

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY DOCTORAL PROGRAM

Kent State University

Self-Study Report Prepared for the
Committee on Accreditation
March 12, 2004

Narrative

Domain A: Eligibility

As a prerequisite for accreditation, the program's purpose must be within the scope of the accrediting body and must be pursued in an institutional setting appropriate for the doctoral education and training of professional psychologists.

1. *The program offers doctoral education and training in psychology, one goal of which is to prepare students for the practice of professional psychology.*

The Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) is the terminal degree in school psychology granted by Kent State University. The program is founded on principles consistent with the scientist practitioner model originally proposed at the 1949 Boulder Conference (Raimy, 1950), with emphasis on the science and practice of psychology with children, youth, families; learners of all ages; and the schooling process (American Psychological Association, 1998). The original conception of scientist practitioner roles was limited to that of researcher, consumer of research findings, and empirical evaluator of programs and interventions. To this solid foundation the KSU doctoral school psychology program has added a focus on problem-solving within the professional context—where the aim is to address pressing problems for children, youth, families, and systems using evidence-based interventions from education and psychology. Students are introduced to the scientific literature and a research orientation as a basis for developing a critical problem-solving orientation to professional practice.

Such a focus on the psychologist as a school's primary problem solver is consistent with the model proposed by the APA Center for Psychology in Schools & Education, which was detailed in *Reframing America's Schools: Psychology's Role* (Talley & Short, 1995) and *Making Psychologists in Schools Indispensable* (Talley, Kubiszyn, Brassard, & Short, 1996), as well as the *Archival Definition of School Psychology*, approved by the American Psychological Association in 1998. As described in this archival definition, "school psychologists conceptualize children's development from multiple theoretical perspectives and translate current scientific findings to alleviate cognitive, behavioral, social, and emotional problems encountered in schooling" (p. 1).

The program model receives additional philosophical guidance from *School Psychology: A Blueprint for Training and Practice II* (Ysseldyke et al., 1997) and the *Standards for Training and Field Placement in School Psychology* (National Association of School Psychologists, 2000). The program's training paradigm encompasses 11 broad competencies, each of which is associated with specific objectives that reflect the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of professional school psychologists. These competencies and objectives are described in the *Program Handbook* (Appendix A).

Graduates typically assume leadership positions as psychologists in educational and mental health settings and in research settings that contribute to the scientific knowledge about children, youth, families, and the learning process. Table 1 reports the number of doctoral degrees in school psychology awarded over the past five years, and Table 9 reflects employment status of graduates.

2. *The program is sponsored by an institution of higher education accredited by a nationally recognized regional accrediting body in the United States ...*

Since its inception in 1964, the KSU doctoral program in school psychology has been housed within the Graduate College of Education (CoE), and receives instructional support from faculty in both the CoE and the Department of Psychology, which is housed within the College of Arts & Sciences. The KSU College of Education, founded as a land grant College in 1910, has actively sought accreditation from appropriate learned societies and nationally recognized accreditation bodies since being granted its Charter. Initially gaining NCA accreditation in 1915, the university and its College of Education have been continuously accredited. Currently, the university holds accreditation from North Central Association of Schools and Colleges, with the College of Education

also being accredited by the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The school psychology program was initially accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA) in 1984, and the doctoral program in school psychology has been continuously approved by the National Association of School Psychologists/NCATE since 1987. KSU is a Research Extensive Institution accredited by all geographically and academically relevant nationally recognized regional accrediting bodies.

3. *The program is an integral part of the mission of the academic department, college, school, or institution in which it resides...*

Kent State University's 1998 strategic plan comprises nine initiatives (Appendix B). The school psychology program is an integral part of the plan through three of these initiatives: #3: Provide a learning environment that supports student success; #5 Use technology as a tool to enhance learning and university operations; and #8 Seek and develop mutually beneficial partnerships and collaborations. Evidence of a learning environment that supports student success is demonstrated by student-student mentorship, an active student listserv, a consistent record of financial support for students through Teaching Fellowships and Graduate Assistantships, and a vital student organization (see Appendix D). With regard to initiative #5, the program maintains a comprehensive web page, which serves as an important recruiting device, as well as a means of informing both students and the public about the program. In addition, specific expectations for student mastery and use of technology are maintained (see Appendix E). Examples of beneficial partnerships between the program and the practice community are evident in the Program Advisory Committee (Appendix F), the network of practica sites (Table 2), and strong Adjunct Clinical Faculty (Appendix G) and other program contributors (Table 3).

Beginning in the summer of 2003, the university commenced a new strategic planning process, which is intended to set the course for the university for the next 3-5 years. School psychology program faculty were actively engaged in strategic planning activities at the program, department, and college levels during the fall of 2003. A draft strategic plan released for discussion in the spring of 2004 identified four broadly defined principles as follows: innovative learning, focus on those we serve, real-world experiences, and relationships that foster success (see Appendix B). It is anticipated that the university strategic plan and strategies will be completed by the end of spring semester, 2004.

The school psychology program is one of 10 doctoral granting programs in the CoE, and is integrally aligned with the function and mission of the College (Appendix B). Three departments comprise the academic organization of the CoE. The school psychology program is housed within the Department of Educational Foundations & Special Services (EFSS); other program areas within the department are Educational Psychology, Special Education, Rehabilitation Counseling, Cultural Foundations, Instructional Technology, and Evaluation & Measurement. Although each program area is self-governing with regard to staffing selection for courses, determination of program foci, course development, program orientation/specialty, management of enrollment, and the preparation of program reports, the Departmental mission (Appendix B) reflects the common foci for its programs.

A faculty member from the program area represents school psychology on the departmental Faculty Advisory Committee, and, typically, a school psychology faculty member is elected to the College Advisory Committee. The program area is also represented at the monthly Program Coordinator Meetings, where scheduling-conflicts, course-encroachment, departmental priorities, allocations of departmental and graduate student support, and similar management functions that affect programs can be negotiated among colleagues. The program area reports on significant program activities and issues to the entire department at department-wide meetings each semester, and is featured in department announcements.

The school psychology program is intentionally a small program, consistent with the number of program faculty and the needs of the state and region. The program's goal is to maintain a cohort of approximately 3-4 students in each year of the program, which provides a sufficient number of students to allow for meaningful peer interaction, support, and socialization. This is evident in the vital student organization, active student-student mentorship, a Ph.D. listserv and student directory, and collegial dinner meetings with doctoral students and faculty.

4. *The program requires of each student a minimum of three full-time academic years of graduate study (or the equivalent thereof) and completion of an internship prior to awarding the doctoral degree...*

The school psychology doctoral program requires a minimum of 3 full-time academic years of graduate study (or the part-time equivalent) and the completion of a calendar-year internship prior to awarding the doctoral degree (see Appendix A). Students must complete requirements for both the Department of Education license/certificate and the pre-doctoral internship requirements of Ohio's State Board of Psychology (1,800 clock hrs. in pre-determined categories of supervised experience).

Students must complete at least 60 semester hours of study from KSU, including a residency requirement of at least 18 semester hours, as part of their journey to completion of the degree requirements (see *Handbook for Ph.D. Students and Advisors*, Appendix C). A full-time continuous residency or an alternate planned experience is required of all students.

5. *The program engages in actions that indicate respect for and understanding of cultural and individual diversity...*

The KSU school psychology program is founded in respect for the dignity and worth of each individual and in a commitment to further an understanding of behavior for the purpose of promoting human welfare. A commitment to understanding and responsiveness to diversity is articulated and practiced throughout all aspects of the program, including recruitment, admissions and retention; faculty hiring; coursework content and periodic review; practica and internship placements; and research activities. Respect for individual and cultural differences is emphasized in all the program's didactic coursework and practica and internship placements (see Appendix A *Program Handbook*, Appendix C, for the *KSU Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity/Employment Policies*, and Table 2, *Practicum Placements*). Further, the program fosters a commitment to enhancing the strengths of critical socialization institutions such as families and schools through the delivery of school psychological services that are sensitive to the unique needs of systems and organizations, as well as those effective in promoting mental health and the acquisition of competencies (see Domain B).

KSU has a policy relating to students with documented disabilities who require reasonable accommodations to obtain equal access to academic experiences. This policy is codified in the University catalog (Appendix C), and is required to be reflected in course syllabi (Appendix H).

The KSU school psychology program strives to enact transparently nondiscriminatory policies and procedures. The program does not restrict program access or completion on the basis of age, color, disabilities, ethnicity, gender, language, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status or other characteristics that are irrelevant to success in graduate training or the profession. Kent State University is committed to increasing the diversity of both its faculty and student body through significant institutional investment of scholarship, affirmative hiring practices, inducements and incentives, and other devices that create a reflection in the KSU community of the makeup of the wider North-East Ohio region (see Appendix B, *University Purpose & Mission*; Appendix I *Office of Diversity*, and Appendix J *Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty and Students*).

