



COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING
Ensuring Educator Excellence

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report**
(For Institutions in the Yellow, Blue, and Violet Cohort Due Summer/Fall 2012)
Academic Years 2010-11 and 2011-12

Institution	California State University, Fresno
Date report is submitted	August 1, 2012
Program documented in this report	Ed.S., School Psychology
Name of Program	School Psychology
Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other)	NA
Credential awarded	PPS in School Psychology
Is this program offered at more than one site? No	
If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered	
Program Contact	Marilyn Wilson
Title	Coordinator
Phone #	559-278-5129
E-Mail	marilynw@csufresno.edu
If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:	
Name	
Title	
Phone #	
E-mail	

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART I – Contextual Information

School Psychology

California State University, Fresno is one of 23 universities in the California State University system. Fresno State began as a normal school in 1911 and has a strong history of service and preparation of education professionals. Fresno State's last joint visit (NCATE/CCTC) was in March 2006. The Dean of the Kremen School of Education and Human Development is the Unit Head that oversees 16 programs.

The School Psychology program is a three year program of 57 units in courses, 16 units in fieldwork, and a 3-unit thesis or project. The program consists of two years of coursework and minimum 500 hours of practica in the schools, followed by a 1200 hour internship in the third year. The program operates on a cohort model with students admitted only in the fall. It is offered only as a full-time program with most courses in the day, although students can chose to extend their program to 4 years.

At completion of the program students are awarded the Ed.S. degree and are eligible for the California Pupil Personal Services (PPS) Credential in School Psychology and the National Certificate in School Psychology (NCSP). The program has been fully approved by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) since 1994 and was recently approved through 2017. In spring 2012 the program underwent University Program Review and received a very positive report from the Program Review Team. An action plan will be developed in Fall 2012 as part of the Psychology Department retreat and review.

Program Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
	2010-11		2011-2012	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>

Changes Since Last Accreditation Activity (Biennial Report, Program Assessment or Site Visit).

- Coursework in mental health (e.g., counseling, psychopathology) strengthened (2011-12)
- Project option approved as alternative culminating event (2011)

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

a) Assessment of Ed.S. Candidates - School Psychology Program

Year 1 Assessments	Year 2 Assessments	Recommendation for Internship Credential	Year 3 Internship	Year 3 Credentials
Maintain 3.0 GPA	Advancement to Candidacy	Pass PRAXIS II at the national level	Pass internship class requirement	Apply for PPS credential
Pass Research sequence with grade of A or B	Maintain 3.0 GPA	Have thesis / project proposal meeting	Logs for 1200 hours of internship	Submit PRAXIS scores
Pass University Graduate Writing Requirement	Demonstrate competencies for Behavior Intervention Case Manager (BICM – CA FBA qualification)	Submit thesis committee form	Faculty site visit(s)	Apply for NCSP
Practicum Supervisor evaluations (each semester)	Practicum Supervisor evaluations (each semester)		Field supervisor evaluations (each semester)	
Faculty ratings (each semester)	Faculty ratings (each semester)		Evaluations from administrator, 2 teachers, parent (each semester)	
Individual evaluation meetings with school psychology faculty (each semester)	Individual evaluation meetings with school psychology faculty (each semester)		Faculty ratings	
NASP Portfolio	Continuation of NASP Portfolio		Completion of NASP Portfolio	
Intervention PND	Intervention(s) PND		Defend and submit thesis / project	
			Intervention(s) PND	

b) Additional information about candidate and program completer performance or program effectiveness

