Section IV Assessment 6 – Effects on Student Learning Environments and/or Learning

1-4. Narrative

1. Brief Description of Assessments

Data for impact on student learning, using various measures, are available from 2004-2008. Beginning in 2007-2008, formal procedures for providing direct evidence of measurable positive impact on children, youth, families and other consumers was implemented in both practicum and internship experiences. Prior to this, assessment on the impact of student learning had been assessed from 2004-2007 via field-based supervisor ratings of case outcomes based on students' ability to conduct effective interventions and produce positive outcomes. From 2006-2007, an additional rating form, the Documentation of Student Outcomes, was added to gain more detailed information in this area.

2. Alignment to NASP Standards

2007-2008

Beginning in 2007, NASP Standard 2.1 (Data-based Decision-Making and Accountability) has been addressed by three methods of data collection at both the practicum and internship level. For individual consultation cases at each level of training, effect sizes have been used to evaluate intervention outcomes. In order to aggregate data and determine effectiveness of overall service delivery, goal attainment scaling have been used for all individual, group and consultation cases. In addition, the Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS; Von Brock & Elliot, 1987) has been used to collect data from teacher or parent on effectiveness and social validity factors for all interventions used.

2006-2007

The Documentation of Student Outcomes form aligns directly with NASP Standard 2.1. This form evaluates how well our school psychology interns and practicum students evaluate, document and monitor student outcomes in both social/emotional and behavioral outcomes and academic outcomes. This form utilized a 3-point Likert scale with ratings from 1 (needs improvement) to 3 (excellent). For practicum and internship students, this evaluation was linked to two portfolio artifacts: (a) one artifact demonstrating social/emotional or behavioral outcomes and (b) one demonstrating academic outcomes. Cases evaluated consisted of individual, group or consultation cases completed during their practicum/internship year).

2004-2007

The Field Supervisor Evaluation Form Part B, questions 1-4 directly aligned with NASP Standard 2.1. Items rated were related to a global evaluation of students' ability to provide effective services and produce positive outcomes (See Form XX in Section 5(a) Assessment Tools).

3/4. Analysis and Interpretation of Data

2007-2008

3. Analysis

<u>Internship</u>

Evidence of School Psychology Intern (n=13) effects on student learning environments and/or learning was evaluated across several service delivery models, including (a) academic/RTI cases, (b) counseling cases, and (c) behavioral intervention. All three case outcomes were assessed using a multi-modal evaluation approach utilizing (a) outcome ratings of intervention effectiveness, (b) outcome ratings of social validity, and (c) goal attainment scaling, and (d) calculation of effect sizes.

Overall mean outcome ratings across all intervention cases were as follows: outcome ratings of effectiveness (4.60 out of 6), outcome ratings of social validity (5.68 out of 6), and goal attainment scaling (4.32 out of 5). These outcomes suggest significant improvement in areas of targeted concern, and suggest the delivery of interventions that were acceptable to individuals, teachers, and parents. Overall mean effect sizes for RTI and home-school partnership cases were 4.10. Based on Cohen's (1992) interpretation, these findings suggest very large case outcomes.

Academic/RTI case outcomes are reported in Table A. Subjective ratings for intervention effectiveness from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 4.59 (out of 6) and ranged from 3.60-5.80. Subjective ratings for intervention acceptability from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 5.60 (out of 6) and ranged from 5.00-6.00. Mean goal attainment scale ratings were 4.35 (out of 5) and ranged from 3.50-5.00. Mean effect sizes were reported to be 6.60, ranging from 1.14 to 20.78.

Counseling case outcomes are reported in Table B. Subjective ratings for intervention effectiveness from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 4.62 (out of 6) and ranged from 3.30-5.75. Subjective ratings for intervention acceptability from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 5.72 (out of 6) and ranged from 4.72-6.00. Mean goal attainment scale ratings were 4.28 (out of 5) and ranged from 3.60-5.00. Mean effect sizes were reported to be 2.39, ranging from 0.65 to 5.26.

Behavioral intervention case outcomes are reported in Table C. Subjective ratings for intervention effectiveness from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 4.61 (out of 6) and ranged from 3.30-5.93. Subjective ratings for intervention acceptability from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 5.73 (out of 6) and ranged from 5.33-6.00. Mean goal attainment scale ratings were 4.33 (out of 5) and ranged from 3.00-5.00. Mean effect sizes were reported to be 3.32, ranging from -0.05 to 9.10.