-
6. *The program adheres to and makes available to all interested parties formal written policies and procedures...*

Program Government: Program faculty enact program policies and make substantive decisions within the context of monthly Program Meetings, which are customarily attended by the Department Chairperson and an elected student representative (see Appendix D for a description of the KSU chapter of the Student Affiliates in School Psychology [SASP] chapter). When policies with potential student impact are considered, it is the program's practice to introduce the policy, invite student discussion and dialog, and take action on the policy at a subsequent meeting (see *Program Meeting Minutes* in Appendix K). Approved Program Meeting minutes are e-mailed to all students via the SASP listserv.

Academic Admissions & Degree Requirements: Descriptions of the admissions and academic requirements are contained in the *Catalog* (Appendix C) and the *Program Handbook* (Appendix A). In addition, the Program Coordinator, and other program faculty as appropriate, meets or talks with prospective applicants who wish to discuss the program features and responds to individual questions. Applicants participate in a standard faculty interview process and interact with current students during one of the three annual admission cycles. Upon request, potential applicants or individuals who have been admitted and are considering enrollment are connected with two or three current students with shared interests or backgrounds via e-mail or telephone contact.

All admission decisions are made by simple majority of the faculty following completion of the interview process and an evaluation of all application materials. A written determination of the program's disposition on the application is made available to each applicant within two weeks of the interview, followed by a more detailed letter from the Program Coordinator to students who are admitted (Appendix M).

Administrative & Financial Assistance: Students are afforded extensive assistance to become oriented to the program, the university, and the wider Kent/NEOhio community through a student mentorship program, through faculty advising, and through formal and informal contacts with other students in the KSU school psychology cohort. Three program-wide social gatherings are held annually, and two to three "Doctoral Dinner" meetings are each year, which provide opportunities for social interaction and substantive discussion of shared program components. The program web page contains a dedicated section containing information of particular relevance to Ph.D. students, including content about comprehensive examinations, doctoral internship, and the doctoral portfolio.

The procedure for making application for financial assistance is described in the KSU *Catalog* (Appendix C); in addition, applicants are provided an application for graduate assistantships during the faculty interview. It is rarely necessary for students to seek an open position on a competitive basis, in that faculty assist new admits (and continuing students) in locating and securing fellowships/assistantships/ traineeships to match their interests and abilities. For each of the past five years every student expressing an interest in gaining supported employment/assistantship at the university has been facilitated in locating an appropriate position. The combined value of a doctoral level tuition waiver and stipend for the nine-month 2003-2004 academic year is \$15,748. There are no scholarships (i.e., funds absent training responsibilities) currently available to KSU school psychology students. One of the core school psychology faculty is principal investigator for a federal grant for the training of disciplinary professionals serving infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, with funding for 14 multi-disciplinary students annually (\$298K+ annually in student support, available through 2005-6). A second faculty member is co-director for a federal grant designed to prepare advanced graduate students in special education and school psychology to become behavior intervention specialists. This grant supports 6-8 students annually through 2007. No students in the

school psychology doctoral program currently require access to these support-funds since they have alternative supports already in place.

Student Performance Evaluation, Feedback, Advisement, and Retention & Termination Decisions: Students develop a prospectus and residency plan that outlines the specific course of study and related professional activities charted for completion during the journey to doctoral candidacy (see Appendix C, *Handbook for Ph.D. Students and Advisors*, and Appendix Q *Illustrative Student Prospectuses and Transcripts*). Students meet on a regular basis with their academic advisor, typically at least once each semester. Additionally, the program's full faculty cohort monitors each student's progress at least annually. Each student receives a written summary of his/her status, which explicitly describes time-lines, expected products and their due-dates, years-to-completion, and reminders about program and CoE expectations, and becomes part of the student's permanent record (see Appendix N for sample mailing). In addition to annual progress summaries, faculty advisors have access to student-progress in graded activities through Web for Faculty, a password-protected on-line system.

The program has a written policy detailing the steps to be followed in circumstances where faculty determine that a student's progress is unsatisfactory due to impairment, failure to meet academic standards, or incompatibility with the demands of a helping profession. All students have access to this policy on the program web page (see *Policy for Addressing Concerns about Student Performance or Functioning*, Appendix O). This policy was initially formulated by faculty, refined following its implementation with a student-in-need, and is periodically reviewed and revised by faculty and endorsed by the KSU chapter of SASP. This policy has also been reviewed and endorsed by the EFSS department, the Graduate Council of the CoE, and accepted as a program policy by the CoE Dean. Other academic program areas in the CoE have modeled their own practice for dealing with students in fragile circumstances on this developed policy.

The program has adopted a policy on the unattributed use of another's work (plagiarism). The program policy, which is available on the program web page states: "*Plagiarism is a serious ethical violation. Any attribution of another's work as one's own without appropriate credit is considered plagiarism. This applies whether information is obtained from print, presentation, or electronic sources.*" There are stipulated university procedures and sanctions that will be followed in the case of students suspected of violating this canon

Due Process and Grievance Procedures for Students and Faculty: Faculty at KSU work subject to a collective bargaining agreement developed between the university administration and an active union. This employment contract has sections on grievance and due process procedures that have become well refined following many years of implementation. The due process and grievance provisions of the contract for faculty meet or exceed the national model for faculty governance determined by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and has been reviewed and accepted as legally binding by the National Labor Relations Board following numerous arbitration tests.

The KSU school psychology Program has policies and procedures that are consistent with those of the university in general which, in turn, follow the guidelines of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States that pertain to faculty and student rights, responsibilities, and personal development.

Due process and grievance procedures for students are detailed in the EFSS departmental handbook (Appendix C). There is a student Ombuds who follows a published protocol for managing complex interpersonal conflict. The redress procedure may also begin at the departmental level, and, in the case of academic complaints, a Student Academic Complaint Committee, which includes student representation, conducts deliberations and makes a recommendation for resolution to the EFSS Department Chairperson.

Domain B: Program Philosophy, Objectives, and Curriculum Plan

The program has a clearly specified philosophy of education and training, compatible with the mission of its sponsor institution and appropriate to the science and practice of psychology. The program's education and training model and its curriculum plan are consistent with this philosophy.

1. *The program publicly states an explicit philosophy of training....*

The program prepares psychologists to work effectively as leaders in applied practice in educational and mental health settings. The program philosophy is guided by the *Archival Description of School Psychology* (APA, 1998) and *School Psychology: A Blueprint for Training and Practice II (Blueprint II)* (Ysseldyke et al., 1997), and is founded on the principles of the 1949 Boulder Conference's scientist-practitioner model (Raimy, 1950) (see *Program Handbook*, Appendix A). Students are introduced to the scientific literature and a research foundation as the bases for developing a critical problem-solving orientation to address problems of children, youth, families, and systems using evidence-based interventions from education and psychology.

The professional preparation paradigm is distinct from other training programs within the institution because of its reliance on the dual foundation areas of education and psychology (APA, 1998). Additionally, the program's strong foundation in measurement theory and applications of advanced statistical methodology provides graduates with essential tools for engaging in evidence-based practice. Finally, the codes of professional conduct and ethical principles that ground the profession emphasize the individual's responsibility for integrity in practice.

The program's training paradigm is reflected in the following broad competencies, which were originally conceptualized in *Blueprint II* and further refined in the *Standards for Training and Field Placement Programs in School Psychology* (NASP, 2000):

- A. Data-Based Decision-Making and Accountability
- B. Consultation and Collaboration
- C. Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills
- D. Socialization and Development of Life Skills
- E. Student Diversity in Development and Learning
- F. School and Systems Organization, Policy Development, and Climate
- G. Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental health
- H. Home/School/Community Collaboration
- I. Research and Program Evaluation
- J. School Psychology Practice and Development
- K. Information Technology

2. *The program specifies education and training objectives in terms of the competencies expected of its graduates...*

Each of the 11 competencies comprising the program's training paradigm is described in this section, together with a brief rationale for its contribution to the preparation of doctoral level school psychologists and the methods of implementation within the KSU school psychology program.

1.0 -- Data-Based Decision Making and Accountability: School psychologists have knowledge o 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.

A core theme in school psychological practice is the experience of incorporating data in decision making. Examples include (a) student-centered assessment resulting in diagnoses through application of setting-specific taxonomies (e.g., the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*, DSM-IV); (b) decision-making that occurs within the context of student-focused academic or behavioral interventions; and (c) the systematic evaluation of programs and services to determine their benefits for recipients, including the evaluation of school psychological services (Lambert, 1993). This competency is conceptually linked to the Boulder model of the scientist-practitioner, which has long provided an organizing framework for the KSU school psychology program.

The reciprocal interactions between science and practice in the school psychology specialty are evident in recent public policy changes related to data-based decision making and accountability, most notably in the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB, U.S. Department of Education, 2001). This legislation reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—the primary federal law governing K-12 education—and incorporated systems, incentives, and consequences that were designed to enhance educational performance of all learners. The implications of such legislation for the practice of school psychology are profound (Conoley, 2003), and suggest increased emphases on standards based assessments and intervention-based data to examine children's response to intervention (President's Council on Special Education Excellence, 2002).

