

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Preparation of School Psychologists

Note: NCATE recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and review of the unit by NCATE. The NASP approval decision was made independent of NCATE unit review.

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Arkansas State University

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

02 / 01 / 2009

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

Program Type

Other School Personnel

Award or Degree Level(s)

- Master's
- Post Master's
- Specialist or C.A.S.
- Doctorate

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

A1. SPA Decision on NCATE recognition of the program:

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation [See Part G]
- Not nationally recognized

A2. Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds an 80% pass rate on state licensure exams:

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comment:

A3. Summary of Strengths:

The program offers courses that cover knowledge and skills in nearly all NASP domains. During the past 3 years it has used an impressive range of measures to assess the attainment of knowledge and skills, although most are limited in scope and breadth. Clear efforts have been made to develop, employ, and improve trainee assessment instruments and procedures that align with NASP Domains.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1. PROGRAM CONTEXT/STRUCTURE

School psychology training is delivered within a context of program values and clearly articulated training philosophy/mission, goals, and objectives. Training includes a comprehensive, integrated program of study delivered by qualified faculty, as well as substantial supervised field experiences necessary for the preparation of competent school psychologists whose services positively impact children, youth, families, and other consumers.

DOMAINS OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY TRAINING AND PRACTICE

School psychology candidates demonstrate entry-level competency in each of the following domains of professional practice. Competency requires both knowledge and skills. School psychology programs ensure that candidates have a foundation in the knowledge base for psychology and education, including theories, models, empirical findings, and techniques in each domain. School psychology programs ensure that candidates demonstrate the professional skills necessary to deliver effective services that result in positive outcomes in each domain. The domains below are not mutually exclusive and should be fully integrated into graduate level curricula, practica, and internship.

1.1. Mission, goals, objectives; integrated and sequential program of studies in school psychology

Met	Not Met
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment:

The program provides a clear mission and philosophy. Objectives are aligned with those of NASP. Candidate transcripts indicate that candidates do not complete the program in a sequential and integrated fashion (e.g., all 3 transcripts differ markedly). Two transcripts indicate that courses that should precede the internship are taken during the internship, most times completed as independent studies rather than through an organized educational experience with their cohort. Although reasons for this are given, it appears that deviations from the recommended course of study are the norm and not the exception.

Practicum experiences are minimal (one 100-hour course).

1.2. Program commitment to human diversity throughout all aspects of the program

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

Although diversity is lacking among candidates and faculty, the program has taken steps to address this issue. Diversity is listed as an objective in multiple courses, but it is unclear how diversity is actually addressed in most of them (with the exception in counseling). Field experiences take place in schools with much diversity and evaluation data indicate that candidates and consumers are satisfied with training in this area. However, diversity receives very little attention in program materials and evaluation tools for the practicum and internship.

1.3. Candidate affiliation with colleagues/faculty/the profession through full-time residency or alternative planned experiences

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

While this standard is rated as Met the following suggestions are offered. The candidate completion chart submitted suggests that few candidates graduate even though it appears that at least twice as many are admitted each year. This suggests that candidates do not complete the program in the prescribed 3 academic years. This needs to be clarified. It may also be advantageous for the program to clearly outline how program completion policies differ from the reported Graduate School policies and procedures. As it stands, the perception is that candidates are allowed 6 years to complete the program. If candidates are allowed to follow a part-time sequence, a clear scope and plan of study needs to be included in the student handbook.

1.4. Faculty requirements/credentials

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

The FTE appears to be 1.5. Additional faculty members in the program serve on committees but do not teach or supervise school psychology candidates. Further, while several other faculty members support the program from a variety of training backgrounds and specialties in psychology and education (as would be required for coverage of related areas), and the total FTE of involved faculty exceeds 3.0, it is questionable whether the program provides sufficient faculty FTE in school psychology. Many of the courses in the program appear to be somewhat generically developed for candidates from multiple programs and are taught by faculty of various backgrounds.

