College of Education and Affiliated Programs
Annual Assessment Report
For School Psychology Program

Note: this report presents and analyzes data from the 2007-08 academic year. During that year, the College of Education and Affiliated Programs engaged in extensive efforts to refine and extend their assessment system. In many cases, data collected starting in Fall 2008 and beyond will look substantially different from the data being presented in this report.

Background

1. Describe your program (enrollment, number of faculty, general goals). Have there been any major changes since your last report?

   The philosophy of the School Psychology Credential Program is based on an ecological theoretical perspective (Brofenbrenner, 1979). By promoting an ecological model, candidates learn to understand that PreK-12 student achievement and behavioral difficulties result from a discrepancy between the developing capabilities of the student and the multiple demands of his/her environment (Ogbu, 1981; Sroufe, 1979).

   The following **goals** of the school psychology program are based on the Philosophy, Values and Beliefs statement presented above, and support the Theme and Mission Statement of the College of Education. The school psychology program goals are to:

   1. Provide competent instruction in all areas related to the practice of school psychology;
   2. Advance the knowledge base in school psychology through student research, and the research and writing of faculty;
   3. Develop in school psychology graduate students a sense of the necessity for life-long independent study as well as an appreciation of the value of collaborative interactions;
   4. Serve the needs of the community by training school psychology graduate students to provide professional services to students, schools and the community;
   5. Prepare school psychology graduate students to meet all entry-level and continuing education standards for credentialing and licensure appropriate to their future work settings.

   The CSULB School Psychology Credential Program is a 61 semester unit program (plus 9 units of prerequisite courses) housed within the Educational, Psychology, Administration and Counseling (EDPAC) department within the College of Education (CED). Nine of the 61 units are completed as part of candidates' master's degree program. Two distinct types of candidates complete the program: those who have already completed a master's degree in the behavioral or educational sciences from an accredited university (i.e. "Credential Only"), and those who complete CSULB's Master's Degree in Education, Educational Psychology Option (i.e., "Joint" educational psychology degree and school psychology credential programs). Both types of candidates typically complete the program in three years, though the latter typically take summer school.

The program currently serves 62 full- and part-time candidates with three full-time faculty members devoted to the program. In the table below is a summary of candidates admitted to and those who completed the program for years 2005-2008.

Table 1
Summary of Candidates for 2005-08

Academic Year	# of Candidates Admitted to the Program				# of Program Completers
	Female Minority	Female Non-minority	Male Minority	Male Non-Minority	
2008	7	9	2	0	18
2007	11	8	1	1	12
2006	7	6	3	3	13
2005	6	7	4	2	11

Table 2
Program Student Learning Outcomes and Relevant Standards

SLOs	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4	Outcome 5	Outcome 6	Outcome 7	Outcome 8	Outcome 9	Outcome 10
	Use systematic assessment models to collect data that are useful in identifying strengths and needs, understanding problems, and measuring progress; assessment results are then translated into empirically-based decisions about service delivery, and used to evaluate the outcomes of services	Demonstrate knowledge of behavioral, mental health, collaborative, and/or other consultation models and their application to particular situations through effective collaboration with others in planning and decision-making at the individual, group, and system levels	In collaboration with others, develop appropriate cognitive and academic goals for students with different abilities, disabilities, strengths, and needs; implement interventions to achieve those goals; and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions	In collaboration with others, develop appropriate behavioral, affective, adaptive, and social goals for students of varying abilities, disabilities, strengths, and needs; implement interventions to achieve those goals; and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions	Demonstrate the sensitivity and skills needed to work with individuals of diverse characteristics and to implement strategies selected and/or adapted based on individual characteristics, strengths, and needs	Work with individuals and groups to facilitate policies and practices that create and maintain safe, supportive, and effective learning environments for children and others	Provide or contribute to prevention and intervention programs that promote the mental health and physical well-being of students	Work effectively with families, educators, and others in the community to promote and provide comprehensive services to children and families	Evaluate research, translate research into practice, and understand research design and statistics in sufficient depth to plan and conduct investigations and program evaluations for improvement of services	Practice in ways that are consistent with applicable standards, are involved in their profession, and have the knowledge and skills needed to acquire career-long professional development
Signature Assignment(s)	Parent interview, Case study	Class presentation	Case study	Case study	Survey	Class presentation	Case study/ Report	Parent interview	Case study/Report	Report of findings
National Standards	Data-Based Decision Making	Collaborative Consultation	Effective Instruction/ Cognitive Development	Socialization/ Development of Life Skills	Student Diversity	School/ Systems Organization	Prevention/ Mental Health	Home/ School/ Community Collaboration	Research	Ethical/Legal Practice and Professional Development
Conceptual Framework	Research and Evaluation	Service and Collaboration	School Improvement	School Improvement	Values Diversity	Prepares Leaders	Prepares Leaders	Service and Collaboration	Research and Evaluation	Prepares Leaders
NCATE Elements	Knowledge and skills – other	Knowledge and skills– other	Knowledge and skills– other	Student learning– other	Professional Dispositions	Student learning-other	Knowledge and skills- other	Knowledge and skills- other	Knowledge and skills- other	Professional dispositions

