PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Program Philosophy
The program philosophy of the Pupil Personnel Services Program at CSU, Chico emphasizes proactive, prevention-oriented services and intervention at a systemic level where possible. Students are trained in a wide range of school psychological functions including but not limited to counseling and crisis intervention, psychoeducational approaches to the development of social and self-management skills in children, behavioral and instructional consultation, assessment, inservice training, program development and program evaluation, and collaboration with other professionals to intervene in children's problems and optimize their educational and personal development.

In our preventive approach to service delivery, we utilize a model combining three levels of service delivery, consisting of primary prevention, secondary intervention, and tertiary intervention. Services are provided at five systemic levels, ranging from specific individuals to the community at large. In our carefully guided and supervised school counseling fieldwork and school psychology internship, students categorize their activities in terms of this model, in order to keep in mind the goal of intervention of a more preventive nature and at broader systemic levels.

Another hallmark of our program is that specific competencies are attached to all coursework, so that both students and instructors can be clear about the central objectives of their training and the criteria on which evaluation and credentialing are based. Each semester, students' attainment of specific competencies for the courses they have taken are documented. Examples of competencies (i.e. those for our field experiences) are shown in Appendix A. Furthermore, field site supervisors provide formative evaluations at the end of each fall semester, and summative evaluations at the end of each spring semester (see Appendix B for field site supervisor student evaluation form). No credential is recommended for any student until all competencies in all required courses have been certified in writing as having been met.

Our program offers both School Counseling and School Psychology credentials through the Commission on Teacher Credentialing of the State of California.
However, although students receive both credentials at the end of the program and receive thorough training in counseling, the school psychology role is emphasized throughout. Only students who intend to complete both credentials are accepted into the program.

Program Goal
The goal of the Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program at CSU, Chico, as stated in the Department of Psychology's Strategic Plan, is to provide instruction and training experiences that prepare school psychologists to act in a proactive, preventive fashion as well as engage in collaborative problem-solving to serve the educational, emotional, social and cognitive development needs of children.

CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVES

The course of study for a PPS Credential in School Psychology is generally three years in duration. The total program consists of 77 semester units conceptualized as a knowledge-base-to-skill-base instructional sequence for each area of practice.

The program is composed of a logical sequence of coursework and field experience closely supervised by faculty whose primary professional identification and training is in the field of School Psychology. Coursework includes: (a) the graduate academic core, consisting of advanced developmental psychology, advanced human learning, research methods and program evaluation, psychological assessment, and thesis (Psychology 331, 332, 300, 355, 399)*; (b) strands of coursework in counseling (273A, 370, 373A, 373B), assessment (355, 360/360A, 361/361A, 363), behavioral and instructional consultation (332, 355, 339), and School Psychology practice (380A-B-C). The latter sequence includes an overview of education and the profession, the philosophical orientation of the program, and instruction in program development and evaluation, laws and ethics, prevention, early intervention, and childhood exceptionalities. For each of these areas, practica, fieldwork, and internship experiences are provided in which skills and knowledge are applied, practiced and polished.

*Since all courses required in the PPS program are offered through the Department of Psychology, we will cite only course numbers in this document.

MASTER SCHEDULE OF REQUIRED COURSES

FALL: YEAR 1
Psychology 332 Advanced Human Learning
Psychology 273A Counseling Psychology
Psychology 380A School Psychology: Introduction to the Profession and Education
Psychology 300 Research and Evaluation Methods
**SPRING: YEAR 1**
- Psychology 380B: School Psychology: Childhood Exceptionalities
- Psychology 355: Psychological Testing in the Schools
- Psychology 370: Seminar in Group Counseling
- Psychology 373A: Practicum in Individual Counseling

**FALL: YEAR 2**
- Psychology 360: Assessment of Intelligence and Cognition
- Psychology 360A: Practicum in Assessment of Intelligence and Cognition
- Psychology 372: Cross-cultural Issues in Counseling and Research
- Psychology 373B: Practicum in Group Counseling
- Psychology 388A: Fieldwork in School Counseling I
- Psychology 339: Practicum in Psychological School Consultation

