information sources to create a poster presentation and present the case to fellow professionals and colleagues at a professional conference **(Domain 2.11)**

#### **5. Program/Policy Evaluation & Ethical/Legal/Professional (2.6, 2.9, 2.10)**

Systems level artifact – Policy or Program Development/Evaluation - Interns will present a system's level intervention case in which he/she discusses the following information (1) a description of the program or policy (2) his/her role in development, implementation, and/or evaluation, (3) an ethical/legal/professional issue related to the either the development, implementation, or evaluation of the program/policy, (4) the specific strategies used to facilitate change related to the issue and (5) evaluate the effectiveness of the program/policy via data.

**Section IV Assessment 5: Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions: Comprehensive, Performance-Based Assessment of Candidate Abilities Evaluated by Faculty during Internship**

**5b. Scoring Guide**

Artifact 1: Assessment Case and Report	1	2	3	4
Selected multi-faceted, comprehensive and culturally valid assessment tools (Domains 2.1 & 2.5)	Incorporated only one culturally valid assessment measure assessing either individual <i>or</i> environmental variables	Incorporated at least 2 culturally valid assessment measures assessing either individual <i>or</i> environmental variables	Incorporated at least 3 culturally valid assessment measures assessing individual <i>and</i> environmental variables	Incorporated at least 4 culturally valid assessment measures assessing individual <i>and</i> environmental variables
Incorporated non-traditional or progress monitoring assessment measures (Domain 2.1)	Did not use any non-traditional assessment/progress monitoring tools			Used at least one non-traditional assessment including CBM, DIBELS ect.; or progress monitoring observations
Accurate interpretation of assessment results (Domains 2.1 & 2.5)	Misinterpreted assessment results or did not identify key strengths or weaknesses (e.g., did not identify something as a weakness in interpretation when needed)	Accurately identified weaknesses based on analysis of comprehensive assessment measures with an understanding of relevant diversity issues	Accurately identified at least one strength and weakness based on analysis of comprehensive assessment measures with an understanding of relevant diversity issues	Accurately identified <i>multiple strengths and weaknesses</i> based on analysis of comprehensive assessment measures with an understanding of relevant diversity issues
Formulated several recommendations directly linked to assessment results and based in best practice (Domains 2.3 & 2.5)	In conjunction with team and family, identified at least 1 recommendation related to assessment results and based in best practice	In conjunction with team and family, identified at least 2 recommendations related to assessment results and based in best practice	In conjunction with team and family, identified at least 3 recommendations that were directly linked to assessment results and based in best practice	In conjunction with team and family, identified at least 4 recommendations that were directly linked to the assessment results and based in best practice
Report Writing	Multiple grammatical errors; overly technical language, and/or focused on weaknesses.	Language was jargon free and strength focused. Several grammatical errors.	Language was jargon free and strength focused. Few minor grammatical errors.	Language was jargon free and strength focused. Report flowed well.

Score = \_\_\_ / 2 = \_\_\_ (out of 10 possible pts)

Artifact 2: Consultation	1	2	3	4
Operational Definition of presenting issue (Domain 2.2)	Did not identify or define a presenting issue	Identified presenting issue but is not defined in behavioral or measurable terms and is not stated positively (e.g., interrupt)	Identified presenting issue defined either in measurable terms or stated as positive (e.g., improve reading)	Identified/operationally defined the presenting issue in clear, measurable and observable terms. Issue is stated as a positive (e.g., raise hand to speak)
Conducted Functional Behavioral Assessment (Domain 2.2)	Did not conduct a FBA	Conducted a FBA via direct <i>or</i> indirect measures that evaluated either individual <i>or</i> environmental variables. Developed a hypothesis regarding function of behavior that flowed from FBA	Conducted a FBA via direct <i>or</i> indirect measures that evaluated individual <i>and</i> environmental variables. Developed a hypothesis regarding function of behavior that flowed from FBA	Conducted a thorough FBA via direct <i>and</i> indirect measures that evaluated individual <i>and</i> environmental variables. Developed a hypothesis regarding function of behavior that flowed from FBA
Evidence-based Intervention (Domain 2.2)	Did not implement an intervention	Implemented an intervention that is not directly linked to FBA and does not have empirical support.	Implemented an intervention that is either directly linked to FBA <i>or</i> has empirical support.	Implemented an intervention that is both directly linked to FBA <i>and</i> has empirical support.
Evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention (Domain 2.1)	Was unable to adequately evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention due to insufficient data.	Evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention and assessed individual student outcomes via one outcome measure (e.g. effect sizes, GAS, BIRS)	Evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention and assessed individual student outcomes via two outcome measures (e.g. effect sizes, GAS, BIRS)	Evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention and assessed individual student outcomes via all three outcome measures (e.g., effect sizes, GAS, and BIRS.
Summary Report	Summary report included of the 4 key components (e.g., TB, FBA, TX, Graph)	Summary report included 2 of the 4 key components (e.g., TB, FBA, TX, Graph)	Summary report included 3 of the 4 key components (e.g., TB, FBA, TX, Graph)	Summary report included target behavior, results of FBA, description of intervention and analysis of the effectiveness of the intervention (e.g., graph/table)
Score = ___ / 2 = ___ (out of 10 possible pts)				