1.5. Continuing professional development opportunities

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

The program should be commended for collaborating with ASPA and the state department. However, the extent to which professional training opportunities have actually been offered is unclear and not documented. In addition, there appears to be no systematic programmatic effort to offer regular continuing education opportunities to practitioners, and no evidence is provided to indicate that graduates or other practitioners avail themselves of any such programmatic efforts.

REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIALIST LEVEL PROGRAMS ONLY

1.6. Minimum years of study/credit hour requirement (3 years/60 hours with 54 hours exclusive of internship); institutional documentation of program completion

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

The program is described in the program handbook as a 66-semester hour program. Presented transcripts of all program completers exceeded 66 semester hours and indicated completion within 3 years (2005-2006 to 2007-2008). Internship accounts for 6 semester hours of the total hours in each case. However, the provided transcripts indicated that candidates had not mastered basic skills prior to internship, requiring additional coursework during the first internship semester, frequently as independent study rather than as an organized educational experience within their cohort.

1.7. Minimum internship requirement (1 year/1200 clock hours)

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

Data presented regarding internship indicated that interns met or exceeded the 1200 clock hour requirement.

REQUIREMENTS FOR DOCTORAL LEVEL PROGRAMS ONLY

1.8. Greater depth of study in multiple domains

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

1.9. Minimum years of study/credit hour requirement (4 years/90 hours with 78 hours exclusive of internship and dissertation); institutional documentation of program completion

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

1.10. Minimum internship requirement (1 year/1500 clock hours)

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

Standard 2. Domains of School Psychology Training and Practice.

General comments: Insert general comments that may be relevant for a number of domains.

NOTE: For each domain below, provide specific comments labeled as ADDRESSED, ASSESSED, and ATTAINED to explain the basis for any standards judged to be Not Met.

The program should be commended for providing a variety of assessment data aggregated for three cohorts of candidates, with data indicating program improvements as reflected in the most recent cohort scoring the highest across all measures. However, assessment methods are limited, typically consisting of very general items (e.g., one item for each of the 11 NASP domains). As such, it is difficult to determine if the candidates have skills in specific areas within each domain. General comments about the assessments follow. The limitations to each assessment apply to all domains. Except as otherwise noted, the rating of NM for each domain is due to the limitations of the assessment measures and resulting data.

Assessment #1: The PRAXIS is required, and all 12 candidates over the past 3 years obtained a passing score of 620. However, it should be noted that 5 of the 12 scored below 650.

Assessment #2: Grades are reported for courses and are aligned with each domain. A very large number of courses are listed for almost every domain and it is difficult to determine their relevancy. This is particularly true for Domains 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8. Scores on the comprehensive exam also are provided, which are aligned with very few domains. The scoring rubric for the comprehensive exam is not detailed. There are no criteria, only topics or areas for the case study question. For example, what does a candidate have to state to earn a rating of Acceptable for "Assessment Plans Link to Intervention." It is difficult to know how candidates are evaluated given limited criteria. All grades and exam scores are passing.

Assessment #3: The program made a notable effort to anchor practicum assessments in regard to performance during the 2006-2007 academic year. However, items are limited in number and are not clearly related to NASP domains. For example, the rating form completed by practicum supervisors includes very few skill items aligned with the domains, particularly domains 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8. The item evaluation focuses primarily on dispositions or very general skills (e.g., "consultation"). The assessment is very limited in breadth and scope. Therefore, the extent to which trainees met training requirements under NASP standards was difficult to ascertain. Candidates were rated highly in all domains, however.

Assessment #4: A clear effort has been made to relate the evaluation of interns by field supervisors to NASP domains. However, a single item typically is employed to assess an entire practice area, and then classified under multiple NASP domains. There are no specified performances or behavioral anchors for ratings. In fact the rating form completed by intern supervisors, like the practicum rating form, includes very few skill items aligned with the domains, limiting breadth and scope. The extent to which a given trainee is able to "develop an effective intervention based on functional assessment data," for example, is unknown. Nonetheless candidates were rated highly in all domains.