**SPRING: YEAR 2**
- Psychology 331: Advanced Developmental Psychology
- Psychology 361: Social and Emotional Assessment
- Psychology 361A: Practicum in Social and Emotional Assessment
- Psychology 380C: School Psychology: Legal/Ethical Issues, Prevention
- Psychology 388B: Fieldwork in School Counseling II

**FALL: YEAR 3**
- Psychology 363: Advanced Supervision in Psychological Assessment
- Psychology 389A: Internship in School Psychology I
- Psychology 399: Master's Study (Thesis)

**SPRING: YEAR 3**
- Psychology 378: Life Cycles and Careers: Seminar in Career Counseling and Development
- Psychology 389B: Internship in School Psychology II
- Psychology 399: Master's Study (Thesis)

**INTERNSHIP REQUIREMENTS**

By the time a PPS Credential in School Psychology is awarded, students have gained a great deal of field experience. This begins in their second semester in the MA program where, in cooperation with local school psychologists, students are placed in school sites for a half day to a whole day per week. They see approximately five child clients in the school setting (as well as a similar number of adult clients in the University clinic) and complete several assessment assignments. This gives them an opportunity to become familiar with the public school setting and to learn about the job of the school psychologist with whom they are placed.
The following year, students are assigned to a school site two days per week for an entire academic year for school counseling field practice. This field experience is characterized by realistic working conditions, with substantial supervision and support from a school psychologist on site and a University supervisor. Students engage in individual and group counseling, classroom psychoeducational and skill training presentations, behavioral and instructional consultation, student study team meetings, and assessment. In the fieldwork course, they submit weekly logs, receive weekly supervision from their field supervisors, participate in weekly three-hour seminars, and meet monthly on an individual basis with their University supervisor (who consults with their field supervisor monthly prior to these meetings).

In their final year, students demonstrate their knowledge and skill in assessment, intervention, individual educational program evaluation, consultation, group assessment, supervision and working with community agencies in an internship at a school site. They serve four days per week in the school site through the entire school year and receive University supervision on the fifth day. As in the previous year, they submit weekly logs, participate in weekly three-hour seminars, and meet monthly on an individual basis with their University supervisor (who consults with their field supervisor monthly prior to these meetings). During their first semester, they concurrently enroll in an advanced supervision seminar to give them additional consultation and guidance in the assessment process and report writing.

Note: Please see Appendix C, School Psychology Training brochure, and Appendix D, Pupil Personnel Services policy document, for additional information and documentation regarding program philosophy, objectives, curriculum, and internship requirements.

PROGRAM FACULTY

The School Psychology program at CSU Chico is the primary teaching responsibility of three full-time faculty. Two of these faculty hold Ph.D. degrees in educational psychology and the third holds her Ph.D. in psychology. All three faculty attended programs with a School Psychology emphasis or specialization, and one has eight years experience as a full-time school psychologist in the schools. All are tenured full professors. Tenured faculty are typically assigned a 24 unit per academic year (two semesters) teaching responsibility. Release time in the form of three units per semester is generally granted faculty who coordinate the School Psychology program. In addition to the core faculty, ten other tenured or tenure-track faculty from the Department of Psychology also participate in the instruction of PPS students. Information regarding the core School Psychology faculty members is presented below.
Dr. James Wolfe received his Ph.D. in Educational Psychology from the University of Georgia in 1991. This program was both APA and NASP approved. He specialized in School Psychology with minors in assessment and neuropsychology, and completed his predoctoral clinical psychology internship at the Geisinger Medical Center in Danville, Pennsylvania. He has worked eight years as a full-time school psychologist and currently is employed as a consultant to two local school districts. He also has had clinical experience in hospital and clinic settings. He is a California Credentialled School Psychologist, and his national certification as a school psychologist is currently up for renewal. He received tenure and promotion to Professor in 1997. He is currently co-coordinator of the School Psychology program and devotes 100% of his time to this program.