Practicum

Evidence of Practicum student (n=15) effects on student learning environments and/or learning was evaluated across several service delivery models, including (a) individual

counseling cases, (b) groups counseling cases, (c) response to academic interventions, and (d) home-school partnership interventions. All four methods of service delivery were assessed using a multi-modal evaluation approach utilizing (a) outcome ratings of intervention effectiveness, (b) outcome ratings of social validity, and (c) goal attainment scaling. Additionally, RTI cases included effect size calculations to evaluate outcomes.

Overall mean outcome ratings across all four modes of service delivery were as follows: outcome ratings of effectiveness (4.64 out of 6), outcome ratings of social validity (5.72 out of 6), and goal attainment scaling (4.25 out of 5). These outcomes suggest significant improvement in areas of targeted concern, and suggest the delivery of interventions that were acceptable to individuals, teachers, and parents. Overall mean effect sizes for RTI and home-school partnership cases were 4.79. Based on Cohen's (1992) interpretation, these findings suggest very large case outcomes.

Individual case outcomes are reported in Table D. Subjective ratings for intervention effectiveness from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 4.69 (out of 6) and ranged from 4.33-5.18. Subjective ratings for intervention acceptability from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 5.55 (out of 6) and ranged from 4.00-6.00. Mean goal attainment scale ratings were 4.27 (out of 5) and ranged from 4.00-5.00.

Group intervention case outcomes are reported in Table E. Subjective ratings for intervention effectiveness from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 4.59 (out of 6) and ranged from 3.14-6.00. Subjective ratings for intervention acceptability from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 5.77 (out of 6) and ranged from 5.33-6.00. Mean goal attainment scale ratings were 4.37 (out of 5) and ranged from 4.00-5.00.

Response to academic intervention case outcomes are reported in Table F. Subjective ratings for intervention effectiveness from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 4.68 (out of 6) and ranged from 3.70-5.57. Subjective ratings for intervention acceptability from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 5.84 (out of 6) and ranged from 5.33-6.00. Mean goal attainment scale ratings were 4.11 (out of 5) and ranged from 3.00-5.00. Mean effect sizes were reported to be 6.27, ranging from 0.07 to 18.08.

Home-school partnership intervention case outcomes are reported in Table G. Subjective ratings for intervention effectiveness from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 4.70 (out of 6) and ranged from 3.00-5.29. Subjective ratings for intervention acceptability from students, teachers and/or parents were reported to be 5.73 (out of 6) and ranged from 5.00-6.00. Mean goal attainment scale ratings were 4.30 (out of 5) and ranged from 3.00-5.00. Mean effect sizes were reported to be 3.32, ranging from 0.99 to 5.99.

4. Interpretation

Internship

Outcome data indicate that School Psychology Interns were effective in providing individual or group counseling, developing and implementing behavioral interventions, and developing and implementing academic intervention that produce positive outcomes. Additionally, Interns were required to evaluate all forms of intervention by means of effect size calculations based on direct observations conducted by teachers, students, and/or parents. Treatment effect sizes were indicative of highly effective interventions. Ratings of intervention effectiveness, social validity, and goal attainment were similar for interns across the different modes of service delivery. This suggests a generalizabilty of intervention development and implementation skills across different modalities. Effect sizes were greater for academic/RTI cases than counseling or behavioral intervention cases. It is possible that due to the nature of skill acquisition during academic interventions, effect sizes for academic concerns may produce greater effect sizes than social or behavioral concerns. However, these data does suggest a significant improvement in student outcomes of academic intervention developed and implemented by the School Psychology Interns from the previous year. Results also demonstrate the Interns' ability to fully integrate contextually appropriate intervention development and implementation, as well as multimodal evaluation to enhance student development and learning.

Practicum

Outcome data suggest that Practicum students were effective in providing individual counseling, group counseling, home-school partnership interventions, and developing and implementing academic interventions (RTI) that produce positive outcomes. Ratings of intervention effectiveness, social validity, and goal attainment were similar for interns across the different modes of service delivery. Results indicate that Practicum students also exhibited generalizability of intervention development and implementation skills across different modalities. These data provide support that Practicum students have demonstrated effective skills in addressing academic concerns when compared to the previous year.