ASSESSMENT	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTION
Exit surveys	Department and college exit surveys upon program completion	Ratings of satisfaction with coursework, supervision and mentoring, preparation for employment
Thesis rubrics	Completed theses are evaluated according to rubric by 3 faculty	Ratings on adequacy of all sections of thesis and writing
Portfolios	Students are asked to organize work samples by professional (NASP) domain.	Work samples Professional development Technology competence. Collected and evaluated annually
Intervention data	Course intervention projects (single subject design; target behavioral and academic goals)	Intervention data are compared to baseline data and Percent of Non-overlapping Data Points (PND) calculated. Collected and evaluated each semester
PRAXIS	Students take the PRAXIS II exam in school psychology during the 2 nd year in the program	Total and domain scores. Students are required to pass at NCSP criteria prior to beginning internship
Faculty ratings	School Psychology program faculty complete ratings for each student each semester on professional characteristics and dispositions	Numerical ratings plus anecdotal documentation. Feedback via individual meetings each semester. Remediation plans developed as needed.
Field supervisor ratings	Practicum and internship field supervisors complete an evaluation for their student each semester.	Numerical ratings in relevant areas of skill competence and characteristics. Feedback via individual meetings each semester.

c) **Aggregated data from 4-6 instruments that were described in (a) and (b).**

1. PRAXIS

All NASP approved programs are now required to submit PRAXIS II data as part of the program approval process. We have required this assessment for a number of years, and students must obtain the NCSP passing score of 165 prior to going on internship. All students obtained this; the average score for 2011 was 176.09 (SD=5.20). For 2012 the average was 178.78 (SD = 6.26).

Domains measured are:

- **Data-Based Decision Making.** This included problem identification, program analysis, assessment of special populations, and research, statistics, and program evaluation.
- **Research-Based Academic Practices.** These are effective instruction, issues related to academic success/failure, and academic interventions.
- **Research-Based Behavioral and Mental Health Practices.** This included primary, secondary, and tertiary preventative strategies, school-based intervention skills and techniques, crisis prevention and intervention response, and child and adolescent psychopathology.
- **Consultation and Collaboration.** Models and methods of consultation are covered, along with school and system organization and home/school/community collaboration.
- **Applied Psychological Foundations.** This is knowledge of general psychology and measures principles and theories.
- **Ethical, Legal, and Professional Foundations.** Ethical principles and standards for practices are included, as well as legal issues related to the practice of school psychology.

Table 1. PRAXIS Scores for 2011-2012

TEST CATEGORY	POS-SIBLE	MN	SD	AVERAGE RANGE	% BELOW AVERAGE	% AVERAGE	% ABOVE AVERAGE
Spring 2011 (N= 11)							
Data-Based Decision Making	41	27.82	3.63	26-32	27%	64%	9%
Research-Based Academic Practices	15	11.82	1.40	9-12	27%	73%	0%
Behavioral & Mental Health Practices	19	15.00	1.95	15-17	0%	73%	27%
Consultation & Collaboration	14	10.36	2.06	9-12	27%	27%	45%
Applied Psych Foundations	17	11.91	1.58	10-14	9%	55%	36%
Ethic, Legal, & Professional Foundations	13	10.09	1.38	8-10	0%	73%	27%
Spring 2012 (N = 9)							
Data-Based Decision Making	41	30.78	3.35	26-32	0%	67%	33%

Research-Based Academic Practices	15	12.56	1.74	9-12	11%	78%	11%
Behavioral & Mental Health Practices	19	16.33	1.32	15-17	0%	44%	56%
Consultation & Collaboration	14	11.00	2.00	9-12	11%	56%	33%
Applied Psych Foundations	17	10.67	2.35	10-14	22%	67%	11%
Ethic, Legal, & Professional Foundations	13	10.67	1.32	8-10	0%	33%	67%

2. Faculty Ratings

Each student in the program is rated by the school psychology faculty independently each semester. Characteristics on the evaluation form were selected to reflect professional competencies and dispositions necessary for independent practice as a school psychologist. Mean ratings are presented below; aggregated data indicate high ratings across all items and cohorts.