Dr. Denise Worth received her Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of Tennessee in 1978, and specialized in School Psychology. She is a licensed psychologist in the state of California and does part-time consulting as a clinician. She received tenure in 1989 and promotion to Professor in 1994. She is co-coordinator of the School Psychology program and devotes 90% of her time to the program.

Dr. Neil Schwartz received his Ph.D. in educational psychology from Arizona State University in 1981. He specialized in School Psychology as well as Learning, Instruction and Cognition but took specialty comprehensive exams only in School Psychology. Neil is a licensed psychologist in the state of Arizona, where he was also formerly credentialled as a school psychologist. He received tenure in 1989 and promotion to Professor in 1993. He previously co-coordinated the PPS Program and is currently assigned approximately 50% to the School Psychology program. He has worked as a consultant to various schools, clinics and hospitals and is very active in research on cognition and instruction.

**STUDENTS/GRADUATES**

Currently there are a total of 24 students enrolled in the MA program tracking toward a PPS credential in School Psychology. Seven of these students are scheduled to complete the PPS program this spring (2002) and become credentialled as school psychologists. Ten students are in the second year of the program. In their first year of the MA program (PPS track) are seven additional students.

For the past five years, the following number of students have completed the PPS program and received their credentials as school psychologists:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Graduated</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the students listed above, four other students have met all coursework and internship requirements associated with the program, and are presently working with emergency credentials as school psychologists. All are anticipating graduation from the program within the next year after their thesis requirement is completed.

The blinded transcripts of three recent graduates of the current program are included in Appendix E. Please note that transcripts of these students do not reflect recent changes made to the schedule beginning in the Spring, 2001 semester (specifically 380B-School Psychology: Childhood Exceptionalities). A transcript of a second-year student who completed this course is therefore also included in Appendix E.

PROGRAM ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO LAST NASP PROGRAM REVIEW

No areas were given an evaluation of NON in the previous review. However, several standards under II, Knowledge Base, Training Philosophy, Goals and Objectives, were given a rating of NA, to indicate that certain areas were not adequately addressed or documented in the folio or that preparation appeared weak. Each of these areas (2.2-2.6) is addressed below:

2.2. Psychological Foundations. The only psychological foundations area in which concern was expressed was human exceptionalities. We agreed with the reviewers that coursework in exceptionalities was weak, and we also felt that it came too late in the program. We were already working on a solution to this problem at the time of our folio submission in 1998, and we now have redesigned our school psychology practice sequence to include a single course which focuses on exceptionalities and neuropsychology, given in the second semester of the first year (380B: School Psychology: Study of Childhood Exceptionalities). Although many of the topics related to human exceptionalities were covered in other courses, especially the former 380C, the new 380B consolidates these topics and provides additional background on neuropsychology, the special education system and the role of the school psychologist. The previous 380B course is now 380C due to the change in sequencing. Please see transcript #4 in Appendix E, which reflects this change. Also, see Appendix F, for the 380B syllabus.

2.3-2.6. In these areas of the 1998 review, our concerns were not substantial enough to act prior to the awaited new state credential standards. In some specific cases, we felt that coverage was perhaps not clear from course titles and descriptions, although course syllabi often showed that these areas were covered to at least some degree. We have slightly increased the content in several areas, as noted below, and will consider these concerns along with other parameters (i.e., the new state and national standards) in the curriculum and competency review we are currently undertaking. Now that we have the new
state and national standards, we have been undertaking conversations within the core faculty, with the PPS Committee, and with the PPS Advisory Board to consider program changes in preparation for 2003 accreditations.

In an effort to clarify further what is currently covered in the areas noted, we address each area specifically below. Several content areas are infused across courses in such a way that documentation is fragmented and at times difficult. The following paragraphs provide further detail about how we are currently addressing the areas of concern, and possible directions of future change. Additional potential changes are discussed further on in this document.