The paradigms associated with the scientific bases for decision-making are infused throughout the course of study. These include constructs such as the treatment utility of assessment (e.g., Hayes, Nelson, & Jarrett, 1987), a problem-solving, habilitation view of disabilities (Pledger, 2003; Reschly & Ysseldyke, 2002); evidence-based interventions (Lonigan, Elbert, & Johnson, 1998; Task Force on Evidence Based Interventions in School Psychology, 2003); and intervention fidelity (Moncher & Prinz, 1991; Telzrow & Beebe, 2002). Education and training associated with these core concepts is bolstered by relevant research methodologies to assist students in evaluating research and in contributing new knowledge to the profession.

2.0 – 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.

The “art” of school psychological practice is to a large degree grounded in the capacity of individuals to communicate successfully with key stakeholders, including teachers, school administrators, and parents (Conoley & Gutkin, 1995). Interpersonal communication is emphasized in the admissions process during interviews with current students and faculty; in formal coursework (i.e., Role of the School Psychologist, Counseling sequence, Consultation in the Helping Professionals); and during informal student-student and student-faculty interactions. All students are introduced to the program's *Policy for Addressing Concerns about Student Performance or Functioning* (Appendix O), and the critical role of students' personal and interpersonal skills in successful school psychological practice is emphasized. Formal mechanisms for student feedback about the critical dispositions associated with effective personal and interpersonal communication are provided through periodic advising meetings, annual conferences with program faculty, and evaluations by practicum and internship supervisors.

Collaboration and consultation are skills that are systematically addressed through course work, practica, and internship. McNamara et al. (1998) assert that school psychologists represent essential collaborators with school administrators in promoting educational reforms that result in optimal outcomes for students. Collaboration with other educators and families is critical to this competency (Christenson & Buerkle, 1999; Murphy, DeEsch, & Strein, 1998; Rosenfield & Gravois, 1999). In their introductory course in the specialty (The Role of the School Psychologist), students are introduced to key collaboration competencies, and learn that the development of their referent influence is as essential for their future success as the development of their content expertise (Erchul & Raven, 1997). Students receive explicit training in mental health and behavioral models of consultation through coursework and associated practica experiences (see *Syllabi*, Appendix H). The application of

behavioral consultation knowledge and skills to address concerns about students' academic and behavioral functioning is required during practica and internship.

3.0 -- 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.

Concerns about disappointing rates of school completion, particularly among students who are from non-majority backgrounds or who have disabilities (National Center for Education Statistics, 2003) fostered landmark federal legislation designed to enhance the academic performance of all students (NCLB, 2001). Such concerns and their associated public policy initiatives have resulted in an increased emphasis on effective instruction and the development of cognitive and academic skills within the program during the past two years. Although intervention-based assessment models have been emphasized over traditional diagnostic assessment practices for some time (Reschly & Ysseldyke, 2002; Upah & Tilly, 2002), recent curricular revisions have highlighted standards-based assessments and intervention design (Conoley, 2003). Additionally, evidence-based practices, particularly those focused on the prevention and early intervention of cognitive and academic difficulty (Lovett et al., 2000; Shinn, Walker, & Stoner, 2002; Torgeson et al., 2001; *What Works Clearinghouse*, 2003), are emphasized throughout coursework and applied aspects of training.

An additional focus related to this domain is the promotion of improved metacognitive strategies and higher order abstract thinking abilities (Day & Koorland, 1997; Frisby, 1990; Meltzer, Roditi, Houser, & Perlman, 1998; Peverly, 1994). Frisby (1990) argued that school psychologists should assume a central role in the thinking skills movement because (a) the development of such competencies is at the core of the educative process, and (b) they have expertise in identifying programs and techniques that have a high probability of success. Evidence based interventions that are relevant for cognitive and academic concerns are central to this domain (Kavale & Forness, 1999; Lentz, Allen, & Ehrhardt, 1996), and this emphasis is evident throughout a number of courses and applied experiences.

4.0 -- Socialization and Development of Life Competencies: 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.

Scientists and practitioners in the complementary disciplines of psychology and education have recently cautioned that an emphasis on raising students' academic achievement at the expense of their social-emotional well-being is a dangerous undertaking (Elias, Zins, Graczyk, & Weissberg, 2003). There is increasing recognition that educational systems play a key role in fostering students' social acceptance and personal development (Elias et al., 2003; Farmer, Pearl, & Van Acker, 1996; Greenberg et al., 2003; Stanovich, Jordan, & Perot, 1998).

Research in psychology has identified systemic and service delivery factors that may be counterproductive for maximizing students' personal and interpersonal competence (e.g., Arnold & Hughes, 1999; Batsche & Knoff, 1994; Dishion, McCord, & Poulin, 1999; Gresham, 1997; Hyman et al., 1997). Several characteristics of effective prevention programs for children and youth have been identified. These include the consideration of research-based risk and protective factors; the involvement of multiple intervention targets via programs that are long-term, developmentally appropriate, and culturally sensitive; the promotion of wellness in addition to remediation; and consideration of public policies, institutional practices, and environmental supports (Weissberg, Kumpfer, & Seligman, 2003).

Students are provided with education, training, and experience to assist them in considering these variables, as well as positive and proactive approaches that have been shown to promote social competencies (DuPaul & Ervin, 1996; Elias & Tobias, 1996; Goldstein, 1999; Hawkins, Doueck, & Lishner, 1988). Promotion of affective and adaptive behaviors through the use of evidence-based

interventions is emphasized in several courses (Counseling sequence, Diagnosis & Treatment of Child Disorders in Schools, Social-Emotional Interventions, Social Psychology, Community Psychology), as well as applied components of the program (i.e., practica, internship). In light of research suggesting the importance of preventive and early intervention programs, as well as the beneficial outcomes associated with programs that have multiple intervention targets (e.g., Hester & Kaiser, 1998; Reid, 1993), such approaches are emphasized throughout students' didactic and applied experiences.

5.0 -- 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.

The profession of school psychology is inherently linked to considerations of diversity. The discipline's earliest practices were dedicated to the development of reliable means of differentiating learners, and in contemporary school psychology, questions about group differences continue to present a conundrum, albeit one that the profession often uncomfortably avoids (Frisby, 1999). Factors that are of importance to this domain include (a) evidence that the U.S. student population is becoming increasingly more linguistically and culturally diverse (Flanagan & Miranda, 1995); (b) recognition that "diversity" cuts across a multitude of human characteristics, not simply those that are most visibly distinguishing (Henning-Stout & Brown-Cheatham, 1999); and (c) the recognition that "*all diversity boils down to individual differences*" (Frisby, 1999, p. 196; emphasis in original). Among the important sensitivities emphasized in the training of school psychologists is recognition of the tendencies to (a) misrepresent diverse perspectives by interpreting patterns of behavior that are not the norm in the dominant culture as deviance (ethnocentrism); (b) attribute a characteristic of an individual to others within his or her group (stereotyping); and (c) interpret personal characteristics as individual traits rather than emerging from a social context (idiosyncrasy) (Henning-Stout & Brown-Cheatham, 1999).

Diversity considerations are addressed in a dedicated course (Interventions with Culturally Diverse Students). Additionally, relevant content about a range of diversity issues is infused in other courses where such considerations are critical (Diagnosis of Child Disorders in Schools, Consultation in the Helping Professions, the Assessment and Intervention sequences). Efforts are made to provide exposure to diverse student populations during practica and internship placements, which are facilitated by the university's proximity to both major urban and rural districts.

6.0 -- School and Systems Organization, Policy Development, and Climate: School psychologists have knowledge of general education, special education, and other educational and related services.

Effective school psychological practice requires knowledge about the organizational contexts where that work is conducted, as well as the influences that affect these systems (Borgelt & Conoley, 1999; Curtis & Stollar, 2002). Examples of current issues that have significantly affected schools and schooling include the effective schools literature (Bickel, 1999), large scale testing programs (Zlatos, 1994), and educational policies (NCLB, 2001; Telzrow, 1999).

Increasingly, leaders promoting school improvement efforts have attended to the science of systems change when considering their implementation (e.g., Greenberg et al., 2003). A decade of research by the Rand Corporation (*New American Schools Development Corporation*, 2003) concluded that evidence-based models of intervention that are imported into schools deteriorate over time, and that systemic issues must be addressed. Elliott, Kratochwill, and Roach's conclusions are that "it takes consensus (i.e., 80% or more of the staff), commitment (i.e., years, including summers, not weeks), partnerships (i.e., a team of school-based leaders working with experienced consultants who understand the skills needed to implement the innovation), and the ongoing evaluation of one's intervention actions and outcomes" (2003, p. 325).

The KSU school psychology program historically has promoted school psychologists as change agents. Exposure to conceptual models related to this area of competence occurs through formal course work in *The Role of the School Psychologist*, *Community Psychology*, *Social Psychology*, and *Administration and Supervision in Special Education*, as well as applied experiences obtained in *Field Experience*, *Practica*, and *Internship*.

7.0-- *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.

...Jonesboro. Paducah. Columbine... These place names are reminders that school violence, albeit still uncommon in most children's experience, requires an area of competence in school psychological practice that was not widely considered by training programs until the past decade. The Kent State school psychology program provides exposure to crisis prevention and management through a sequenced set of didactic and applied experiences beginning during the first semester of enrollment and continuing through practica and internship.