Table 2. Faculty Ratings 2010-2012

ITEM	2010-2011 N = 29	2011-2012 N = 29
ADAPTABILITY (e.g., to changes in schedule or placement)	4.82	4.91
COMMUNICATION SKILLS (Written and oral, presentations, diplomatic in stating problems & presenting information, sensitive to cultural and linguistic diversity)	4.54	4.57
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS (Neatness, accuracy, work is completed on time, organized)	4.68	4.89
COOPERATION (With peers, faculty, staff, field supervisors, teachers, parents, students)	4.90	4.95
ETHICAL CONDUCT (In class & practicum/internship, respects confidentiality)	4.89	4.97
INDEPENDENCE (Initiative, problem solving, thesis on schedule)	4.77	4.66
KNOWLEDGE OF THE FIELD (School psychology, special education, assessment, consultation, intervention)	4.51	4.52
MATURITY (Life experience, empathy, decision making)	4.88	4.73
MOTIVATION (Curiosity, interest in the field, desire to learn and to work, takes advantage of professional development opportunities)	4.90	4.94

PERSONAL STABILITY (Receptive to feedback, emotional well-being)	4.89	4.88
PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT (Appropriate dress and behavior, pleasant, cooperative, courteous)	4.92	4.96
PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT (Use of knowledge, class and practicum attendance)	4.91	4.94
PROFESSIONAL SKILLS (Application of knowledge in evaluation, prevention, intervention, report writing)	4.47	4.66
RESPONSIBILITY (Punctual, keeps up with coursework, makes appointments, notification of change in plans)	4.90	4.89
AVERAGE	4.78	4.82

Please rate the student according to the following scale:

5=excellent, 4=good, 3=average, 2=needs improvement, 1= unacceptable, NA= not applicable

3. Field Evaluations

Field experience is considered a critical part of the program and evaluated each semester. Practicum and internship supervisors complete evaluations designed to measure the skills expected at the cohort's level of training. First and second year students are rated by their field practicum supervisor each semester. Interns have multiple field supervisors and must obtain ratings from all of them, as well as two teachers and a parent.

Table 3. Field Evaluations for Each Cohort for 2010-2012

Year	N	Fall 2010	N	Spring 2011	Mean Ratings
1	10	3.43	10	3.60	1 field supervisor rating each semester
2	11	3.64	11	3.71	1 field supervisor rating each semester
3	9	3.64	9	3.85	1-4 field supervisor ratings each semester
3	9	4.88	9	4.94	2 teacher ratings each semester
3	9	4.83	9	4.83	1 parent rating each semester
Year	N	Fall 2011	N	Spring 2012	Mean Ratings
1	9	3.67	9	3.69	1 field supervisor rating fall, 2 in spring semester
2	10	3.79	9	3.80	1 field supervisor rating fall, 2 in spring semester
3	11	3.52	11	3.44	1-4 field supervisor ratings each semester
3	11	4.82	11	4.86	2 teacher ratings each semester
3	11	4.94	11	4.97	1 parent rating each semester

- Field supervisor evaluations are rubrics with scores ranging from 1 to 4, with 4 the most positive rating.
- Teacher ratings are a 1-5 Likert scale with 5 being most positive.
- Parent ratings are a 1-5 Likert scale with 5 being most positive.

4. Intervention Case Studies

Competencies are evaluated through intervention single subject design case studies in Psych 278, 279, 286, and 267. These are evaluated each semester by the course instructor. In addition data are aggregated using Percent of Non-overlapping Data Points between baseline and intervention data. The result is interpreted as effect size.

Table 4. Percent of Non-overlapping Data Points by Cohort for 2011-2012

Year	N	Fall 2010	Spring 2011	N	Fall 2011	Spring 2012
1	10	NA	65%	9	NA	70%
2	11	49%	71%	10	65%	57%
3	9	90%	52%	11	52%	77%

5. Portfolios.

These are evaluated by program faculty at the end of each academic year for completeness. The portfolios include examples of assessments, consultation cases, interventions, home-community involvement, professional development, and technical skills (e.g., PowerPoint). Twenty-four points are possible if all components are included. Portfolios are cumulative and it is expected that students will add material each year. This progression is seen in the table below. We are working on moving the portfolio to an electronic format; the first year cohort will be submitting those in August.