Counseling Case	1	2	3	4
Operational Definition of presenting issue (Domain 2.4)	Treatment plan did not identify, define, or frame a presenting issue in behavioral terms.	Treatment plan did one of the following (1) Identified presenting issue (2) operationally defined it (3) framed in behavioral and measurable terms.	Treatment plan did two of the following (1) Identified presenting issue (2) operationally defined it (3) framed in behavioral and measurable terms.	Treatment plan identified presenting issue, operationally defined it, and framed it in behavioral and measurable terms.
Identified Treatment Goals/Objectives (Domain 2.4)	Treatment plan did not identify any goals, objectives or desirable outcomes.	Treatment plan identified at least 1 long term goal <i>or</i> 1 short term objectives indicating a desirable outcome.	Treatment plan identified at least one long term goal <i>and</i> 2 short term objectives indicating a desirable outcome.	Treatment plan identified at least one long-term goal and 3 short-term objectives indicating a desirable outcome.
Evidence-based Intervention (Domain 2.4)	Did not implement an intervention	Implemented an evidence-based intervention for at least 1 of the short term objectives on the treatment plan	Implemented an evidence-based intervention for at least 2 of the short term objectives on the treatment plan	Implemented an evidence-based intervention for 3 short term objective indicated on the treatment plan.
Evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention (Domain 2.1)	Was unable to adequately evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention due to insufficient data.	Evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention and assessed individual student outcomes via one outcome measure (e.g. effect sizes, GAS, BIRS)	Evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention and assessed individual student outcomes via two outcome measures (e.g. effect sizes, GAS, BIRS)	Evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention and assessed individual student outcomes via all three outcome measures (e.g., effect sizes, GAS, and BIRS).
Treatment Plan and Progress Summary	Summary report included 1 of the 5 key components (e.g., presenting issue, goals/objectives, intervention description, progress, effectiveness of TX.)	Summary report included 2 of the 5 key components (e.g., presenting issue, goals/objectives, intervention description, progress effectiveness of TX.)	Treatment plan included 3 of the 5 key components (e.g., presenting issue, goals/objectives, intervention description, and effectiveness of TX.)	Treatment plan / Summary included presenting issues, goals/objectives, brief description of intervention or curriculum used to meet objectives, progress, and analysis of the effectiveness of the intervention (e.g., graph/table)
Score = ___ / 2 = _____ (out of a possible 10 pts)				

RTI: Academic and/or Instructional Case	1	2	3	4
Operational Definition of presenting issue (Domains 2.3 & 2.7)	Did not identify or define a presenting issue related to academic functioning or instruction	Identified presenting issue but is not defined in behavioral or measurable terms and is not stated positively (e.g., interrupt)	Identified presenting issue defined either in measurable terms or stated as positive (e.g., improve reading)	Identified/operationally defined the presenting issue in clear, measurable and observable terms. Issue is stated as a positive (e.g., raise hand to speak)
Assessment Data prior to Formal Referral (Domains 2.3 & 2.7)	Did not conduct any assessment	Conducted an assessment via direct <i>or</i> indirect measures that evaluated either individual <i>or</i> environmental / curricular / instructional variables.	Conducted an assessment via direct <i>or</i> indirect measures that evaluated individual <i>and</i> environmental / curricular / instructional variables.	Conducted a thorough assessment via direct <i>and</i> indirect measures that evaluated individual <i>and</i> environmental / curricular / instructional variables (e.g., universal screening, strategic monitoring with CBM).
Evidence-based Intervention (Domains 2.3 & 2.7)	Did not implement an intervention to address the academic/instructional needs of the student(s).	Implemented an intervention that is not directly linked to assessment findings <i>and</i> lacks empirical support.	Implemented an intervention that is either directly linked to assessment findings <i>or</i> has empirical support.	Implemented an intervention that is both directly linked to assessment findings <i>and</i> has empirical support.
Evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention (Domain 2.1)	Was unable to adequately evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention due to insufficient data.	Evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention and assessed individual student outcomes via one outcome measure (e.g. effect sizes, GAS, BIRS)	Evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention and assessed individual student outcomes via two outcome measures (e.g. effect sizes, GAS, BIRS)	Evaluated the effectiveness of the intervention and assessed individual student outcomes via all three outcome measures (e.g., effect sizes, GAS, and BIRS.
Summary Report	Summary report included of the 4 key components (e.g., TB, assessment, TX, Graph)	Summary report included 2 of the 4 key components (e.g., TB, assessment, TX, Graph)	Summary report included 3 of the 4 key components (e.g., TB, assessment, TX, Graph)	Summary report included target behavior, results of assessment, description of intervention and analysis of the effectiveness of the intervention (e.g., graph/table)
Score = ___ / 2 = _____ (out of a possible 10 pts)				