Assessment #5: Candidates submit a portfolio that is rated by the faculty. The portfolio must contain prescribed evidence of specific performances such as a psychological report, a case study, and a

summary of a school-wide assessment, prevention, consultation, or intervention case. The rating criteria/rubrics are not behaviorally anchored to specific performances, scores, skills or domains. The scoring rubric for the portfolio is very general, with each portfolio item rated on a 3-point scale. For example, what constitutes Unacceptable, Acceptable, or Superior performance in a specific area or skill is unknown. Only a total score for the portfolio was reported for each candidate but all were rated at least as “Acceptable”.

PLEASE SEE SECTION F.1 BELOW FOR CONTINUATION OF GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT NASP STANDARDS 2.1 TO 2.11

2.1. Data-Based Decision-Making and Accountability: School psychologists have knowledge of varied models and methods of assessment that yield information useful in identifying strengths and needs, in understanding problems, and in measuring progress and accomplishments. School psychologists use such models and methods as part of a systematic process to collect data and other information, translate assessment results into empirically-based decisions about service delivery, and evaluate the outcomes of services. Data-based decision-making permeates every aspect of professional practice.

Met	Not Met
jn	jn

Comment:

ADDRESSED: Coursework and field experiences appear to adequately address this domain.

ASSESSED and ATTAINED: See general comments above.

Standard 2.2. Consultation and Collaboration. School psychologists have knowledge of behavioral, mental health, collaborative, and/or other consultation models and methods and of their application to particular situations. School psychologists collaborate effectively with others in planning and decision-making processes at the individual, group, and system levels.

Met	Not Met
jn	jn

Comment:

ADDRESSED: Coursework and field experiences appear to adequately address this domain.

ASSESSED and ATTAINED: See general comments above.

Standard 2.3. Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills. School psychologists have knowledge of human learning processes, techniques to assess these processes, and direct and indirect services applicable to the development of cognitive and academic skills. School psychologists, 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. Such interventions include, but are not limited to, instructional interventions and consultation.

Met	Not Met
jn	jn

Comment:

ADDRESSED: Coursework and field experiences appear to adequately address this domain.

ASSESSED and ATTAINED: See general comments above.

Standard 2.4. Socialization and Development of Life Skills. School psychologists have knowledge of human developmental processes, techniques to assess these processes, and direct and indirect services applicable to the development of behavioral, affective, adaptive, and social skills. School psychologists, 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 limited to, consultation, behavioral assessment/intervention, and counseling.

Met

Not Met

jñ

jñ

Comment:

ADDRESSED: Coursework and field experiences appear to adequately address this domain.

ASSESSED and ATTAINED: See general comments above.

Standard 2.5. Student Diversity in Development and Learning. School psychologists have knowledge of individual differences, abilities, and disabilities and of the potential influence of biological, social, cultural, ethnic, experiential, socioeconomic, gender-related, and linguistic factors in development and learning. School psychologists 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.

Met

Not Met

jñ

jñ

Comment:

ADDRESSED: Diversity is listed as an objective in multiple courses, but it is unclear how diversity is actually addressed in most of them (with the exception in counseling). Issues of assessment do not appear to be addressed.

ASSESSED and ATTAINED: See general comments above.

Standard 2.6. School and Systems Organization, Policy Development, and Climate. School psychologists have knowledge of general education, special education, and other educational and related services. They understand schools and other settings as systems. School psychologists work with individuals and groups to facilitate policies and practices that create and maintain safe, supportive, and effective learning environments for children and others.

Met

Not Met

jñ

jñ

Comment:

ADDRESSED: Coursework and field experiences appear to minimally address this domain.

ASSESSED and ATTAINED: See general comments above.

Standard 2.7. Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health. School psychologists have knowledge of human development and psychopathology and of associated biological, cultural, and social influences on human behavior. School psychologists provide or contribute to prevention and intervention programs that promote the mental health and physical well-being of students.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

ADDRESSED: Coursework and field experiences do not adequately address this domain.