Table 3
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)[1]

	Transition Point 1		
	Admission to Program		
	Applied	Accepted	Matriculated
	#	#	#
TOTAL	103	42	32

Table 4
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

	Transition Point 2
	Advancement to Culminating Experience
	#
Thesis (698)[2]	0
Comps[3]	12
Other (Advanced Credential Programs Only)	0

Table 5
Program Specific Candidate Information, 2007-2008 (snapshot taken F08)

	Transition Point 3
	Exit
	#
Degree	18
Credential[4]	15

---

[1] Represents Educational Psych and School Psych program totals.

[2] This is data on students who were enrolled in thesis work during Fall 2007 and Spring 2008. This figure may include students who actually "crossed into" this transition point prior to Fall 2007 and were still making progress on their theses at this time.

[3] This is data on the number of students who *applied* to take the comprehensive examination in Fall 2007, Spring 2008, or Summer 2008. The data include students who may not have taken or passed the examination(s).

[4] Data for Initial and Advanced Credential Programs reflects students who have filed for their credential with the Credential Office. These data generally include students who have completed the program 1 or more years prior to filing their credential request, particularly related to the advanced credential programs. Data are reported for Summer 2007, Fall 2007, and Spring 2008.

Table 6
Faculty Profile 2007-08[5]

Status	Number
Full-time TT/Lec.	4
Part-time Lecturer	11
Total:	15

2. How many of the total full- and part-time faculty in the program reviewed and discussed the assessment findings described in this document? Please attach minutes and/or completed worksheets/artifacts to document this meeting.

   Kristi Hagans and Kristin Powers, both full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty, who teach the three courses where the signature assignments are required.

Data

3. Question 3 is in 2 main parts focused on *primary* data sources related to: student learning and program effectiveness/student experience:

   a. Candidate Performance Data: Provide *direct* evidence for the student learning outcomes assessed this year and describe how they were assessed (the tools, assignments, etc. used). Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, percentage passing as appropriate for each outcome.

   Case study assignments from three required courses in the school psychology program (EDP 527, 579, 560) require candidates to collect baseline data, develop student goals, develop and implement (or assist in the implementation of) an intervention, collect and graph weekly progress monitoring data, and make data-based decisions regarding the efficacy of implemented interventions. SLOs assessed include *Data-Based Decision Making* (SLO 1); *Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills* (SLO 3); and *Socialization and Development of Life Skills* (SLO 4).

   Table 7 below displays case study assessment results in terms of number of case study assignments, average percentage of points earned, and standard deviations across three cohorts.

---

[5] Represents Educational Psychology and School Psychology program totals.

Table 7
Average Case Study Grades (%) by Course across Three Cohorts

	EDP 527 (Fall only)			EDP 560 (Spring only)			EDP 579 (Fall only)		
YEAR	N	%	SD	N	%	SD	N	%	SD
2004-2005	11	94	1.63	16	92	1.76	11	94	1.17
2005-2006	14	93	2.32	17	88	2.98	14	92	1.76
2006-2007	13	90	6.1	15	95	1.49	11	92	2.26
2007-2008	17	89	11.76	16	100	0	22	93	6.0

b. Program Effectiveness Data: What data were collected to determine program effectiveness and how (e.g., post-program surveys, employer feedback, focus groups, retention data)? This may be indirect evidence of student learning, satisfaction data, or other indicators or program effectiveness. Describe the process used for collection and analysis. Present descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, or summarized qualitative data, for each outcome.