2.3. Educational Foundations. The 1998 review pointed out that we do not have education courses, and expressed concern regarding coverage of instructional design and school organization and operation. Due to our program’s location within a Department of Psychology and a College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, we have historically provided all of the instruction in courses required for the school counseling and school psychology credentials. While the College of Communication and Education houses several teaching credential programs and courses related to these areas, those courses are designed for other programs and do not efficiently address the content needed for future school psychologists (not surprisingly, since we have no involvement in curriculum development in other colleges). That is, the heavy content demand of school psychology preparation would not allow our students to participate in whole courses in these areas, geared primarily to future teachers, while still learning enough about the field of school psychology. Our approach allows us to integrate instructional information with psychological knowledge about cognition, and similarly integrate all of these areas with the role of the school psychologist. Therefore, content regarding instructional design, the organization of schools, school reform, and related areas are infused through numerous courses in our curriculum.

The introductory course, 380A, includes an introduction to principles of effective instruction, effective schools and school reform processes, the structure of schools, classroom management, and several types of interventions from counseling to tutoring programs. The amount of instruction that is devoted to the educational system and instructional practice and interventions has also been increased slightly over previous levels. One of our assessment courses (355) has also added content regarding instruction and the development of reading. Refer to syllabi for 380A and 355 in Appendix F for documentation of these changes. There are several other courses wherein students study content relevant to educational foundations, as well, although no major changes have been made in those courses. The advanced human learning course, 332, includes cognitive principles relevant to instructional design as well as the development of reading skill and other academic areas. During their fieldwork in school counseling (388A-B), students design a program of services for a district, which includes an examination of the organizational structure and budget of the
district. The practicum in consultation (339) includes readings regarding instructional design and interventions as well as the requirement of an instructional consultation. In their advanced supervision in assessment, 363, students further review the development of reading skill and are taught how to use a diagnostic reading inventory as a vehicle to study and assess reading and reading disorders. The first internship semester is timely for this training. Furthermore, emphasis in all assessment courses is solidly placed on directly tying cognitive deficits displayed by children to specific areas of academic difficulty. Thus, the overall emphasis in our program is very much in keeping with the current movement away from a test-and-place model of psychological services and toward increased knowledge of and involvement in instruction designed to improve the development of academic skills in all children. This fits with our long-term emphasis on prevention and services to all children. Our most recent graduate survey showed considerable improvement in graduates’ perceptions of their preparation in the area of instruction since 1995. Having pointed out all of these aspects of educational background in the coursework undertaken by our students, we also emphasize that we are paying particular attention to this area in our current curriculum review, and are considering other ways of including more instructional/school organization content and/or consolidating it in one or two courses. We agree that there is an increasing need for school psychologists to be knowledgeable about instructional design and the development of academic skills, and this is the area we are most interested in increasing and reorganizing over the next couple of years as a result of our current discussions.

2.4. Interventions/Problem-Solving. We were somewhat perplexed by this concern in the review, particularly the phrase “does not include behavioral and academic interventions extensively.” While we indeed provide extensive training in counseling skills (and consistently receive supportive feedback about the critical importance of these communication skills in a wide variety of contexts), we also provide both instruction and practice in a wide variety of other interventions. The competencies in Appendix A illustrate some of the interventions students are expected to practice, and syllabi reflecting some of this material are in Appendix F. Students are initially exposed to a wide variety of potential interventions (such as tutoring, social skill training, early intervention, and parent training) in the introductory course (360A). The following year, they are required to undertake classroom and small group instruction and training in a variety of areas (e.g., social skills, emotional awareness, study skills, disability awareness, conflict management) and undertake behavioral and instructional consultation. The entire focus of 339, built upon background information provided in 332 and 355, is on behavioral and instructional intervention. Trainees plan a wide variety of intervention programs for individual students throughout both years of field practice, and design systemic programs of intervention in each year (a broad school counseling program in the first case, a community program involving collaboration with other agencies in the latter). In the course of field practice many students also undertake the creation or
administration of additional programs of intervention, such as tutoring or peer mediation programs. The advanced assessment seminar also emphasizes throughout the importance of linking assessment to intervention, and provides various measures, procedures, and instructional strategies with this goal in mind. Also, many guest speakers, student presentations and discussions during the field practice seminar include information about a wide variety of interventions, from gang prevention to reading programs. While current curricular discussions include possible reorganization of the way various intervention methods are addressed, we intend to continue to include extensive background in behavioral and academic intervention, consultation, and systemic planning and change.

