COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING
Ensuring Educator Excellence

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report

California State University, Fresno
Kremen School of Education and Human Development
Academic Years 2008-09 and 2009-10

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report

Academic Years 2008-09 and 2009-10

Institution	California State University, Fresno
Date report is submitted	October 15, 2010
Program documented in this report	Ed.S, School Psychology
Name of Program	School Psychology
Credential awarded	PPS

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
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:	
Phone #	
E-mail	

California State University, Fresno (09-10)
Section A-1
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 64 units in courses, 16 units in fieldwork, and a 3-unit thesis. The program consists of two years of coursework and 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. We will be undergoing reaccreditation review this year.

Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document	Date
• A thesis rubric is used as part of the Psychology Department Assessment Plan	2009
• Embedded questions were also implemented as part of the Psychology Department Assessment	2009
• School Psychology Alumni survey was administered	2010
• New Program Faculty	2009

Program Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
Site (If multiple sites)	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates
	2008-2009	2008-2009	2009-2010	2009-2010
	9	8	6	6

Section A-2
Candidate Competence and Program Effectiveness Data

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

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

b. Additional Information About Candidate and Program Completer Performance / Program Effectiveness

Alumni Survey Summary

A survey was sent to alumni of the CSU, Fresno school psychology program via Survey Monkey in May 2010. Sixty-nine completed the survey, for a response rate of 56%. Ninety percent had gradated since 1996; most had at least five years experience. The vast majority (84%) were still working as school psychologists; some had moved into administration. Our students tend to come from the Central Valley and stay in the Valley; 85% were working in Fresno or nearby counties.

The first section asked the alumni to rate all the courses they had taken in the school psych program. The courses receiving the highest ratings were the applied ones, such as assessment and consultation courses. Courses the grads rated as less valuable were more theoretical or some of the counseling courses.

The next section asked about possible areas to increase in the program. Autism was #1. More behavioral assessment and special education law were indicated. School neuropsychology and graduate statistics were most likely to be rated as not needed or only somewhat needed.

In order to keep our cognitive assessment course current and aligned with local needs, as noted earlier, most of our graduates remain in this area, respondents were asked to indicate how often certain measures were used. The measures indicated as most commonly used were the WISC-IV, UNIT, CTONI/CTONI2, WRAML2, and CTOPP. Significant numbers also used the DAS II and KABC2.

The final section assessed current Response to Intervention (RTI) practices in their districts. California has had a very varied adoption of RTI. This group was about evenly split between planning, piloting, beginning school-wide implementation, and having this in place for more than 1 year. Seventy percent were implementing RTI at the elementary level. Most reported screening and small group pullout interventions in reading and phonemic awareness. About half indicated they were doing interventions in math or writing and half noted deployment in general education classrooms for reading. Fifty percent said the RTI data were part of the special education eligibility process; only 13% were using RTI data as the primary criteria for qualification as a student with a learning disability.

The information gathered will be used to plan program and curriculum changes. These include a possible course on autism and having our counseling sequence focus more on children and adolescents. The measures included in our cognitive assessment course will be modified slightly to better align with current practice. We do include an emphasis on RTI in several courses, practicum, and internship, and will continue to push our students to become leaders in their districts.

Exit Survey Ratings
All students in the Psychology Department are asked to complete an exit survey. They are asked to rate items on a 4 point scale with 1 for Poor and 4 for Excellent. Topics include overall Psychology faculty ratings, thesis chair, advising, gains in knowledge, and future plans. Eleven responses from school psychology students from 2009 and 2010 were available. Ratings were 3 or 4 on all items. All indicated they would enroll again, and all had employment upon graduation. Few had presented research at conferences. Overall they were satisfied with their graduate experience.

Area	Mean	SD
Possible Rating	*1 to 4*	
Psychology Faculty: respect, expectations, feedback, opportunities, caring	3.55 to 3.82	.40 to .52
Thesis Chair: : respect, expectations, feedback, opportunities, caring	3.6 to 3.82	.40 to .81
Advising (Program Coordinator): access, responsiveness, knowledge	3.82 to 3.91	.40
Knowledge Gained: psychology, research, communication, writing	3.82 to 3.91	.30 to .40

Kremen School of Education Exit Survey
This survey was designed by an interprofessional team and is used as part of our NCATE review process. Students graduating from credential programs (e.g., teaching, including special education, nursing, counseling, social work) are asked to fill out this survey. The data reported are mean ratings by school psych students.