A preventive approach, which has been an emphasis of the school psychology program at Kent State since the 1970s, persists today in the form of training in evidence-based prevention and early intervention programs for such diverse concerns as conduct problems (Walker, Severson, Feil, Stiller, & Golly, 1998), adolescent suicide (Sandoval & Brock, 1996), bullying (Espelage & Swearer, 2003) and substance abuse (Botvin, 1996; Dusenbury & Falco, 1995).

Also of relevance for this area is the increasing emphasis that has been placed on expanding mental health services in schools (Dwyer & Bernstein, 1998). Although still inadequate to address the needs of children and youth, current evidence indicates that there is increased service coordination across traditionally fragmented systems, greater emphasis on comprehensive prevention and intervention programs, and higher standards for the provision of evidence based psychosocial interventions (Adelman & Taylor, 2000; Hibbs & Jensen, 1996).

8.0 -- *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.

In a comprehensive review of the empirical evidence concerning family-school partnerships, Christenson and Buerkle (1999) concluded that such practices are associated with specific benefits for children, parents, and schools. These authors suggest that full understanding and appreciation of family-school involvement requires (a) a non-hierarchical, partnership orientation on the part of educators; (b) recognition that family involvement encompasses ways that parents support learning outside of schools; and (c) knowledge about the competence-enhancing mechanisms families often afford their children that facilitate their success as learners).

School-community partnerships are often advantageous for meeting the needs of children and families, schools, and the community in general (Epstein et al., 2002). Sheridan, Napolitano, and Swearer offer the following characteristics of meaningful school-community partnerships: (a) interactions among partners are collaborative; (b) maintenance of a positive relationship is a priority; (c) relationships are balanced; (d) relationships are cooperative and interdependent; (e) the relationship occurs within a context with students at the center; (f) actions between schools and other community agencies are flexible, responsive, and proactive; (g) differences in viewpoints and perspectives are seen as strengths, not hindrances; (f) there is a commitment to cultural diversity; and (g) there is an emphasis on outcomes and goal attainment.

Within the KSU school psychology program, home/school/community collaboration is promoted as part of both the "written" and the "unwritten" curricula. Addressing parent-family issues is a major

consideration in several courses, including Diagnosis & Treatment of Child Disorders in Schools, Developmental Assessment, Social Psychology, the Counseling sequence, the Assessment sequence, and Consultation in the Helping Professions. These priorities are also addressed through partnership and training activities involving the Family Child Learning Center, a community-based early intervention and preschool program serving individuals and families with special needs. Additional modeling and supervised experiences in fostering family/school/community collaboration are provided through practica and internship.

9.0 -- Research and Program Evaluation: School psychologists have knowledge of research, statistics, and evaluation methods.

This competency assures that school psychologists use data to inform their decisions and actions. As data-based decision makers, school psychologists recognize that: systems use information from state and local assessments to determine needs and target resources; schools use data to provide appropriate professional development for teachers and help to meet the needs of all subgroups of students; teachers use information from high-stakes assessments to inform classroom decisions and enhance instruction so that all students succeed; and that parents have access to regular school, district and state report cards, so they may monitor progress and make informed decisions.

The school psychology program's most over arching and pervasive theme—data based decision making—is revisited and emphasized in doctoral study in competencies related to research and program evaluation. At this level, students refine their thinking as consumers of research and begin their initiation as independent researchers. Through Research Seminars, students learn to “focus on the implications [of research] for solving school problems” (Phillips, 1999, p. 61). A strong research foundation is provided by collaborating faculty in Evaluation and Measurement, who introduce students to both quantitative (e.g., Keith, 1999) and qualitative methods (e.g., Polkinghorne & Gribbons, 1999), as well as advanced study in one of these methodologies, generally determined by the anticipated focus for dissertation study. These collaborating faculty members frequently serve as outside members on students' dissertation committees. The program employs a systematic process that ensures all students are competent consumers of research and new knowledge, and are able to use diverse methodologies (e.g., ethnographic, single subject designs, quantitative- & qualitative-methods) to evaluate professional practices (e.g., interventions).

10.0 -- *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.

Because of their key role in building bridges—between instructional staff and school administrators, between general and special educators, and between home and school—school psychologists must be knowledgeable about legal requirements that affect schools and their other practice arenas. In her depiction of the future, Jacob-Timm (2000) posits that “advances in science and technology will require the profession to struggle with difficult ethical questions” (p. 39). The types of ethical issues that currently confront interns and recent graduates—such as “do not resuscitate” orders for students with disabilities, the ethical and responsible provision of on-line mental health services, and profound inequalities among students' educational opportunities—are likely to become increasingly complex during the next decade.

The rapidity of change within school psychological practice requires ethical professionals to embrace life-long learning and continuing professional development (Fowler & Harrison, 1995). In addition, formal continuing professional development requirements associated with credentials such as state Department of Education licensure, the NCSP, and State Board of Psychology licensure, make it essential for professional school psychologists to engage in a systematic renewal and updating of

professional skills and competencies. This expectation for continuing professional development is conveyed in formal program requirements as well as through faculty modeling.

The course of study provides a knowledge-base specific to the professional specialty of school psychology, including history and foundations of school psychology; legal, ethical and professional issues; alternative models for the delivery of school psychological services; implications and use of emergent technologies; & the diversity of roles and functions for the contemporary school psychologist.

11.0 -- **Information Technology:** School psychologists have knowledge of information sources and technology relevant to their work.

This competency relates to school psychologists' ability to access, evaluate, and utilize information sources and technology in ways that safeguard and enhance the quality of services. Examples include accessing professional literature and research to apply data-supported solutions for problems, and helping select instructional and adaptive technology for use in student programs or interventions.

Educational professionals use an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies, including a variety of educational technology and media, to develop students' critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills. Since schools are reliant on technology to support information access and dissemination, professional competence in this area requires mastery of specific technology-related skills. These include Basic Computer/Technology Operations and Concepts (e.g., familiarity with characteristics of media for information storage), Personal & Professional Use of Technology (e.g., word processing, templates use for psychological reports and test data, database applications, presentation software), and Technology in the Service of School Psychology (facility in the application of computers to support assessment, consultation, and intervention). Such skills are introduced in initial coursework, incorporated as requirements for all SPSY courses and evaluated for completion of the program competencies. Extensive resources and supports to assist in the development and reinforcement of technology competencies are provided to students, and evidence of their information technology competencies is to be displayed within their Portfolios.

Each of the competency areas is associated with specific objectives, which are outlined in the *Program Handbook* (Appendix A). These competencies are attained through (a) a sequence of course work focused on educational and psychological theory; research methods, design, and data analytic techniques; and professional school psychology; (b) application of skills through practica of graduated intensity and a comprehensive internship experience; and (c) sequenced research activities progressing from faculty-guided individual research projects through the dissertation. A matrix illustrating the interface between the objectives associated with the 11 competencies and the course of study is contained in Appendix A, immediately following the *Program Handbook*.

3. *In achieving its objectives the program has and implements a clear and coherent curriculum plan*

In addition to identifying 11 school psychology competency areas and their associated objectives, the program has organized its program requirements according to the following major categories (described in the *Program Handbook*, Appendix A, and in specific *Course Syllabi*, Appendix H).

Psychological & Educational Foundations (27 semester hours)

- Biological Aspects of Behavior
- Cognitive Aspects of Behavior
- Social Aspects of Behavior
- Developmental/Affective Aspects of Behavior
- History and Systems of Psychology
- Graduate School of Education Core Requirements
- State Licensure Requirements for Individuals without a Teaching Credential

Research Methodology, Design, and Data Analytic Techniques (14 semester hours)

- B. Basic Research
 - Advanced Research
 - Applied Research

Professional School Psychology (42 semester hours if no previous coursework)

- Assessment and Intervention
- Counseling and Consultation
- Professional Role & Practice

Practica (12 semester hours)

- Practicum
- Advanced Practicum
- Elective

Residency (2 semesters)**Comprehensive Examination****Internship** (12 semester hours)**Dissertation** (2 semesters, 15 hours each)

Explicitly identified within this course of study are the *psychological foundations* of biological aspects of behavior; cognitive and affective aspects of behavior; social aspects of behavior; history and systems of psychology; psychological measurement; research methodology; and techniques of data analysis. Also embedded are the *scientific, methodological, and theoretical foundations* of practice in the substantive areas of professional psychology, each reflected in coursework addressing individual differences in behavior; human development; psychopathology; and professional standards and ethics. Coursework and supervised practica and internship provide knowledge and experience in *diagnosing or defining problems through psychological assessment and measurement and formulating and implementing intervention strategies* (with emphasis on empirically supported procedures), including:

- Theories and methods of assessment and diagnosis; effective intervention; consultation and supervision; and evaluating the efficacy of interventions; with ...
- Training and experiences to foster an appreciation of cultural and individual diversity;
- Curricular and co-curricular mentorship and experiences to foster a commitment to life-long learning and scholarly inquiry.