2006-2007

3. Analysis

Internship

Outcome data for Interns are reported in Table H. The overall average rating for Interns (n=6) on evidence of emotional/social and behavioral outcomes was 2.66 with a range of individual ratings from 2.0-3.0. The overall average rating for Interns on evidence of academic outcomes was 2.33 with a range of individual ratings from 2.0-3.0. This suggests at minimum satisfactory demonstration of evidence of student outcomes. The interns were rated separately on outcome evaluation, documentation and monitoring for both emotional/social/behavioral interventions and academic interventions. The mean scores for interns on emotional/social/behavioral interventions were 2.66 in each category. The mean scores for interns on academic interventions were 2.33 in each category. This suggests satisfactory evaluation, documentation and monitoring of

outcomes for both categories of intervention, though a slightly higher level of competence in the social/emotional/behavioral area.

Practicum

Outcome data for Practicum students are reported in Table H. The overall average rating for Practicum students (n=15) on evidence of emotional/social and behavioral outcomes was 2.36 with a range of individual ratings from 1.0-3.0. The overall average rating for Practicum students on evidence of academic outcomes was 2.01with a range of individual ratings from 1.0-3.0. This suggests a range of competencies within the cohort. However, as a group, there is demonstration of adequate evidence of student outcomes. In terms of sub skills, in the academic/social/behavioral area, the mean score on outcome evaluation was 2.6, documentation 2.4 and effective progress monitoring 2.1. The mean scores for academic interventions outcome evaluation were 2.3, documentation 2.1 and effective progress monitoring 1.7. This suggests as a group there was satisfactory level of competence in all areas except in progress monitoring for academic interventions. This was determined to be an area that needed attention and improvement.

4. Interpretation

Practicum/Internship

The data suggests that there is growth in the NASP Domain 2.1 (Data-based Decision-Making and Accountability) from practicum year to internship. The data suggests slightly higher skill level in evaluating, documenting and systematically monitoring progress in the emotional/social/behavioral area than in the academic area. However, with the exception of progress monitoring of academic interventions at the practicum level, students at both levels of training demonstrated satisfactory competence in obtaining evidence of student outcomes. In part, the variation in practicum students use of progress monitoring for academic interventions may have been related to differing experiences in practicum sites use of such methods as RTI and curriculum based assessment.

2004-2007

3. Analysis

Outcome data for Interns and Practicum students are reported in Table I. The overall mean rating for interns from 2004-2007 by their field supervisors on items related to Domain 2.1 (Data-based Decision-Making and Accountability) was 3.92, with individual scores ranging from 3.0 to 4.0. This suggests that all interns demonstrated competency in selecting appropriate assessment instruments, systematically collecting data, linking assessment results to intervention and evaluating their interventions. For 2004-2005, the mean rating was 3.96. For 2005-2006, the mean rating was 4.0. For 2006-2007 the mean rating was 3.88. Again, this demonstrates that each cohort year demonstrated competency at or approaching above average level as rated by their field supervisors.

4. Interpretation

The data above suggests that the interns from 2004-2007 have knowledge of and use data based decision making and accountability practices. This supports our program emphasis

on these areas and the collection of outcome data for all interventions used. However, the evaluation ratings do not provide direct evidence of what impact these practices actually had on the students, families and other consumers involved, leading our program to the changes outlined at the end of this document to be in place beginning Fall 2007.

Section IV Assessment 6 – Effects on Student Learning Environments and/or Learning

5ab - Assessment Tools and Scoring Guides

2007-2008

Goal Attainment Scaling. Goal attainment scaling (GAS; Kiresuk, Smith, & Cardillo, 1994) was used as an outcome measure consistent across the multiple models of intervention (e.g., individual counseling, group counseling, and consultation cases) used by students in practicum and internship settings. This allowed for the School Psychology Program to determine an aggregate measure of case outcome data across intervention models. The GAS was used to assess perceptions of attainment of case outcome goals. Following individual counseling, group counseling, and consultation cases, teachers, parents, or clients reported the degree to which they believed case outcome goals were met using a scale of 1 (situation got significantly worse) to 3 (situation stayed the same) to 5 (goal completely met). As a measure of validity school psychology students directing the case interventions were also report case outcomes based on the GAS.