Survey Open-Ended Comments

PROGRAM STRENGTHS
- Accessibility to professor/advisors (4)

- Professors are experts (2)

- Small cohort
- Access to necessary resources
- Well organized (2)
- Excellent field training (2)
- Helpful in setting up practicum and internships
- Consultation training (2)
- Academic interventions & learning how to implement
- Learning & implementing RTI
- Learning how to work w. culturally diverse students
- Excellent training in theory, research, & ethics (3)

POTENTIAL CHANGES
- Modification to 270T (Multicultural) seminar
- Developmental class that pertains to more child development (3)
- Counseling training other than Rogerian (8)
- More legal coursework
- Coursework in autism
- Research based program (4)
- Exit program VERY well prepared (4)

Items	2009	2010
I am prepared to use techniques to build rapport with students	5.00	4.83
I was taught how to organize my professional tasks	4.86	4.50
I am prepared to respond with fairness to disabled, ethnically, and linguistically diverse students	5.00	4.83
My preparation has upheld the concept that all individuals can learn	5.00	4.83
I have proper theoretical grounding in my field	4.86	4.67
I am familiar with the research in my field	4.86	4.83
I have related my learning to actual situations in schools/professional settings	5.00	5.00
I can assess/evaluate the progress of students	5.00	5.00
I know how to conduct myself in accordance with professional ethics and standards	5.00	5.00
I have skills to successfully collaborate with others in the workplace	5.00	4.83
I reflect upon and assess my own performance	4.86	4.83
I feel that I received a helpful and appropriate amount of supervision/advisement	4.86	4.83
I can think critically about theory and research in my field and put it into practice	5.00	4.67
My preparation has modeled the value of lifelong learning	4.86	4.83
Indicate the degree to which you feel prepared to assume a full-time position.	4.86	4.83
5=Excellent preparation, 4=More than adequate preparation, 3=adequate preparation, 2 = Less than adequate preparation, 1 = Very inadequate preparation, 0 = Not applicable	N=7	N=6

c. Summary of Data on Candidates and Program Completers

A. Candidate Assessments the program uses to and through recommending credential

Assessment	description	data collected
Portfolio	Students are asked to organize work samples by domain.	Work samples Professional development Technology competence
Faculty Ratings	School Psychology program faculty complete ratings for each student each semester on professional characteristics	Numerical ratings plus anecdotal Documentation
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
PRAXIS	Students take the PRAXIS II in school psychology during the 2nd year in the program	Total and domain scores

1. Portfolio

Candidates in the School Psychology Program at California State University Fresno are required to submit a portfolio in order to ensure they have mastered all program goals and objectives. The contents of the portfolio include samples of work that have been completed during each year of the program. Individual items, such as reports, are graded during the class for which they were assigned. Portfolio contents are designed to demonstrate competence based on NASP and CCTC training standards.

The portfolio is submitted prior to finals at the end of each year to the Program Coordinator, who distributes the portfolios to the School Psychology Program faculty for evaluation. The portfolio is cumulative; students are expected to add to the portfolio as they progress through the program, and that each year the portfolio should become more comprehensive.

California State University, Fresno
Portfolio Contents
Indicator 1:   Program Requirements
Indicator 2:   Data Based Decision Making
Indicator 3:   Consultation and Collaboration
Indicator 4:   Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills
Indicator 5:   Diversity in Development and Learning
Indicator 6:   School and Systems Organization, Policy Development, and Climate
Indicator 7:   Prevention, Intervention, and Mental Health
Indicator 8:   Home, School, Community
Indicator 9:   Research and Evaluation
Indicator 10: Professional Practice
Indicator 11: Information Technology

Table 1. *Summary of Portfolio Data for 2009-2010*

	YR 1 % Complete	YR 2% Complete	YR 3 % Complete
2009	37%	29%	93%
2010	17%	68%	99%

Note: Each indicator is rated as:
0 = Not Present (No components are included in the student's portfolio)
1 = Partial (Some, but not all of the components are contained within the student's portfolio)
2 = Complete (All components are contained within the student's portfolio)

2. 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 being allowed to go on internship. All students passed the NCSP score of 165. The average for the 2009 scores was 179.50. For the 2010 scores the average was 178.00.

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.

Across the two cohorts the strongest areas appear to be Consultation, Applied Psychological Foundations, and Ethics, Legal, and Professional Foundations. Data-Based Decision Making was good, as was Research-Based Academic Practices.

3. 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 necessary for independent practice as a school psychologist. Ratings are on a scale from 1 to 5. Summary data are presented below for the total evaluation; aggregated data indicate high ratings across all items and cohorts.

Table 3. *Faculty Ratings 2009-2010*

	08-09 TOTAL	09-10 TOTAL
	N = 27	N = 30
ADAPTABILITY (e.g., to changes in schedule or placement)	4.86	4.85
COMMUNICATION SKILLS (Written and oral, presentations, diplomatic in stating problems & presenting information, sensitive to cultural and linguistic diversity)	4.49	4.70
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS (Neatness, accuracy, work is completed on time, organized)	4.69	4.80
COOPERATION (With peers, faculty, staff, field supervisors, teachers, parents, students)	4.94	4.98
ETHICAL CONDUCT (In class & practicum/internship, respects confidentiality)	4.96	5.00
INDEPENDENCE	4.55	4.77