During the 2003-04 academic year, program faculty engaged in a systematic review and evaluation of the course of study, and implemented a number of curriculum changes, including the addition of new courses and the revision of existing courses. This review was precipitated by the addition of two new program faculty and facilitated by the self-study process. It is anticipated that these curriculum changes will be effective in Fall 2005. In the interim, courses are being phased in and offered on a special topics basis in order to accommodate students' needs. The current *Program Handbook* (Appendix A) reflects the new course of study, albeit with special topics course numbers until official curriculum revisions go into effect.

The CoE requires students to maintain a grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 or higher (see *Catalog*, Appendix C). Student GPA is monitored following grade postings each semester, and students and advisors are notified in writing if performance levels fall below this expectation. In

addition, the school psychology program has adopted a policy requiring students who earn a grade of "C" or lower or a grade of "U" in any required pre-clinical or pre-practicum courses to meet with their advisor to evaluate the impact of that performance on the overall course of study and to identify an appropriate response, which may include a faculty-approved remedial plan to develop and demonstrate mastery of essential competencies. An additional policy states that students who earn a "U" in one or more semesters of practicum will not be permitted to continue in advanced seminar and practicum courses. These policies are reflected in the *Policy for Addressing Concerns about Student Performance or Functioning* (Appendix O).

The program ensures that these achievement levels are maintained through a systematic sequence of performance-based indicators of success. Beginning with the admission process and continuing to postgraduate follow-up, the program incorporates specific assessments of student progress on at least an annual basis. Examples of assessments include those that reflect student performance in didactic coursework (e.g., grades of B/S or better), in applied settings (e.g., evaluations by field-based practicum supervisors), and in integration and application of research (e.g., written and oral comprehensive examinations, defense of dissertation proposal and dissertation). The program's Performance-Based Accountability System for Evaluating Student Attainment of Program Objectives is depicted in Table 10, and a schematic of assessments by year in the program is reflected in Table 11. Data from performance-based assessments are reviewed consistently to identify need for a program response (see *Program Meeting Minutes*, Appendix K).

4. *Additionally, the program requires that its students receive adequate and appropriate practicum experiences...*

Laboratory and field-based practica are used to evaluate a trainee's mastery of distinct skills and dispositions as one measure of preparedness to enter the internship. Students participate in practica in educational and mental health settings that are chosen to provide (a) comprehensive experiences that complement previous and current preparation, (b) appropriate supervision and mentorship, and (c) applied experiences to address individual and program objectives. The graduated nature of the program's practica is described in the *Program Handbook* (Appendix A), and the locations and characteristics of practica settings utilized over the past five years are depicted in Table 2. In the KSU school psychology program practica experiences are governed by the following principles:

- Practica experiences are designed to be distinct from and occur prior to the internship.
- Practica occur at times, are in settings, and are of sufficient length to address the specific training objectives for which the practicum was designed.
- Practica are sequential, that is they 'layer' skills over multiple semesters following didactic coursework that is essential to support the intervention skills to be practiced.
- There is a direct and explicit relationship between practica experiences and the objectives/competencies under consideration.
- Practica experiences occur under conditions of appropriate supervision and always occur with university faculty involvement and supervision.
- Practica experiences are recognized through the award of academic credit.
- Practica experiences are conducted in accordance with current legal-ethical and professional standards.

The KSU program provides a sequence of closely supervised practica experiences through which students are evaluated regarding their mastery of distinct skills consistent with the 11 competency areas and their associated objectives (see *Practica Evaluation Instrument*, Appendix R).

Domain C: Program Resources

The program demonstrates that it has resources of appropriate quality and sufficiency to achieve its education and training goals and objectives.

1. *The program has an identifiable core faculty responsible for its leadership...*

There are five full-time Core Program Faculty (Drs. Anhalt, Cowan, McGoey, Mcloughlin & Telzrow), each of whom has an earned doctorate in psychology and sole appointment within the School Psychology program. The number of Core Program Faculty increased from three to five FTE faculty during the current academic year. Following a search for a fourth faculty member during the 2002-2003 academic year, two exceptional candidates were identified, and support for two hires instead of one occurred at the College and Provost's levels as a means of both contributing additional resources to the program and increasing the program's faculty diversity. The addition of Drs. Anhalt and Cowan to the core program faculty provides a clear indication of the institution's commitment to the program and to enhancing faculty diversity. It has been more than a decade since there were five core faculty dedicated to the program.

Consistent with the CoA specifications, the criteria for Core Program Faculty are that they (a) possess an earned doctorate in school psychology or a related field (in the case of Dr. Anhalt, child clinical psychology); (b) have an explicit affiliation to the school psychology program; and (c) are committed for a minimum of 50% of time to the program. All faculty members are fully committed to the School Psychology program for determining student admissions and retention, curriculum development and evaluation, student advising, approval of practicum and internship sites, student comprehensive examinations, and dissertation direction. Three of the five faculty members each teach one course per academic year in another program area (Drs. Anhalt and Cowan in Educational Psychology; Dr. McGoey in Early Childhood Education), which enhances the program by providing complementary recruitment and research opportunities.

Other Program Faculty contribute to the program by teaching and advisement. These include faculty members from other program areas within the CoE and the Psychology Department (see Table 3 and Appendix H, *Faculty Vitae*). These individuals teach courses (most notably psychology foundation courses, evaluation and measurement courses, doctoral seminars cross-listed with the Special Education program, and those designated as Universal Professional Requirements [UPRs]), and participate on students' advisory phase and dissertation committees. Other Program Contributors have a more limited role in the program, primarily presenting seminars and providing practicum supervision. These include four individuals who have been recognized by the EFSS Faculty Advisory Committee as Adjunct Clinical Professors (see Table 3 and Appendix H, *Faculty Vitae*).

(a) Function as an integral part of the academic unit of which the program is an element

The core program faculty functions as a unit in curriculum development, policy-making, and other actions. Program meetings are held monthly during the academic year, and are generally attended by the Department Chairperson and an elected student representative (see *Program Meeting Minutes*, Appendix K). Decisions are arrived at collectively by the program faculty, in consultation with students and other constituencies, and are then forwarded to appropriate departmental, college, and university committees for their approval. Program faculty also participate actively in departmental governance (e.g., as members of the EFSS Faculty Advisory Committee and the Curriculum Committee), in collegial decision-making groups (e.g., the monthly meeting of the EFSS Program Coordinators), and in critical decision-making processes related to the unit (e.g., the Program Coordinator chaired the Search Committee for the Department Chairperson in 2001 and served on the Dean's Search Committee in 2002).

(b) Are sufficient in number for their academic and professional responsibilities

The addition of two fulltime tenure track faculty members to the core program faculty during the current academic year provides for a sufficient number of faculty to fulfill academic and professional responsibilities to the program. Core faculty provide teaching and advisement to both the Ph.D and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degree programs. Because the Ed.S. program has a complementary mission to the Ph.D. program (with a focus on preparing entry-level school psychologists to work in educational settings) and serves as a “feeder” program for the doctoral program, faculty involvement in both degree programs is viewed as an asset.

- (c) Have theoretical perspectives and academic and applied experiences appropriate to the program’s goals and objectives
- (d) Demonstrate substantial competence and have recognized credentials in those areas which are at the core of the program’s objectives and goals
- (e) Are available to and functional as appropriate role models for students in their learning and socialization into the discipline and profession

The core program faculty have explicit training as psychology professionals with expertise in school psychology or a closely related specialty. The three most recent hires all graduated from APA-approved training programs and completed APA-approved internships. All core faculty members possess certification and licensure appropriate to their teaching responsibilities and have professional affiliations with the field’s major learned societies (see Table 3 and Appendix G, *Faculty Vitae*).

2. *The program has an identifiable body of students at different levels of matriculation...*

The KSU school psychology program has an approximately equal cohort of students at each of the stages in the program (see Tables 4 & 5). There are 14 students enrolled in the program at the time of this writing. Seven students were awarded degrees since the 1999-00 AY, with an additional 3 students expected to complete degree requirements (dissertation) by August 2004 (see Table 1). The program seeks to admit approximately 3 to 4 doctoral students each year to comprise a year-cohort and maintain a reasonable program size for the number of core faculty.

During the previous five-year period, the number of applications to the Ph.D. program per year has ranged from 2 to 12. In an effort to increase the size and diversity of the applicant pool, program faculty coordinated a student focus group in the summer of 2002 to seek data about the reasons for pursuit of the Ph.D. and suggestions for recruitment and retention. As a result of student recommendations, the program developed a FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions) document about doctoral study, which was subsequently posted on the program web page; conducted a recruitment mailing to graduates of the Ed.S. program within the past 10 years; and intensified recruitment from within the Ed.S. cohort of students. Although the total number of applicants over the past two years has increased only slightly, applicants are competitive, and the program has been successful in attaining its goal of admitting 3-4 students into the program annually. Continued focus on enhancing the number and diversity of applicants is evident during the current academic year (see Domain D and Appendices J [*Plan for Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Faculty and Students*] and K [*Program Meeting Minutes*]).

Consistent with the program’s goals and objectives, graduates predominantly elect leadership positions in educational and mental health settings (Table 9).