Table 5. Professional Portfolio Completion Data for 2011-2012

Year	N	2011	N	2012
1	10	37%	9	NA
2	11	72%	10	79%
3	9	97%	11	95%

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

1. PRAXIS

- a. Students are required to take the PRAXIS II during their second year in the program, and to obtain passing scores according to the NCSP criteria. Students are not specifically prepped for the test by program faculty; it is assumed all critical material is covered in courses. Candidates are encouraged to review materials on their own and to study as a cohort. Scores are examined by subtest to determine areas of strength and weakness in program content.
- b. Across the two cohorts the strongest areas appear to be Behavioral and Mental Health Practices and Ethics, Legal, and Professional Foundations. Areas where some students scored in the Below Average Range both years were Research-Based Academic Practices and Consultation and Collaboration. However, there were more students scoring lower in the 2011 cohort and this has not been a systematic area of concern over several years of data collection. However, we continue to update the curriculum on academic and systems consultation in response to changes in practice.
- c. Overall students perform exceptionally well on the PRAXIS with a 100% pass rate at the level required for national certification indicating comprehensive coverage of all areas in the program and mastery by students.

2. Faculty Ratings

- a. The ratings given by faculty each semester are shared with the students at individual meetings at the end of the semester. Ratings are rigorous and vary by individual student. Any areas of concern are discussed and remediation plans developed as needed. This is also an opportunity for commending students for positive work and characteristics. Rating for skills are most varied, and expected to improve across the years of training. Overall ratings were very high for the students in the program in 2010-11 and 2011-12. No consistent areas of weakness were noted. Our ratings are supported by very strong interviews and recommendations from employers. We plan to continue to monitor and mentor students carefully.

3. Field Supervisor Ratings

- a. Overall ratings are very positive for all three cohorts. Most received higher ratings in spring semester than fall, indicating growth across the year.
- b. For the first year students, professional development, groups, and observations were rated the lowest by their field supervisor. These are developing skills.
- c. Second year students showed strength in cultural and linguistic diversity. They were receptive to feedback and eager to learn. Growing skills were presenting at IEP meetings, selecting assessment tools, developing interventions, and conducting groups. We continue to support opportunities for students to participate in IEP meetings and to become more independent in assessment. We are adding coursework on counseling, including group work.
- d. For third year students (interns) the areas that tended to be rated lowest were counseling and knowledge of crisis interventions. Assessment tended to show growth from fall to

spring semester. Knowledge of IEP paperwork is a challenge. As noted above, we are incorporating more counseling content and skills into our coursework. Crisis knowledge is part of our curriculum but perhaps difficult to assess on internship. We are including more training on IEP paperwork during the second year to better prepare interns. Overall interns were regarded as well prepared and trained and to demonstrate excellent “people skills” in communication and sensitivity.

- e. These ratings were consistently positive. The forms were redesigned several years ago into rubrics to try to counter a perceived halo effect, but regardless, the students are very well received and rated by a wide range of field supervisors, indicating quality of training. The intern ratings are particularly significant, as many have several supervisors with varied training and expectations.
- f. Teacher and parent evaluations are solicited by interns, so are not a random sample and therefore are expected to be favorable. Interns are instructed to obtain evaluations from different teachers and parents each semester. No systemic weaknesses were noted in the data.

4. Intervention Case Studies

- a. The first year cohorts complete a consultation project; the average percent of non-overlapping data points (PND) were very high both years. The second year students had two intervention projects. In 2010-2011 the cohort obtained a lower average PND for their behavior intervention project in the fall than the academic intervention in the spring; this is unusual. Typically students are more successful with behavioral interventions, as students who are targeted for academic interventions have often displayed persistent failure. The third year cohort (interns) had mixed PND for their projects. While rates varied by cohort, overall the PND were in the moderate to strong effect size range. Clearly the students are developing competencies that are resulting in positive changes in student behavior and learning. Intervention training has been a consistent strength of our program.