Effect sizes. Effect sizes for the various small N designs used in individual consultation cases were used to evaluate intervention outcomes based on direct observations of the target behavior. Several different types of small n designs were used to evaluate direct observational data including: A/B designs, multiple baseline designs, multitreatment designs, and reversal designs. Effect sizes for each target behavior were calculated using a "no assumptions" approach (Busk & Serlin, 1992). This approach calculates effects of between treatment phases without making assumptions concerning population distributions or homogeneity of variance. Effect sizes were interpreted based on Cohen's (1992) representation. Thus, an effect size of 0.2 indicates a small treatment effect, 0.5 is considered medium, and an effect size of 0.8, or greater, represents a large treatment effect.

Behavior Intervention Rating Scale: Effectiveness factor. The Effectiveness factor from the Behavior Intervention Rating Scale (BIRS; Von Brock & Elliot, 1987) was completed by teachers or parents at the conclusion of intervention services. The BIRS Effectiveness factor is comprised of 7 items scored on a 6-point Likert scale (1= low perceived efficacy; 6 = high perceived efficacy). Mean scores on the 7 items were calculated and reported as a subjective measure of case outcomes. Items comprising the BIRS Effectiveness factor are listed in Form A.

Social Validity. Social validity for case interventions will be attained using items selected from the BIRS: Acceptability factor. These items will be completed by the teacher, parent, or client at the conclusion of intervention services. This measure of social validity will identify both the acceptability and the generalizability of the intervention to other individuals. Items on the social validity measure are presented in Form B.

Rhode Island College NASP Accreditation Report - 8

Form A. Behavior Intervention Rating Scale: Effectiveness factor

These items concern your reactions to the <u>intervention</u> that was implemented to help your student/child at school and/or home. Please evaluate the <u>intervention</u> by circling the number that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

		Strongly Disagree		Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree		Strongly Agree
1.	The intervention produced a lasting improvement in the child's behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	The intervention improved the child's behavior to the point that it did not noticeably deviate from other classmates' behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	The child's behavior will remain at an improved level even after the intervention is discontinued.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	Using this intervention not only improved the child's behavior in the classroom, but also in other settings (e.g., other classrooms, home).	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	When comparing this child with a peer before and after use of the intervention, the child's and the peer's behavior were more alike after using the intervention.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	This intervention produced enough improvement in the child's behavior so that the behavior no longer is a problem.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	Other behaviors related to the problem behavior also are likely to be improved by the intervention.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Form B. Social Validity Measure

These items concern your reactions to the <u>intervention</u> that was implemented to help your student/child at school and/or home. Please evaluate the <u>intervention</u> by circling the number that best describes your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

		Strongly Disagree		Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree		Strongly Agree
1.	This was an acceptable intervention for the child's problem behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	The intervention did <u>not</u> result in negative side-effects for the child.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	The intervention would be appropriate for a variety of children.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Satisfactory

Needs

2006-2007

Domain

Form C

<u>Documentation of Student Outcomes</u>

Documentation of Student Outcomes

How well does this school psychology candidate document student outcomes?

This might include but is not limited to outcome results evaluation and documentation via comparison of pre- and post- interviews, scales, assessments of academics or social/emotional/ behavior by teachers, parents, administrators, children, and youth, and progress monitoring.

Name	Practicum or Internship (circle one)
Date of Rating	Rating covers period fromto

Excellent

Subskills

		=3	=2	Improvement = 1
Social	Outcome	Outcomes	Outcomes	None
Emotional/Behavioral	results	regarding	regarding	1,0110
Outcomes	evaluation	behavior and	changes in	
	• (with with the second	skills change	behavior and	
		evaluated	skills	
		systematically	evaluated	
	Outcome	Comprehensive	Some	Missing
	results	and coherent	documentation	B
	documentation	documentation	included	
		included		
	Monitoring	Includes plan	General plan	No plan
	plan	for systematic	for monitoring	
		monitoring	included	
Comments:				
Academic Outcomes	Outcome	Outcomes	Outcomes	None
	results	regarding	regarding	
	evaluation	behavior and	changes in	
		skills change	behavior and	
		evaluated	skills	
		systematically	evaluated	
	Outcome	Comprehensive	Some	Missing
	results	and coherent	documentation	
	documentation	documentation	included	
		included		
	Monitoring	Includes plan	General plan	No plan
	plan	for systematic	for monitoring	
		monitoring	included	
Comments:				

2004-2007

Form D Field Supervisor's Summative Evaluation

Delineated section of:

RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE

Feinstein School of Education and Human Development School Psychology Program

Field Supervisor's Summative Evaluation (CEP 629)

Domains of School Psychology Training and Practice

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	0	1	2	3	4

Directions: The rating of the intern 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 intern's competence. A description of the scale points is provided below.