3. *The program has, and appropriately utilizes, the additional resources it needs to achieve its training goals and objectives. The resources should include:*

a. *Financial support for training and educational activities.*

The school psychology program faculty load for teaching and research responsibilities is determined within the EFSS department (see Appendix C, *Department Handbook*). Initial appointments traditionally have a teaching-load reduction for the first academic year. In addition, during the past two years, significant administrative support for course releases for research and service activities (e.g., self-study preparation) for all faculty has been evident. School psychology faculty members have the option of summer teaching appointments, and the university assigns significant funds to support summer research appointments, particularly for newly appointed and untenured faculty. Program requests for affiliated/adjunct/part-time faculty have been granted when program needs and student enrollment warrant. New faculty hires to replace lines vacated by resignation and retirements routinely are handled expeditiously following procedures to affirm that requested lines will support the university's overall mission.

The department provides support for program administration by allocating release load to the Program Coordinator in all calendar-year semesters (including the critical summer semester when newly admitted students require orientation). For the past several years, the department has allocated two graduate assistants and one teaching fellow (who serves as a teaching assistant for assessment courses) to the program. This level of support is in line with other CoE units' graduate assistant allocations.

The department provides modest budgetary support for research dissemination and professional development activities (typically \$600 per annum), with additional amounts upon application and approval by the EFSS FAC. Additional travel support is granted for attendance at meetings of the statewide inter-university school psychology training council and for intern site visits. Further sources of support from the department are available for program initiatives (e.g., for hosting meetings of Advisory Committee) and for support of individual faculty members' research and teaching. The CoE makes available "cost share" contributions to programs and faculty as part of an institutionalized incentive plan. Professional improvement leaves (sabbaticals) are available once every seven years as budgeted items allocated to the school psychology program area similar to all other academic units.

Numerous university supports for educational and training activities exist. The Sponsored Programs sector of the Division of Research, Graduate Studies and Technology Transfer provides a range of supports for faculty research, including identifying potential funding sources, access to the Community of Science (COS) funding opportunity database, technical assistance for proposal development, and administration of funded projects. This office's efforts resulted in nearly \$31 million in external funding during the past year. The Division sponsors the University Research Council, whose charge is to foster and stimulate research efforts by providing financial support for projects unlikely to generate outside-funding; an \$85,000 academic year budget is allocated for faculty awards ranging from \$100 to \$2,500. The University Research Council also hosts an annual competition for summer and academic year research appointments.

The University Teaching Council provides reimbursement for travel and related expenses (e.g., participation in meetings, conferences, workshops, and seminars related to teaching; visiting archives and collections that are tied to courses; presenting papers or talks on teaching activities; and facilitating research on teaching) associated with efforts to improve teaching at Kent State University. The UTC's University Summer Teaching Development Award provides financial

support for faculty to engage in projects that will significantly improve teaching methods, develop curricula, or create valuable new course materials.

b. Clerical and technical support.

Secretarial support within the Department of EFSS is provided for specific functions (e.g., book orders, curricular revisions, admission and licensing activities). In addition, staff in the Office of Student Services manage the program application process.

Computer terminals attached to the Local Area Network (LAN) of the College and University have been installed for each faculty member and for shared use by Graduate Assistants/Teaching Fellows. There is a computer 'refresh' program in operation to ensure that no faculty has a desktop computer older than three years. The www connections are all via fiber-optic cable at state-of-art transmission speeds. Every faculty member is furnished with on-site and remote e-mail & voice-mail facilities, and there is on-site and remote technology assistance within the CoE and the university.

c. Training materials and equipment.

Through its Teaching Development Support initiative, the UTC provides funds for teaching materials that go beyond the infrastructure categories. The Faculty Professional Development Center (FPDC) supports the scholarship and professional work of faculty and graduate students. Technology grants in the amount of \$500 are available for the purchase of technological equipment, and financial support for a range of professional development activities consistent with the FPDC's mission is available. An annual budget is allocated to the department by the Instructional Resource Center for the purchase of assessment and curriculum materials. Additionally, during the current academic year, the Dean's office provided a substantial loan to the department to purchase new test materials needed for training, with the loan to be repaid from student course fees over time.

d. Physical facilities.

Furnished, individual office space is allocated for all core and program faculty members contributing to the program, and each is furnished with the typical services found in university offices. Students on graduate assistantships have shared office space and computer access. Private conference space is available upon reservation. Each student is furnished with a no-cost e-mail account, and extensive on-site and remote access to research sources is available.

Description of the physical facilities for Kent State University is contained in Appendix B (*University Catalog and Description of the College Centers*). The Center for Disability studies provides interdisciplinary research support for faculty and graduate students engaged in research on disability issues. The Child Development Center, an early childhood model laboratory school, provides opportunities for faculty and student research and practice. The Family Child Learning Center, which offers early intervention services to infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, offers a training location for grant-funded school psychology students and for faculty research. The Counseling and Human Development Center (CHDC) provides students with a practicum experience through the supervised provision of assessment services to university students and the local community. The CHDC is equipped with one-way mirrors, split-screen videotaping facilities, and in-room telephones based around seven recently refurbished counseling cubicles. This permits observation by our students at the time of assessment and counseling and allows for videotaping for viewing at a later time. The Bureau of Educational Research provides a source of support for students who are engaged in research activities, including data entry and analysis.

e. *Student support services.*

A range of student support services is available within the program. In addition to faculty advising, which occurs on a consistent basis from pre-admission to graduation, peer interaction, student mentorship and socialization opportunities are available through SASP (see Appendix D). Periodic doctoral student dinners are hosted at the home of faculty members or students to foster a sense of cohort for the largely part-time student body. The recently enhanced doctoral program web presence, including the Ph.D. listserv and doctoral student directory, also provides a means of increasing student connectedness to one another and the program. Early in their doctoral studies students receive mentored research experience through *Individual Research in School Psychology*, which provides for a jointly authored scholarly product. Graduate assistantships, traineeships, or teaching fellowships are available to all Ph.D. students who express interest.

Within the broader university, student support services are available to address a range of students' financial, health, physical, and emotional needs. The Student Financial Aid Office can assist students in locating scholarships, grants, and loans appropriate to their circumstances. The Graduate Student Senate (which has two school psychology representatives, one from the program and one from SASP), represents the concerns of graduate students and provides individual funding for travel support to professional conferences and for dissertation projects, as well as program support for sponsored speakers or social gatherings. The University Health Service provides medical services, psychological services, and health promotion services. The Student Recreation and Wellness Center is a modern 153,000 square foot facility offering extensive recreational and wellness activities. The Office of the Student Ombuds provides students confidential consultation to assist with the possible resolution of any university-related concern, grievance or appeal. Student Disability Services (SDS) provides assistance to students with varying degrees and types of disabilities to maximize educational opportunity and academic potential. All graduate students receiving GA/TF support are eligible for the Faculty and Staff Assistance Program, which provides free, confidential service to assist with any type of personal problem or concern. These services are described on the university web page, and in many cases there are direct links from the program's main web page to individual offices. In specific instances of need, advisors encourage students to access appropriate program or university support services.

f. *Access to or control over practicum training sites and facilities that are appropriate to the program's goals, objectives, and training model.*

The selection and use of practica sites and other training facilities is the exclusive responsibility of the program's faculty.

4. *A graduate program may consist of, or be located under, a single administrative entity (institution, agency, school, department, etc.) or may take the form of a consortium.*

The structure and organization of the KSU College of Education (CoE) and its three component departments, including the Department of Educational Foundations & Special Services (EFSS) within which the school psychology program is housed, are fully described in *Domain A: Eligibility*.

Domain D: Cultural and Individual Differences & Diversity

The program recognizes the importance of cultural and individual differences and diversity in the training of psychologists.

1. *The program has made systematic, coherent, and long-term efforts to attract and retain students and faculty from differing ethnic, racial, and personal backgrounds into the program...*

Kent State University (KSU) has made diversity issues a priority, in part by establishing an Office of Diversity, whose mission is "to ensure the effective translation of diversity themes into policies, procedures, programs and practices" (see Appendix I). In addition, an ad hoc committee from the KSU College and Graduate School of Education has developed a Diversity Plan, which was presented to faculty on February 6, 2004 (see Appendix J). Consistent with the university and college's commitment to diversity, the school psychology program has worked diligently to make this a priority of the program through its philosophy and practice. Competency 5.0 of the program's training paradigm states "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."

As part of the 2002 Annual Report Supplement to APA, the School Psychology program developed a plan to improve recruitment and retention of faculty and students from diverse backgrounds (see Appendix T). A detailed report of activities undertaken by the faculty in the last two years, as well as recent program reflections, can be found in Appendix J. The Department of EFSS conducts its faculty recruitment and promotion in line with the university Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity policies (see Appendix C). Significant efforts to hire women and minorities have consistently been made in all KSU CoE hiring campaigns. A search for a tenure-track Assistant/Associate Professor in School Psychology was conducted in 2002-2003 (see position posting in Appendix J). Concerted efforts were made to obtain qualified minority applicants during this search process and they are described in Appendix J. As a result of the program's efforts, 28% of applications for the position were from ethnic minority individuals. At the conclusion of the search process, the School Psychology Search Committee recommended two candidates for hire; one candidate was a Caucasian male and the other was a Hispanic female. The recommendation was forwarded to the Department Chairperson and the Dean of the CGSE. Because only one position had been approved, approval was sought by the CGSE Dean to hire both individuals. The provost approved this request and both individuals were hired. This demonstrates institutional support for the SPSY graduate program, as well as support at the college and university levels to improve diversity resources.