2.5. Statistics and Research Methodologies. We were also perplexed by the review's concern about coursework in statistics and tests and measurements. Our program requires undergraduate prerequisite coursework in research design and statistics, and includes further research and statistics coursework (300) and a research thesis (399). Since the requirement to conduct research (through the thesis requirement) is increasingly rare in training programs below the doctoral level, we believe that our students actually have a stronger research background than is provided in many specialist-level programs. The graduate level research/statistics course provides more extensive instruction in advanced statistical techniques. Students' grasp of these methods is substantially enhanced by their experience in designing their research, collecting and analyzing data, and writing the thesis, as all of us who have conducted our own research can appreciate. It is for this reason that we have hesitated thus far to join the trend toward comprehensive examinations or projects as the culminating activity for the master's degree. Therefore, we have no current plans to change the requirements in this area. The master's thesis is the only course without associated syllabi or competencies, since students work individually with their research mentors, and this may have led to inadequate documentation in the previously submitted folio.

Also within area 2.5, we provide extensive training in tests and measurement, and both syllabi and course competencies included in the folio documented that well. The basic psychometrics course required as a program prerequisite, along with research/statistics undergraduate and graduate coursework, provides coverage of basic measurement concepts. Students study functional analysis in the advanced human learning and consultation courses (332 and 339). Four additional graduate level assessment courses (355, 360/360A, 361/361A, and 363) provide training and supervision in conducting performance assessments, curriculum-based measurement, administration of various levels of psychological measures in cognitive and socio-emotional domains, interpreting results in the assessment and instructional context, and write cogent and instructionally relevant reports. Since feedback from graduates, supervisors and employers supports our view that students are well-prepared in this area, we are hesitant to make many curriculum changes in this area, although slight rearrangements may occur as a result of our current curriculum review.
2.6. **Professional School Psychology.** Areas considered to be weak in the previous review were the history and foundations of school psychology and training in technology. The former area has been enhanced within the introductory course, 380A, which includes both lecture material and readings regarding history and current trends in the profession. Our new 380B course on exceptionailities focuses on the role of the school psychologist in the special education process. Refer to syllabi for 380A and 380B in Appendix F. Of course, the role of the professional school psychologist is revisited constantly throughout the three-year program. While the previous standards document was vague about the “emergent technologies” considered vital, limiting our attention to this area in the folio, we believe we meet the well-detailed standard 2.11 in the 2000 NASP Standards. We have participated in and shared with our students (as well as learned from them in some cases) the many changes brought about by the growth of technology in education. Our campus has encouraged and supported technology use in general (e.g., distance learning, faculty and library computer facilities). Most current students come to us already familiar with basic technologies such as word processing, email, spreadsheets and the use of web resources. We communicate regularly with students electronically, including the weekly submission of internship logs, and we regularly provide information about additional websites and library online research tools. Students make a variety of presentations to classes throughout the program, and many use presentation software to do so (we are currently considering making this a requirement for all). The use and misuse of software for test scoring, interpretation and report writing are discussed (and in some cases provided) in the assessment courses.

**OTHER CHANGES/DEVELOPMENTS SINCE LAST REVIEW**

The School Psychology Program at CSU, Chico was granted Full Approval by the Program Approval Board of NASP in December 1998 (retroactive to January 1998). In the three-year period since approval was granted, various changes have, we believe, further improved the program. These include changes in curriculum, faculty support, and community participation.

The most fundamental curricular change to the program was the addition of a course to consolidate topics dealing with various high and low-incidence handicapping conditions (380B, School Psychology: Childhood Exceptionalities). The nature of and rationale for this change is described in the section above.