RATINGS

- **0** No data, or insufficient information to make a rating at this time.
- ${f 1}$ Competence for practice is considered to be in need of further formal training. Intern seems to lack basic professional
 - maturation in this area. Skill development without academics seems doubtful.
 - **2** Competence for practice is currently considered below average, but supervision and experience are expected to develop the skill. Close supervision is required.
 - **3** Competence is at a satisfactory level for functioning as an interning school psychologist with moderate supervision.
 - **4** Competence is assessed to be above average and appropriate for an entry-level school psychologist needing only minimal supervision.

Section IV Assessment 6 – Effects on Student Learning Environments and/or Learning

5c – Aggregated Data

2007-2008

Table A Internship 2007-8: Academic / RTI Case Outcomes

Student	BIRS	Social Validity	GAS	Effect Size
	Range (1-6)	Range (1-6)	Range (1-5)	
1	3.70	5.00	3.50	2.63
2	5.80	6.00	5.00	9.40
3	3.71	5.00	4.00	1.14
4	4.40	5.70	4.50	N/A
5	4.15	5.50	4.50	20.78
6	4.70	6.00	5.00	1.75
7	5.50	6.00	4.00	13.77
8	4.57	N/A	4.00	N/A
9	5.40	5.60	4.00	1.93
10	4.70	5.30	5.00	2.58
11	4.22	5.84	4.00	6.97
12	3.60	5.30	4.00	2.70
13	5.22	6.00	5.00	9.00
	_		_	
Mean	4.59	5.60	4.35	6.60
	n=13	n=13	n=13	n=11

Table B Internship 2007-8: Counseling Case Outcomes

Student	BIRS	Social Validity	GAS	Effect Size
	Range (1-6)	Range (1-6)	Range (1-5)	
1	4.65	6.00	4.00	2.23
2	5.75	6.00	4.60	5.26
3	4.18	4.72	3.60	0.83
4	4.10	6.00	4.00	N/A
5	5.15	5.85	5.00	2.30
6	5.15	6.00	5.00	0.65
7	3.30	5.33	4.00	N/A
8	5.11	5.46	5.00	1.54
9	3.71	6.00	4.00	2.20
10	4.00	5.30	4.00	3.09
11	5.20	5.70	4.00	4.10
12	4.70	6.00	4.00	1.66
13	5.00	6.00	4.50	N/A
Mean	4.62	5.72	4.28	2.39
	n=13	n=13	n=13	n=10

Table C Internship 2007-8: Behavioral Case Outcomes

Student	BIRS	Social Validity	GAS	Effect Size
	Range (1-6)	Range (1-6)	Range (1-5)	
1	4.50	6.00	4.00	5.72
2	5.93	6.00	5.00	7.10
3	3.30	6.00	N/A	2.53
4	5.20	5.85	4.50	2.10
5	3.95	5.30	3.75	2.89
6	5.40	6.00	5.00	1.39
7	4.29	5.33	4.00	0.81
8	N/A	N/A	3.00	-0.05
9	4.00	4.70	4.00	3.84
10	4.50	6.00	4.50	1.76
11	4.10	5.70	5.00	2.95
12	4.90	6.00	5.00	9.10
13	5.20	5.85	4.16	2.96
	_			
Mean	4.61	5.73	4.33	3.32
	n=12	n=12	n=12	n=13

Table D
Practicum 2007-8: Individual Case Outcomes

Student	BIRS	Social Validity	GAS
	Range (1-6)	Range (1-6)	Range (1-5)
1	5.18	6.00	4.00
2	4.82	5.33	5.00
3	4.33	6.00	N/A
4	4.82	5.33	5.00
5	4.00	4.00	4.00
6	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	4.43	6.00	5.00
8	4.50	6.00	4.00
9	5.00	5.00	4.00
10	4.57	5.33	4.00
11	5.00	5.00	4.00
12	4.64	5.67	4.00
13	5.14	6.00	4.50
14	4.36	6.00	4.00
15	4.86	6.00	4.00
Mean	4.69	5.55	4.27
	n=14	n=14	n=13