The program seeks two primary qualities in its incoming students: quality and diversity. The quality of the student body is demonstrated by their high entrance qualifications and their success in the program. Additionally, 100% of students gain high quality, paid internships followed by employment in appropriate professional positions. Specific means for encouraging applications from minority applicants include sending a clear message to prospective students in application materials that the program is committed to a diverse student body. Specifically, the Program Handbook states "The Graduate Program in School Psychology is committed to the recruitment and retention of persons from diverse backgrounds. A holistic review of applicants' materials is conducted by program faculty, and performance below the criterion listed in a single area will not eliminate a candidate from consideration" (see Appendix A, p. 7).

A detailed report of recent activities related to recruitment and retention of minority students is presented in Appendix J. Some examples of activities undertaken to increase the number of applications from minority students include: (a) mailing informational packets to chairpersons of departments of psychology and education at 75 institutions with a significant enrollment of minority students; (b) contacting prospective minority students (as soon as they were identified by name) to encourage submission of an application for admission to the school psychology program; (c) actively recruiting minority students admitted to the doctoral program (e.g., through contact with program faculty

and students regarding match in interests and graduate assistantships). The core program faculty have reflected on these efforts and outlined additional plans to improve recruitment of minority students (see Appendix J). These plans were unanimously approved by program faculty on February 19, 2004. Recruitment and retention of a diverse student body is an important and continuous conversation during SPSY program meetings, as indicated by sample of Program Meeting Minutes (see Appendix K).

Every action the program core faculty has been able to identify to further diversity has been incorporated into hiring/enrollment and retention strategies. The university's academic administration -- at the departmental, college and central university levels -- has facilitated every effort undertaken by the program faculty to encourage a diverse student and faculty cohort. No expense limitations have been experienced in generating a broader representation of the general NE Ohio community. In fact, there are regular requests for faculty to brainstorm for innovative ideas to further broaden the breadth of the university community in terms of diversity.

The degree to which the program has succeeded in promoting a diverse family is, perhaps, a reflection of a nationwide problem in higher education. This 'problem' is one of attracting a diverse group of students and faculty to a competitive and academically challenging training program within the 'helping professions.' Business, industry and commerce traditionally have been more generous in their compensation packages to psychologists from underrepresented groups who have earned a doctoral degree and gained licensure. Of note is the fact that Ph.D. level school psychologists working in public schools generally attract no additional compensation when compared to those without a leadership credential. Generally, the career 'specialist level' school psychologist has peaked at the top of the public education salary scale -- leaving little or no financial incentive for a potential doctoral-level leader.

2. The program has and implements a thoughtful and coherent plan to provide students with relevant knowledge and experiences about the role of cultural and individual diversity in psychological phenomena...

Consistent with Competency 5.0 of the program philosophy, the faculty is committed to insuring that the entire program reflects social responsibility and respect for human diversity, including sensitivity to individuals of differing ages, genders, religions, physical and mental abilities, sexual orientations, nationalities, and other social and individual backgrounds, and understanding of the ways these characteristics relate to development and learning. Coursework is woven throughout the program sequence to ensure that students will receive adequate exposure to opportunities for learning about and applying relevant skills and dispositions in the area of diversity. There is one course that is exclusively dedicated to diversity issues (Interventions with Culturally Diverse Students). In addition, courses that meet the curriculum requirements for the social bases of behavior and consultation, as well as those in assessment and intervention include a focus on the range of individual differences, populations, cultures, and disabling conditions within our pluralistic society. The matrix that depicts how specific objectives relate to the course of study provides further information about how competency 5.0 is addressed (see Appendix A, competency 5.0). With regard to practica, students are placed in a wide variety of settings that include work with children with intellectual, physical, and emotional disabilities of different ages, as well as with families with a variety of needs and backgrounds (see Table 2). Further, practicum and internship supervisors are asked to evaluate students' ability to work with diverse individuals in their training settings (see Appendices R and S). Students' interest and sensitivity to diversity issues is evidenced by dissertations of recent graduates, several of which focused on diverse populations.

In summary, the KSU school psychology program has made systematic, coherent, and long-term efforts to attract and retain students and faculty from differing ethnic, racial, and personal backgrounds. Consistent with such efforts, it acts to ensure a supportive and encouraging learning environment appropriate for the training of diverse individuals. In addition, the program implements a thoughtful and coherent plan to provide students with relevant knowledge and experiences about the role of cultural and individual diversity in psychological phenomena as they relate to the science and practice of professional psychology.

Domain E: Student-Faculty Relations

The program demonstrates that its education, training, and socialization experiences are characterized by mutual respect and courtesy between students and faculty and that it operates in a manner that facilitates students' educational experiences.

1. *The program recognizes the rights of students and faculty to be treated with courtesy and respect...*

The KSU program endeavors to foster collegiality and respect in student-faculty and student-student relationships. Evidence that the program has effectively addressed issues related to student-faculty relations is contained in Appendix L, *Current Student Program Evaluation and Feedback*. This evaluation, which was coordinated and summarized by two students during the winter of 2004, provided opportunities for the 14 students enrolled in the program at the time to comment about aspects of the program through a variety of means, including a written questionnaire, telephone interviews, and a student-led focus group. The majority of students at both course work and dissertation stage endorsed all items pertaining to student faculty relations and faculty support for timely completion to degree.

The program faculty is committed to a learning environment with a well-organized curriculum, clear expectations, and collegial student-faculty interactions that foster students' professional development and identification with the field. Faculty members encourage and reinforce students' creativity and intellectual risk-taking through mentored research and applied experiences of graduated intensity. Several processes are used to foster student-faculty and student-student collegiality. Within the past year, an enhanced doctoral student web presence was developed; this includes a PhD student listserv, a directory of doctoral students, and information concerning specific aspects of doctoral study (e.g., comprehensive exams, internship). In addition, "Doctoral Dinners" are held several times per year at the home of a faculty member or student. These events are designed to provide opportunities for collegial socialization as well as information exchanges. Doctoral students also engage with faculty in a range of research and service activities designed to socialize them to the field and mentor their developing scholarship and applied experiences.

Student feedback obtained during the current self-study process indicated that the majority of students **strongly agreed** that education, training, and socialization experiences are characterized by mutual respect and courtesy between students and faculty, and that the program operates in a manner that facilitates students' educational experiences (see Appendix L, *Current Student Program Evaluation and Feedback*).

2. *Program faculty are accessible to students and provide them with a level of guidance and supervision that actively encourages timely completion of the program...*

Guidance and mentorship are available to students beginning during the admission process and continuing beyond program completion. The Program Coordinator typically meets or talks with applicants prior to the admission process, and frequently connects applicants with current students through telephone or e-mail contact. Upon admission and prior to the time that the student has selected an Advisory Phase Committee, the Program Coordinator assigns a core faculty member to serve temporarily as that student's Faculty Advisor (see *Letter Following Admittance*, Appendix M). Student feedback obtained during the self-study process recommended greater student choice in advisor assignment. Although the letter sent to students upon admission indicates that the initial assignment of advisor can be changed upon student request (see Appendix M), student choice will be made more explicit upon admission in the future (see Appendix L, *Current Student Evaluation and Feedback*, and Appendix K, *Program Meeting Minutes* dated February 19, 2004).

Faculty have active research programs and extensive service commitments in which students are encouraged to become involved. During their first two academic year semesters, students enroll in Individual Research in School Psychology. This experience is designed to allow the student to work directly with a core faculty member on a research project leading to a product such as a presentation or publication, which becomes part of the student's portfolio (see Appendix P). Research and publication opportunities also are facilitated by research assistantships and other funded training positions within the CoE or the university. Students are frequently asked to serve as mentored or ad hoc reviewers of manuscripts submitted to the *School Psychology Review*, for which Dr. Telzrow serves as an Associate Editor and Dr. McGoey as a member of the Editorial Advisory Board. After the first year, students are advised to begin preliminary work on their dissertation research projects. This process is facilitated by students' participation in relevant coursework in Basic Research, Advanced Research, and Advanced School Psychological Foundations and Applications.

In order to orient them to professional service, students are actively encouraged to join and become involved with the field's major professional organizations. The program web page includes a comprehensive description of these organizations, which incorporates links to their respective web pages. This page was developed by a doctoral student, and provides an example of the kinds of service projects they are encouraged to engage in. A second student has provided considerable service to the Ohio School Psychologists Association through the development of the association web page and maintenance of their listserv. Within the past two years, two doctoral students have held leadership positions in regional school psychology professional organizations. During the fall of 2002, the program sponsored a local site for the School Psychology Futures Conference, which afforded a unique opportunity for students to engage with professional school psychologists from the region and other sites nationally to discuss issues of importance to the profession (see Appendix L, *2002 Futures Conference Documents*).