ASSESSED and ATTAINED: See general comments above.

Standard 2.8. Home/School Community Collaboration. School psychologists have knowledge of family systems, including family strengths and influences on student development, learning, and behavior, and of methods to involve families in education and service delivery. School psychologists work effectively with families, educators, and others in the community to promote and provide comprehensive services to children and families.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

ADDRESSED: Coursework and field experiences do not adequately address this domain.

ASSESSED and ATTAINED: See general comments above.

Standard 2.9. Research and Program Evaluation. School psychologists have knowledge of research, statistics, and evaluation methods. School psychologists 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.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

ADDRESSED: Coursework focuses on statistics. Program evaluation seems to receive some (but inadequate) emphasis in the behavior intervention course and case study.

ASSESSED and ATTAINED: See general comments above.

Standard 2.10. School Psychology Practice and Development. School psychologists have knowledge of the history and foundations of their profession; of various service models and

methods; of public policy development applicable to services to children and families; and of ethical, professional, and legal standards. School psychologists 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.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

ADDRESSED: Coursework and field experiences appear to adequately address this domain.
ASSESSSED and ATTAINED: See general comments above.

Standard 2.11. Information Technology. School psychologists have knowledge of information sources and technology relevant to their work. School psychologists access, evaluate, and utilize information sources and technology in ways that safeguard or enhance the quality of services.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

ADDRESSED: Assessment courses address 2.11. Other courses listed only show requirements for technology use.
ASSESSSED and ATTAINED: See general comments above.

Standard 3. Field Experiences/Internship. School psychology candidates have the opportunities to demonstrate, under conditions of appropriate supervision, their ability to apply their knowledge, to develop specific skills needed for effective school psychological service delivery, and to integrate competencies that address the domains of professional preparation and practice outlined in these standards and the goals and objectives of their training program.

3.1. Practica and internships are completed for academic credit; practica include the development/evaluation of specific skills; practica are distinct from and precede culminating internship; internship requires integration/application of full range of competencies/domains.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

Practica and internship experiences are completed for academic credit. The duration and extent of practicum experiences appear to be inadequate to develop skills and professional competencies adequately prior to internship. The Internship Agreement/Contract is lacking in specificity and does not prescribe the nature and extent of required experiences for each intern. Evaluation of specific skills during practicum and internship is problematic with the limited item, unanchored rating system currently in use.

3.2. Internship is a collaboration between institution and field site, includes activities consistent with program goals, and has a written plan specifying responsibilities.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

3.3. Internship is completed on full-time basis over one year or half-time over two consecutive years; at least 600 hours in a school setting.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

3.4. Interns an receive average of two hours of field-based supervision per week from credentialed school psychologist or, for non-school settings, credentialed psychologist.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

3.5. Provision of appropriate support for the internship experience

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

Standard 4. Performance-based Program Assessment and Accountability. School psychology training programs employ systematic, valid evaluation of candidates, coursework, practica, internship, faculty, supervisors, and resources and use the resulting information to monitor and improve program quality. A key aspect of program accountability is the assessment of the knowledge and capabilities of school psychology candidates and of the positive impact that interns and graduates have on services to children, youth, families, and other consumers.

4.1. Systematic, valid procedures used to evaluate and improve the quality of the program

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

Although the process is unclear, the program has made improvements based on evaluation data.

4.2. The program applies published criteria for assessment and admission at each level and for candidate retention and progression. Criteria address academic/professional competencies and professional work characteristics.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

4.3. The program employs a systematic, valid process to ensure that all candidates are able to integrate domains of knowledge and apply professional skills in delivering services evidenced by measurable positive impact on children, youth, families, and other consumers.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

Although the comprehensive case study provides evidence of positive impact, there is a general lack of evidence that candidates integrate knowledge and skills across domains in delivering a comprehensive range of services. That is, the comprehensive case study can be specific to one topic, and can be completed during the one required practicum. In addition, the case study is evaluated using a single rating item.