Table E
Practicum 2007-8: Group Intervention Outcomes

Student	BIRS	Social Validity	GAS
	Range (1-6)	Range (1-6)	Range (1-5)
1	4.86	6.00	4.00
2	3.81	5.89	4.00
3	5.43	6.00	5.00
4	N/A	N/A	4.20
5	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	6.00	6.00	5.00
7	4.29	5.67	5.00
8	N/A	N/A	N/A
9	5.00	5.00	N/A
10	4.29	5.67	5.00
11	5.14	6.00	4.00
12	4.37	6.00	4.20
13	5.09	6.00	4.00
14	3.14	5.33	4.00
15	3.71	5.67	4.00
Mean	4.59	5.77	4.37
	n=12	n=12	n=12

Table F
Practicum 2007-8: Response to Intervention Case Outcomes

Student	BIRS	Social Validity	GAS	Effect Size
	Range (1-6)	Range (1-6)	Range (1-5)	
1	5.10	6.00	4.00	5.30
2	3.90	6.00	4.00	1.43
3	3.70	6.00	4.00	2.51
4	4.86	5.67	5.00	8.54
5	4.36	6.00	4.00	1.99
6	4.73	6.00	4.00	0.07
7	5.57	6.00	5.00	17.70
8	N/A	N/A	N/A	18.08
9	3.71	6.00	3.00	0.59
10	4.95	5.33	4.50	4.76
11	5.18	6.00	4.00	13.02
12	5.45	6.00	5.00	5.83
13	4.36	5.00	4.00	8.37
14	4.30	6.00	4.00	5.20
15	5.33	5.75	3.00	0.68
Mean	4.68	5.84	4.11	6.27
	n=14	n=14	n=14	n=15

Table G
Practicum 2007-8: Home-School Partnership Case Outcomes

Student	BIRS	Social Validity	GAS
	Range (1-6)	Range (1-6)	Range (1-5)
1	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	4.43	6.00	4.00
3	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	5.29	5.58	5.00
5	4.95	5.67	5.00
6	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	5.00	6.00	4.00
8	N/A	N/A	N/A
9	4.43	6.00	4.00
10	4.91	5.33	5.00
11	3.00	5.00	4.00
12	5.29	6.00	5.00
13	4.57	5.67	4.00
14	N/A	N/A	N/A
15	5.18	6.00	3.00
Mean	4.70	5.73	4.30
	n=10	n=10	n=10

2006-2007

Table H

Documentation of Student Outcomes Data

Intern	Emotional/	Emotional/	Emotional/	Academic	Academic	Academic
student	Behavioral outcome evaluation	behavioral documentation	behavioral monitoring	outcome evaluation	documentation	monitoring
	1 3	3	3	3	3	3
,	2 3	3	3	2	2	2
,	3 2	2	2	3	3	2
4	4 2	2	2	2	2	3
:	5 3	3	3	2	2	2
(5 3	3	3	2	2	2
Averag	e 2.66	2.66	2.66	2.33	2.33	2.33

Practicum student	Emotional/ Behavioral outcome evaluation	Emotional/ behavioral documentation	Emotional/ behavioral monitoring	Academic outcome evaluation	Academic documentation	Academic monitoring
1	3	3	3	2	2	2
2	3	2.	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	_ 1
3	2	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	2	1
4	$\frac{2}{2}$	2	$\frac{2}{2}$	3	2	2
5	3	3	_ 1	3	2	$\frac{1}{2}$
6	3	3	2	3	2	3
7	2	2	$\frac{-}{2}$	2	2	2
8	3	3	3	$\frac{-}{2}$	2	1
9	2	2	2	2	2	2
10	3	2	2	2	2	1
11	3	2	2	2	2	1
12	2	2	2	2	1	1
13	3	3	2	3	3	3
Average	2.6	2.4	2.1	2.3	2	1.75

Average ratings on measuring student outcomes

2006-2007	Emotional/	Academic		
	Behavioral	outcomes		
	outcomes			
Interns (n=6)	2.66	2.33		
Practicum students (n=13)	2.36	2.01		

2004-2007

Table I Field Supervisor summative Ratings Data

Intern	Domain		Domain	Intern	Domain
	2.1		2.1		2.1
2004-2005		2005-2006		2006-2007	
1	4	1	N/A	1	4
2	4	2	4	2	4
3	3.75	3	4	3	4
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	4	5	4	5	4
6	4	6	4	6	3.25
7	4	7	4		
8	4				
Mean	3.96		4		3.88