(Initiative, problem solving, thesis on schedule)		
KNOWLEDGE OF THE FIELD (School psychology, special education, assessment, consultation, intervention)	4.25	4.82
MATURITY (Life experience, empathy, decision making)	4.61	4.94
MOTIVATION (Curiosity, interest in the field, desire to learn and to work, takes advantage of professional development opportunities)	4.66	4.90
PERSONAL STABILITY (Receptive to feedback, emotional well-being)	4.78	4.90
PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT (Appropriate dress and behavior, pleasant, cooperative, courteous)	4.76	4.91
PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT (Use of knowledge, class and practicum attendance)	4.88	5.00
PROFESSIONAL SKILLS (Application of knowledge in evaluation, prevention, intervention, report writing)	4.13	4.67
RESPONSIBILITY (Punctual, keeps up with coursework, makes appointments, notification of change in plans)	4.75	4.90
AVERAGE	**4.66**	**4.87**

Please rate the student according to the following scale:
5=excellent, 4=good, 3=average, 2=needs improvement, l= unacceptable, NA= not applicable

4. 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 often have multiple field supervisors and must obtain ratings from all of them, as well as an administrator.

Table 4. *Mean Total Evaluation Ratings by Field Supervisors for Each Cohort for 2008-2010*

Year	N	2008-2009	N	2009-2010	Ratings
1	9	3.70	11	3.64	1 field supervisor rating each semester
2	9	3.79	9	3.79	1 field supervisor rating each semester
3	9	3.79	9	3.76	3 field supervisor ratings each semester

Note: Each field evaluation form is a rubric with scores ranging from 1 to 4, with 4 the most positive rating.

Overall ratings are very positive for all three cohorts. For the first year students, professional development, groups, and observations were rated the lowest by their field supervisor. Tack and groups were lowest for the second year students.

For third year students (interns) the areas that tended to be rated lowest were counseling. Areas where supervisors most often indicated as non-applicable or unable to rate were curriculum-based assessment, group counseling, and in-services.

Interns also get evaluations from one parent each fall. These were very positive. The average ratings were 4.84 on a scale of 1-5 with 5 as the most positive. Interns are required to get evaluations from 2 teachers each semester. These were also very positive, 4.93 on a scale of 1 to 5. No systemic weaknesses were noted in the data.

<u>**School Psychology**</u>

ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION IN SECTION A-2

Charts or bullets of the analysis of data for candidate competence and program effectiveness.

- **Portfolio**.
  - o The assessment of portfolio contents followed the expected pattern; that is students are able to meet more domains as the 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.
  - o The second year students were able to complete more components, including research and academic assessment.
  - o The third year students have been able to provide evidence in all domains, indicating we are requiring and assessing performance in all domains.

- **Faculty Ratings**
  - o 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. However, overall ratings were very high for the students in the program in 2008 and 2009. No consistent areas of weakness were noted. Our ratings are supported by very strong interviews and recommendations from employers.

- **Field Supervisor Ratings**
  - o 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.
  - o 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.

- **PRAXIS**
  - o 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 prepped for the test in any way 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. Students did well in all domains in both years, indicating the program is

providing a strong base in the professional domains. All pass at the level required for national certification, indicating we are providing essential training.

- **Alumni Survey**
  - The current alumni survey assessed graduate perceptions of current courses in the curriculum and need for strengthening areas and topics. Overall most courses were rated very positively. The need to include more information on autism in the program was noted and will be addressed. Based on the survey, the content of the assessment course will be slightly modified, and the counseling sequence revised. The measures included in our cognitive assessment course will be modified slightly to better align with current practice. We do include an emphasis on RTI in several courses, practicum, and internship, and will continue to push our students to become leaders in their districts.

School Psychology
Program Name

Data Source	Data Focus	Action(s)	Contact Person	Timeline
Portfolio	Work samples	No concerns were revealed with candidate competence or the program. The instrument could be strengthened with additional rubrics for scoring of component quality. In the future electronic portfolios might be considered.	Hong Ni	2010-2012
Faculty Ratings	Professional characteristics	Monitoring of candidate's professional characteristics with feedback to candidates and remediation plans as necessary will continue.	School psychology faculty	
Field Supervisor Ratings	Professional skills and characteristics	Considering the number of field supervisors we use and their lack of communication with each other it might be concluded that the students are indeed doing stellar work in the field. Any areas of lower feedback are reviewed carefully with students. No programmatic areas of weakness were revealed by the field supervisor ratings; therefore, no programmatic changes are planned at this time. We will continue to advise students to make supervisors aware of their work in the schools.	School psychology faculty	
PRAXIS	Candidate competence on a nationally normed test	The pass rate on the PRAXIS has always been very high; virtually all pass on their first try. No curricular changes are planned based on the PRAXIS results.		
ALUMNI SURVEY	Assessment of needs in the field and training	Responses indicated the program is meeting the needs in the field. Responses noted the need for more training in child-oriented	Program coordinator	

	provided by the program	counseling. As a result we are revising our counseling sequence. The program is continually striving to update curriculum to meet changes in the field. An inter-session course on autism is planned. We also informally assess local needs through interviews with field supervisors and discussion at the School Psychology Advisory Board meetings.		
EXIT SURVEYS	Survey of program completers	Exit survey data from the Psychology Department and School of Education indicate student satisfaction. Continued energy and responsiveness to students by faculty is expected.	Program Coordinator	