Program Policy & Professional Practice	1	2	3	4
Description of program or policy (Domain 2.6)	Limited or no description of program/policy	Thorough description of the program/policy. No description of intern role is discussed.	Thorough description of the program/policy and discussion of a <i>passive role</i> the intern played in the development, implementation, or evaluation.	Thorough description of the program/policy and discussion of the <i>active role</i> the intern played in the development, implementation, or evaluation.
Legal/Ethical/Professional (Domain 2.10)	No discussion of an ethical, legal, or professional issue			Thorough discussion of a legal, ethical or professional issue related to either the development, implementation, or evaluation of the program/policy
Strategies for facilitating system's level change (Domain 2.10)	No discussion of strategies he/she would use to influence system's level change	Identified at least 1 strategy used/would use to facilitate or influence change related to the ethical, legal, or professional issue.	Identified at least 2 strategies used/would use to facilitate or influence change related to the ethical, legal, or professional issue.	Identified at least 3 strategies used/would use (e.g., reciprocity) to facilitate or influence change related to the ethical, legal, or professional issue.
Program/policy evaluation (Domain 2.9)	No discussion of program/policy evaluation	Discussed 1 evaluation procedure that can be/was used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program at the initial, intermediate, or long-term level	Discussed 2 evaluation procedures that can be/were used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program at the initial, intermediate, or long-term level	Discussed 3 evaluation procedures that can be/were used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program at the initial, intermediate, and long-term level
Summary Report	Summary included 1 of the components (e.g., description, ethical/legal issue, strategies, and evaluation procedures).	Summary included 2 of the components (e.g., description, ethical/legal issue, strategies, and evaluation procedures).	Summary included 3 of the components (e.g., description, ethical/legal issue, strategies, and evaluation procedures).	Summary report included description of program/policy, ethical/legal issue, strategies to influence change, and evaluation procedures.
Score = ___ / 2 = _____ (out of a possible 10 pts)				

On at least one of the artifacts (2: consultation; 3: counseling, or 4: RTI for an academic/instructional issue) the intern will present a reflection of H-S collaboration. On the selected artifact, the below rubric criteria will replace the rubric item related to summary report.

Home-School Field Collaboration Reflection (2.8)	1	2	3	4
Discussion of home-school collaboration (Domain 2.8)	Limited or no discussion of family strengths or involvement in intervention	Thorough discussion of family strengths and influences on student development. No discussion of how the family was involved in the intervention.	Thorough discussion of family strengths <i>and</i> the <i>passive</i> role the family played in the development, implementation or evaluation of the intervention.	Thorough discussion of family strengths and influences on student development <i>and</i> the <i>active</i> and meaningful role the family played in the development, implementation or evaluation of the intervention.

One at least one of the artifacts (2: consultation; 3: counseling, or 4: RTI for an academic/instructional issue) the intern will create and present a poster at a conference (e.g, RIC, NASP). On the selected artifact, the below rubric criteria will replace the rubric item related to summary report.

Information Technology: Poster Presentation (2.11)	1	2	3	4
Use technology in the dissemination of evidence-based outcomes (Domain 2.11)	Intern did not use technology and information sources to create a poster highlighting the development, evaluation, and delivery of a case. No poster presentation.			Intern will use technology and information sources to create a poster highlighting the development, evaluation, and delivery of a case. Posters will be presented at a conference (e.g., RIC, NASP ect).

**Section IV Assessment 5: Pedagogical and Professional Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions: Comprehensive, Performance-Based Assessment of Candidate Abilities Evaluated by Faculty during Internship**

**5c. Aggregated Candidate Data**

Table 1  
Mean Score on Performance Portfolio

Mean Score on Performance Portfolio	
Intern 07-8	Mean Score
1	9.75
2	9.9
3	9.8
4	9.45
5	9.57
6	9.75
7	9.825
8	9.55
9	9.5
10	9.85
11	9.5
12	9.77
13	9.4
Overall Mean	9.66