Standard V. Program Support/Resources (to be evaluated for non-NCATE programs only). Adequate resources are available to support the training program and its faculty and candidates. Such resources are needed to assure accomplishment of program goals and objectives and attainment of competencies needed for effective school psychology practice that positively impact children, families, and other consumers.

5.1. Faculty no greater than 75% of that typically assigned to those teaching primarily undergraduate courses. Program administrator receives at least 25% reassigned time.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

5.2. Program maintains a no-greater-than 1:10 FTE faculty to FTE student ratio in the overall program, practica, and internship

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

5.3. Program faculty receive support for learning/professional experiences

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

5.4. Candidates receive support, including faculty advisement and supervision, university and/or program support services, and opportunities for funding.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

5.5. Adequate physical resources available to faculty and candidates (i.e., office space, clinical and laboratory facilities, data and information-processing instructional resources, audiovisual materials, technology)

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

5.6. Program provides reasonable accommodations for candidates/faculty with disabilities.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

5.7 Adequate library/ information resources to support instruction, independent study, and research, including major publications/periodicals

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

5.8. Program meets standards for the appropriate state credentialing body(ies) and is in a unit/institution that meets regional accreditation standards.

Met	Not Met
jñ	jñ

Comment:

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

The PRAXIS is required; with all 12 candidates scoring above the program's passing score of 620 and 7 scoring above 650. Grades are reported for courses and are aligned with each domain, but it is unclear how all of the numerous courses listed cover each domain. A comprehensive exam also is required that appears to assess a few domains.

C.2. Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Rating forms completed by field supervisors are very limited in the assessment of knowledge and skills. They generally include more items assessing dispositions than knowledge and skills.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

The case study may be completed during practicum or internship. It is unclear how practicum candidates would have developed adequate skills to demonstrate competency in those areas prior to internship. Case studies are scored using the NASP NCSP Case Study Evaluation Rubric. This includes the candidate reporting single-subject research design data, goal attainment data, and consultee satisfaction data. The university internship supervisor also rates the case study on a 3-point scale (single item).

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

Although the process is unclear, the program cites evidence that it has made changes in course requirement to improve the program. This is supported by improved scores on multiple measures from 2005 to 2008.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

LEAVE BLANK

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

CONTINUATION OF GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT NASP STANDARDS 2.1 TO 2.11

Assessment #6: The assessment consists of a case study that includes assessment, intervention, and consultation. The program needs to be commended for requiring candidates to collect impact data. The case study may be completed during practicum or internship (it is unclear how practicum candidates would have developed adequate skills to apply professional skills in delivering a comprehensive range of services evidenced by measurable positive impact on children, youth, families and other consumers). Case studies are scored using the NASP NCSP Case Study Evaluation Rubric. In addition candidates

report data using a single-subject research design, including goal attainment and consultee satisfaction data. The university internship supervisor also rates the case study on a 3-point scale (single item). Various data results ranged from “needs improvement” to “effective”.

Assessment #7: This assessment consists of an annual review of each candidate by a faculty committee in school psychology. The faculty completes a rating form consisting of a single item for each of the 11 NASP domains and 19 additional items that measure professional dispositions and characteristics (e.g., “responsibility”). Each item is rated on a 3-point scale, with 2 being “Acceptable.” Aggregated data show a mean above 2 for each item across all 3 cohorts (except for a mean score of 1.82 for “promptness” for cohort 2. Scores across items were markedly higher for the most recent cohort.

Assessment #8: This consists of a School Psychology Constituent Survey that was completed in 2005 by field supervisors and special education coordinators. The survey consisted of 13 items, rated on a 3-point scale, with 11 being the NASP domains. The scale was not behaviorally anchored and no specific performance skills within each domain were required to be rated. Three domains received a score below 2 (2=acceptable): 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8. Faculty commitment and theoretical foundations were reported strengths of the program, and the lack of sufficient practicum experiences was noted as a program weakness.