5. Portfolio

- a. The assessment of portfolio contents followed the expected pattern; that is students are able to complete more domains as they move through the program. Those in the first year indicated appropriate development of professional skills through papers about school psychology and related professions, professional memberships and workshop attendance. They demonstrated initial skills in observation and assessment.
- b. The second year students were able to complete more components, including beginning research, psycho-educational assessment reports, and academic and behavioral intervention case studies.
- c. The third year students have been able to provide evidence in all domains, indicating we are requiring and assessing performance in all domains.
- d. Overall analyses indicate increased accountability in diverse assessments, functional behavior analyses, and prevention activities. There is more evidence of home-school collaboration than in previous years but this is still an area for improvement.
- e. The move to E-portfolios will allow for more detailed analyses of student competence and program accountability.

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Part IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Data Source	Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made	Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)
PRAXIS	<p>The pass rate on the PRAXIS has always been very high; virtually all candidates pass the PRAXIS at the national level on their first try. Attention to maintaining research-based, cutting edge curriculum, especially related to academic interventions and systems consultation, will be continued. No other curricular or programmatic changes are indicated from the PRAXIS data.</p> <p>ACTION: Program Coordinator</p>	<p>CCTC Standard 4 – Assessment, 5 – Intervention for Achievement, 6 – Ethics and Legal mandates, 10 – consultation, 11 – Learning theory and Psychology, 13 – Collaboration, 17 – Psychological Foundations, 18 – Educational Foundations, 19 – Legal, Ethical and Professional Foundations, 20 – Collaboration and consultation, 22 – Evaluation and Assessment</p>
Faculty Ratings	<p>Monitoring of candidate’s professional characteristics, skills, and dispositions with regular feedback to candidates and remediation plans as necessary will continue.</p> <p>ACTION: School Psychology faculty</p>	<p>CCTC Standard 8 – Self-Esteem and Personal and social Responsibility, 6 & 19 – Legal, Ethical, and Professional foundations, 24 – Research, Measurement, and Technology, 27 – Determination of Candidate Competence</p>
Field Supervisor Ratings	<p>Any individual areas of lower ratings are reviewed carefully with students. Programmatic areas which might be strengthened are knowledge or and experience with the IEP process and counseling skills. We added computer IEP training to the curriculum and have increased requirements for participation in IEP meetings. In addition, enhanced communication and training with field supervisors will be pursued.</p> <p>ACTION: School Psychology Faculty supervising practicum and internship</p>	<p>CCTC Standard 3 – Socio-Cultural Competence, 8 – Self-Esteem and Personal and Social Responsibility, 25 – Practica, 26 – Culminating Field Experience, 27 – Candidate Competence</p>
Intervention Case Studies	<p>Candidate impact on children is assessed via intervention case studies. Results vary slightly but overall candidates demonstrate moderate to strong effects on student learning and behavior. Consultation and intervention are regarded as strengths of our program and will continue to be emphasized. A change has been the interim addition of a functional analysis class to the program; this was very successful in 2011-12 and will be repeated</p>	<p>CCTC Standard 5 – Comprehensive Prevention and Early Intervention for Achievement, 7 – Family-School Collaboration, 10 – Consultation, 15 – Technological Literacy, 21 – Wellness Promotion, Crisis Intervention, and Counseling,</p>

	<p>in 2012-13. If positive results are again obtained, the course will be added permanently to the program.</p> <p>ACTION: Program Coordinator</p>	23 – Program Planning and Evaluation
Portfolio	<p>No concerns were revealed with candidate competence or the program. The instrument could be strengthened with additional rubrics for scoring of component quality. We are moving to e-portfolios which will allow for more detailed analyses of candidate competency and program accountability.</p> <p>ACTION: Program Faculty; electronic portfolios: Dr. Ni</p>	<p>CCTC Standard 3 – Social-cultural Competence, 4 – Assessment, 5 – Early Intervention for Achievement, 7 – family-School collaboration, 10 – consultation, 15 – Technological Literacy, 20 – Collaboration and Consultation, 21 – Wellness promotion, Crisis Intervention, and Counseling, 22 – Individual Evaluation and Assessment, 23 Program Planning and Evaluation, 24 Research, Measurement, and Technology</p>