In addition to the development of 380B, the point at which the counseling credential is awarded was also changed. It was the decision of the core program faculty, under the guidance of the PPS Committee, to grant both Counseling and School Psychology credentials at the end of the third year rather than granting the Counseling credential at the end of the second year as had previously been practiced. Granting the School Counseling credential in the third year allowed more flexibility in the sequencing of courses throughout the three-year program.
It was the Committee’s belief that the survey course in childhood exceptionalities (380B), which also included discussion of the role and function of the school psychologist in special education and the special education referral process, should be provided in the first year of the program. Granting the counseling credential later in the program allowed us to move the career counseling course to the third year and make other master schedule readjustments, thereby freeing up space earlier in the sequence for the course on exceptionalities. This change also emphasized to prospective graduate students our primary program objective of training school psychologists rather than school counselors, and made it more difficult for students to prematurely leave the program after two years with a counseling but not a school psychology credential. Although this had not been a significant problem in the past, it was the belief of the committee that, with a limited number of slots available in our graduate program, only those students seriously considering careers in school psychology should be considered for admission.

The program has also benefited from the addition of a new faculty member to the Department of Psychology in 1999. Although she was hired to primarily teach in the area of educational psychology, Katherine Cushing was a practicing school psychologist for ten years prior to receiving her Ph.D. from the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Arizona. She has an extensive clinical, administrative and research background in areas related to assessment and reading and is active in local public school collaboration. She is presently a member of the PPS Committee and teaches one of the core assessment courses for PPS graduate students. Dr. Cushing has been supportive of the PPS program in many ways and we look forward to her continued participation.

It should also be noted that last spring the Department of Psychology, at the request of the core faculty of the PPS program and PPS committee, endorsed a faculty search to hire an additional PPS core instructor. Unfortunately, due to financial constraints of the department and college, this search was not approved; and recent budget constraints have postponed it further. It is, however, the intention of the PPS program to pursue the addition of a new faculty member in the near future.

Coupled with the above noted changes and developments in curriculum and faculty, the PPS advisory board has also recently been augmented to include a broader and more diverse group of participants. This was done in an effort to draw more comprehensively from those throughout the community and university with related experiences and interests. Our advisory board now consists of members including school psychologists, school counselors, program specialists, school principals, special education directors, social workers, teachers, and university professors from a variety of related disciplines.
STUDENT AND PROGRAM EVALUATION PROCEDURES

As was described in section 3 above, our program has competencies attached to each required course. This extensive document was included in our 1988 folio, and examples are provided in Appendix A. Competencies guide instructional experiences and requirements and clearly communicate expectations to students. Following satisfactory completion of coursework, professors document that each student has completed the associated program competencies. This long-term practice of our program dovetails nicely with requirements that we clearly evaluate whether each student meets each program objective. While the introductory courses include numerous academic competencies, the program as a whole includes a large proportion of competencies met through actual practice, primarily in school settings and under the combined supervision of site psychologists and university supervisors. Although other courses have applied components, this is especially true of the practica (360A, 361A, 373A, 373B, 339, and 363) and field practice courses (388A-B and 389A-B). In addition to the competencies, these conditions of both formal and informal observation and close communication provide a great deal of feedback about student performance from a wide variety of perspectives, including unusually close University contact with both students (intense supervision during practica and one day per week during internship) and supervising psychologists (at least monthly telephone contact) continuing through the internship. An additional source of documentation and evaluation of student performance, also directly tied to competencies, is our new intern evaluation form (Appendix B). This form is now being completed by site supervisors at the end of each semester, providing additional formative evaluation after one semester and a written summative evaluation at the end of the academic year.

Thus, we receive very direct feedback, both anecdotal and databased, about the impact of our trainees on the pupils, parents, and staff with whom they work. Some of our competencies demand that trainees provide this type of evaluative feedback directly (e.g., 339, see Appendix E). In other cases the competencies reflect only implicitly that the trainee is having a positive impact, and the feedback from supervisors and other staff is rather general. Clearly, the most general change that will be needed in our current set of competencies during the current review will be to strengthen the demand that students measure and document more frequently the impact of their services. These changes will also be reflected on our intern evaluation form. We see this focus on outcomes as an improvement and very much in line with current trends in educational assessment. Our competencies provide an effective vehicle for incorporating new expectations regarding performance-based assessment in terms of impact on outcomes for children/clients, as is discussed further in the section below.