Assessment #9: This consists of the School Psychology Exit Survey, completed by candidates near the end of their internship. The survey consists of 13 items, rated on a 3-point scale, with 11 being the NASP domains. Domain 2.3 was rated below acceptable in 2005-2006 and Domain 2.7 in 2006-2007. No domains were rated low in 2007-2008.

As noted above, there are numerous concerns about the assessment methods and candidate attainment evidence is limited. For this reason, each domain is rated “NM.” In addition, as noted below, a few domains are not adequately addressed by the program in coursework and other experiences.

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the Board of Examiners:

None.

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- Program is nationally recognized with conditions. The program will be listed as nationally recognized on websites and/or other publications of the SPA and NCATE. The institution may designate its program as nationally recognized by NCATE, through the time period specified below, in its published materials. National recognition is dependent upon NCATE accreditation.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

The program is recognized through:

MM DD YYYY
02 / 01 / 2011

Subsequent action by the institution: To retain national recognition, a report addressing the conditions to recognition must be submitted on or before the date cited below.

The program has **up to two opportunities** to address conditions within an 18 month period.

If the program is submitting a Response to Conditions Report **for the first time**, the range of possible deadlines for submitting that report are 4/15/09, 9/15/09, 2/1/10, or 9/15/10. *Note that the opportunity to submit a second Response to Conditions report (if needed), is only possible if the first Response to Conditions report is submitted on or before the 9/15/09 submission date noted above. However, the program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this recognition report.*

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a **second** Response to Conditions Report, the report must be submitted by the date below.

Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM DD YYYY

09 / 15 / 2010

The following conditions must be addressed within 18 months (or within the time period specified above if the program's recognition with conditions has been continued). See above for specific date.

Program is NASP Approved-Conditional and (if in a unit that is NCATE accredited) NCATE nationally recognized with conditions for the period JANUARY 1, 2009 through DECEMBER 31, 2010.

The following conditions must be addressed and a report addressing the conditions must be submitted for a regular fall or spring review cycle before the end of the conditional period, and no later than September 15, 2010:

- The program must meet the NASP standards rated below as Not Met. The program's conditional report must document the program's compliance with each NASP standard rated above as Not Met and must address comments noted for each standard rated as Not Met, as well as other concerns noted in the current national recognition report.

-The program's conditional report must be submitted online and contain ALL required materials to document compliance with each NASP standard rated as Not Met. Thus, to document that the program is in compliance with standards rated as Not Met the program's conditional report must include required sections and attachments as outlined in the standard NASP/NCATE online program report form and in instructions for NASP online program submissions at the time of the program's submission of the conditional report, located at http://nasponline.org/standards/approvedtraining/training_program.aspx

- The program must ADDRESS, ASSESS, and ATTAIN domains listed in NASP Standards 2.1 to 2.11.

In addition to providing all other sections of the required NASP/NCATE online report form to provide evidence of the program's compliance with NASP standards currently rated as Not Met, the program's conditional report must include specific required documentation that domains are ADDRESSED in program required coursework and other experience. Further, the program must provide specific required documentation for Section IV-Assessments 1-6 in order to provide evidence of program ASSESSMENT methods and candidate ATTAINMENT relative to the domains. Important information about required Assessments 1-6 and documentation that must be submitted by programs is located in the NASP/NCATE online report form. The required program assessment and candidate attainment documentation is as follows (except for Assessment 1-National or State Exam, which has additional requirements) and should be submitted online as part of the conditional report:

1. A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program;
2. A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with each domain it is cited for in Section III.
3. A brief analysis of the data findings.
4. An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting each domain it is cited for in Section III.
5. Documentation for each assessment, including:
 - (a) the assessment TOOL or description of the assignment;

(b) the SCORING GUIDE for the assessment; and
(c) aggregated candidate DATA derived from the assessment, with aggregated data specific to each NASP domain that it assesses.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.