All final fieldwork candidates participate in a Performance-Based Exit Interview and are asked four standard questions related to three program SLOs: *Data-Based Decision Making* (SLO 1; Question 1 & 2), *Diversity* (SLO 5; Question 4), and *School Psychology Practice and Development* (SLO 10; Question 4). The candidates do not receive advanced preparation on these topics and questions are kept secure from candidates. The interview panel, comprised of three credentialed school psychologists from the program's Community Advisory Board, is provided a scoring rubric and anchors to rate candidates' responses to questions. Responses are scored on a scale of 1 – 5, with '1' being 'Inadequate/Needs Improvement'; '3' being 'Adequate/Average'; and '5' being 'Exceptional. Ratings were averaged across the three panelists to obtain a mean score by question as well as overall interview score for each candidate.

Table 8 below summarizes candidates' performance on the 2006, 2007, and 2008 exit interview exam.

Table 8
Exit Interview Mean Performance by Question for 2006, 2007, 2008

Year	Question				Overall Score
	1	2	3	4	
2006	3.95	4.03	4.05	3.51	4.00
2007	3.74	3.2	3.5	2.7	3.3
2008	3.37	2.60	3.08	2.33	2.85

4. Complementary Data: You may provide *additional* information (e.g., other data, copies of letters of support from granting agencies or school staff, etc.) about candidate performance, the student experience or program effectiveness used to inform programmatic decision making. This may include quantitative and qualitative data sources.

NA

Analysis and Actions

5. What do the data for each outcome say regarding candidate performance and program effectiveness? Please note particular areas of strength or areas in need of improvement.

Candidate Performance. Overall, candidates' performance on case studies is above average. Although we would hope to see a gradual improvement in skills overtime as candidates engage in multiple opportunities to learn and practice skills, there is little evidence that candidates' assessed skills progress from novice (EDP 579), to competent (EDP 560), to proficient (EDP 527). However, this progression is confounded by candidates' ability to influence the assessment-to-intervention process. In EDP 579 candidates work in a clinic setting and have complete control over the assessment and intervention activities. In EDP 560 and EDP 527, they must negotiate the policies and practices at their school placement. Additionally, the increase in class size could account for the variability in average scores across the three cohorts. Cohorts increased significantly in 2007-2008 in EDP 527 and 579 where the largest variability in candidate scores occurred. Instructors may have had difficulty implementing instructional activities normally conducted with a smaller class.

Another possible explanation for a decrease in case study scores is that candidates may have received inconsistent feedback from faculty regarding the quality of their case study assignments. Thus, the rubric used in 2007-2008 was revised for use in fall 2008 to provide more uniform, detailed, and consistent feedback to candidates regarding the quality of assessment, intervention, and report writing skills. The revised rubric also will allow us to report out on candidate subskills directly linked to program SLOs.

Also implemented in fall 2008 was additional class time for candidates to discuss case studies with peers using an instructor-developed case study worksheet as a guide. Candidates meet five times throughout the semester for 15-20 minutes, complete the case study worksheet, and return it to the instructor for written feedback. Thus, candidates are receiving timely, formative feedback on their case studies that is conducive to larger class sizes.

Program Effectiveness. Performance variability among candidates and across items and cohorts suggests the exit interview adequately differentiates stronger candidates from weaker ones, and identifies content areas that have been taught better than others. Again, however, performance variability among the cohort may be explained by the larger number of students in the cohort and thus, greater variability.

6. How do these findings compare to past assessment findings?

   Overall, candidates performed in the 'Adequate' range on exit interview questions measuring *Data-Based Decision Making* (SLO 1) and *School Psychology Practice and Development* (SLO 10), with the 2005-2006 cohort outperforming the 2006-2007 cohort on all questions. Mean overall scores by cohort also indicate that the 2006 cohort outperformed both the 2007 and 2008 cohort.

7. What steps, if any, will be taken with regard to curriculum, programs, practices, assessment processes, etc. based on these findings in Questions 5 and 6? Please link proposed changes to data discussed in Q5.

   Candidate performance on item 4 on the exit interview has historically received the lowest ratings each year of implementation. As a result, program faculty met and identified readings, lessons and exercises to be introduced into various courses to better prepare candidates to obtain proficiency in this domain of practice. However, performance did not increase in 2008. Thus, program faculty will be revisiting these data and brainstorming ways to increase candidate performance before administration of the 2009 exit interviews.