There has not been a formal process for aggregating competency data for program evaluation. It would not be difficult to do so; however, selection procedures and intensive formative evaluation and feedback are such that most
students meet all competencies, with few program failures following entry in the spring of the first graduate year. Furthermore, faculty are very directly familiar with student performance on competencies, due to small program numbers. We also receive regular feedback on our graduates from many regional employers on a more informal basis. Even though competency data is not used systematically in program evaluation, the competencies have provided a natural basis to ensure that ongoing changes in program approval and accreditation standards are reflected in instruction. This occurs as we review our competencies for each round of substantial curriculum review at approximate five-year intervals. Thus, new standards automatically become reflected in student performance standards assigned to courses. It is this process in which we are currently engaged, response to new training standards and in preparation for next year’s state accreditation and originally anticipated NASP approval extension review.

Other program evaluation information has been based primarily on (1) graduate surveys at approximately five-year intervals (the last was conducted in Fall 2000 in conjunction with the University’s institutional review of the Department of Psychology’s programs), (2) faculty familiarity with practice through literature, practice, and involvement in state and trainers’ organizations, (3) faculty contact with practice through weekly intern logs and monthly conversations with field supervisors regarding student performance and other trends and events in the profession, and (4) guidance from the PPS Committee and the PPS Advisory Board, the latter of which has a wide variety of professional educators who work with our interns or graduates.

PROGRAM PLANS OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS, INCLUDING PLANS TO ADDRESS NEW NASP STANDARDS

Some of our program’s plans over the next five years will emerge from the curriculum review we are currently engaged in. Feedback from the various sources of program review cited above suggest that the areas we will examine most closely include:

- the sequencing of second-year instruction and practica experiences supporting field placement activities (several discussions regarding our concerns in this area have already taken place, due to some discontinuities between practicum assignments and the natural sequence of activities in the field);
- increasing further the educational foundations curriculum (organization and operation of schools, curriculum design, remediation of reading and other instructional problems) and perhaps introducing a first-semester volunteer placement in a school setting;
- enhancement of instruction in the areas of crisis intervention and non-special-education assessment.
While these are all areas we wish to address more adequately, we are also realistic about the amount of material that can reasonably be handled well within the limits of a three-year training program. There will always be certain areas of expertise within school psychology where we can only give students an introductory understanding and information about further resources. Perhaps more importantly, we provide an orientation to the field that emphasizes continuing education and the ability to find current information regarding new professional challenges.

An additional influence on this review is the presence of a new MSW degree program on campus. Since its faculty intend to seek approval to grant a state credential in School Social Work, this may have an impact on the school counseling aspect of our program, and thus on the overall program structure. This program is housed within our college, and we are meeting with their faculty to explore whether there is sufficient overlap in requirements and curriculum for the two credentials that a combined course could serve both programs. The courses most likely to be affected would be the current 380C (former 380B, covering laws and ethics, school services planning and evaluation, and prevention research) and 378 (career counseling). As we both work to address new state credentialing standards, we will have an eye to the practicality and desirability of continuing to offer the school counseling credential along with the primary goal of the school psychology credential. As both fields continue to add requirements, it may become impossible to meet all of the standards for the school counseling credential as well as school psychology standards within the framework of our three-year program.

One fortunate aspect of the direction of the new standards is the overlap between emergent state and national standards, and these will be additional factors driving our curriculum update. For instance, we will be working to ensure that we are more systematically including content and experiences in the areas of home-school collaboration and crisis intervention and planning. These are areas we have been increasingly including in our instruction, but primarily thus far in the form of presentations in internship seminars, which provide limited coverage. We expect to re-examine the overall curriculum to determine where these competencies would fit most logically.

As mentioned in the previous section, our competencies will be the primary vehicle for incorporating new expectations regarding performance-based assessment in terms of impact on outcomes for children/clients. In our current curriculum review, we will add competencies requiring greater documentation of student outcomes. Aggregating this data in some way will also provide program directors with a clear indication of the effectiveness of our trainees overall, and an additional lens for program evaluation through analyzing the types of outcomes they achieve in practice.