As students progress through the program, they receive ongoing advice, guidance and feedback from the Major Advisor, who meets individually with the student on a regular basis, and guides the preparation of a prospectus (see Appendix C, *Handbook for Ph.D. Students & Advisors* for a description of this process, and Appendix Q for illustrative prospectuses). The Program Coordinator also provides written correspondence to each student about his/her status and progress annually (see Appendix N). Of the seven students who were awarded degrees since the previous self-study (Table 8), three of these were beyond university timeline to degree. A major contributing factor for these delays is believed to be a significant reduction in core program faculty beginning in the mid-1990s as a result of retirements. More recent degree recipients have completed their degrees within posted timelines (Table 8). Although four students are currently matriculating beyond their seventh year in the program (Table 7), two of these are still within university timeline and two are on approved extensions (see Appendix N, *Approved Extensions*).

Student feedback obtained during the current self-study process indicated that the majority of students **strongly agreed** that faculty are accessible to students and provide them with a level of guidance and supervision that actively encourages timely completion of the program, that faculty keep the students informed of their progress on a regular basis, and that faculty are available and willing to work together with the students to solve any problems or disputes regarding training at the doctoral level (see Appendix L, *Current Student Program Evaluation and Feedback*).

3. *The program shows respect for cultural and individual diversity among their students...*

Consistent with its global philosophy, the program is committed to fostering in its students sensitivity to, appreciation for, and understanding of all individual differences (see *Program Handbook*, Appendix A). This objective is accomplished through both the formal course of study, where research and applied practice concerning diversity is routinely incorporated, as well as through the "hidden curriculum," or the manner in which student-faculty and student-student interactions occur. The atmosphere is intended to foster tolerance and respect for colleagues whose viewpoints and

epistemology differ from their own. Student feedback obtained during the current self-study process indicated that the majority of students **agreed** that the program recognizes the importance of cultural and individual differences and diversity in its training and that systematic and long-term efforts have been made to attract and retain students and faculty from differing ethnic, racial and personal backgrounds into the program (see Appendix L, *Current Student Program Evaluation and Feedback*). Degree recipients since the previous self-study included one Hispanic female and one student subject to the Americans with Disabilities Act, and recent dissertations have related to various diversity themes (see Table 8).

4. *At the time of admission, the program provides the students with written policies and procedures regarding program and institution requirements and expectations regarding students' performance...*

Upon admission to the program, and at other intervals, as appropriate, students are provided with written policies and procedures regarding program and institution requirements and expectations regarding their performance and continuation within the program, and procedures for the termination of students (see Appendix A, *Program Handbook*; Appendix C, *Graduate Catalog* pages and *Handbook for Ph.D. Students & Advisors*; Appendix H, *Course Syllabi*; Appendix O, *Policy for Addressing Concerns about Student Performance or Functioning*). This information is available to students at any time via the program web page. Students receive written feedback about the extent to which they are meeting the program's requirements and performance expectations annually (see Appendix N). All members of the student's Advisory or Dissertation Phase Committee receive copies of this correspondence in order to prompt closer faculty involvement and supervision when indicated.

Students experiencing special difficulties may, with the approval of their instructor, elect to either drop or take an incomplete in a course and complete requirements at a later time when they are better prepared. A degree of flexibility is also possible for students experiencing difficulties with timely completion of the program requirements. The College provides the granting of an extension for those students who do not meet university guidelines for program completion (see Table 7 and Appendix N, *Approved Extensions*). Although concerns about timely program completion, particularly at the dissertation stage, have existed in the past due to a large number of faculty retirements in the early to mid 1990s, an improved record of timely completion has been evident recently, and the program continues to target this as a priority. In addition, program faculty remain committed to the support of those enrolled students who are maintaining progress toward the degree.

When there are concerns about students' performance or functioning, the approved program policy (Appendix O) is adhered to. Due to the rigorous requirements and selection procedure for acceptance into the program, serious problems regarding student performance or functioning develop only rarely. As yet, no student has been asked to withdraw from the program due to unacceptable standards of work or performance. Within the past five years, two students withdrew from the program as a result of personal circumstances (see Table 6).

5. *Each program will be responsible for keeping information and records of all formal complaints and grievances...*

There have been no formal complaints or grievances since the previous site visit.

Domain F: Program Self-Assessment and Quality Enhancement

The program demonstrates a commitment to excellence through self-study, which assures that its goals and objectives are met, enhances the quality of professional education and training obtained by its students, and contributes to the fulfillment of its sponsor institution's mission.

1. The program, with appropriate involvement from its students, engages in regular, ongoing self-studies...

Three major constituencies contribute to the program's continuous improvement activities: the program faculty, including the core program faculty and other faculty; other contributors, most notably those providing practicum and intern supervision, Adjunct Clinical Faculty, and those who serve on the program's Advisory Committee; and the student body.

Core program faculty engage in self-study on a regular basis. The program systematically collects, analyzes, and interprets process and performance evaluation data and uses these results to guide program improvement. For example, core program faculty review various aspects of performance-based accountability at each of the Program Meetings (see *School Psychology Program Meeting Minutes*, Appendix K).

Other program faculty members assist in continuous improvement by communicating with core program faculty about course content and sequence, and dissertation advisement through the monthly Program Coordinators' meetings and less formal interactions. Doctoral level school psychologists who are actively engaged in providing psychological services within the community have been appointed to serve as Adjunct Clinical Professors (see Appendix G, *Faculty Vitae*). These individuals and others contribute to the program by providing practicum and internship supervision and presenting seminars. Their evaluations of students' performance on practicum and internship (see Appendices R and S) provide important information relative to program improvement. In addition, periodic group meetings with these individuals are conducted for the purpose of seeking feedback and advice for the program. The Program Advisory Committee, consisting of community leaders in school psychology and education, represents an additional external stakeholder group from whom information concerning program improvement is periodically requested (see Appendix L, *Indicators of Program Self-Assessment and Quality Enhancement* [Agenda and Minutes of Joint Meeting of Adjunct Clinical Faculty and Advisory Committee]).

Student participation in continuous improvement activities occurs in numerous ways, including making suggestions for program improvement within the context of annual self-assessment activities; participating in topic-specific student focus groups; and engaging in periodic program evaluation activities. More information about each of these mechanisms for student involvement in program self-assessment and quality enhancement is provided in the narrative pertaining to Domains A, C, and E, and their accompanying appendices.

2. The program demonstrates commitment to excellence through periodic systematic reviews of its goals and objectives, training model, and curriculum...

During the fall of 2003, program faculty engaged in a systematic review of its training model and course of study. This process was precipitated by the addition of two new core program faculty members and was facilitated by the self-study process. As a consequence of this review, the program's course of study was updated and curriculum revisions were initiated; student reaction and feedback were solicited prior to final adoption. The resulting changes are reflected in the *Program Handbook* and the *Interface of Program Objectives with Course of Study* (Appendix A).

The program's commitment to self-assessment and quality enhancement is also evidenced by its Performance-Based Accountability System. As reflected in Table 10, student attainment of each of the program's 11 competencies is evaluated at periodic intervals through a variety of effectiveness indicators. Various information sources (e.g., tests of knowledge, observations of skills, performance portfolios, written and oral comprehensive) are used, as appropriate, to evaluate components of the program. The program's Performance-Based Accountability System is reviewed by program faculty at regular intervals to confirm its completeness and currency, as well as to provide critical information about the need for program revision or enhancement. The system depicted in Table 10 was endorsed by the core program faculty on February 19, 2004 (see Appendix K, *Program Meeting Minutes*). A schematic illustrating the indices of performance-based accountability as students progress through the program is contained in Table 11.

In addition to ongoing formal and informal communications from students related to program quality, a student-guided program evaluation was conducted within the context of the program's accreditation self-study. The results from the *Current Student Program Evaluation and Feedback* were collated according to the framework for this self-study report (i.e., Domains A-F), and are contained in a summary report prepared by two students (see Appendix L). The results of this evaluation indicate that there are a number of program strengths. A minority of students identified the area of formulating and implementing interventions, including empirically supported procedures, as needing improvement. Curriculum changes introduced during the past three years (after which approximately 30% of current students had completed coursework), as well as more recent enhancements introduced during the current year, explicitly address this identified concern. Specifically, two assessment-intervention course sequences, one addressing cognitive and academic areas and one addressing social-emotional and adaptive functioning, have been incorporated into the current course of study.

In summary, the program's commitment to self-assessment and quality enhancement is evidenced by a systematic plan for performance-based accountability (Tables 10 and 11), as well as regular consideration of students' attainment of these effectiveness indicators and the implications of such data for program improvement (see Appendix K, *Program Meeting Minutes*). Other critical sources of self-assessment are provided by informal and formal student feedback mechanisms, most notably the *Current Student Program Evaluation and Feedback* conducted within the context of this self-study (see Appendix L). The core program faculty's self-study suggests that three major challenges consistently faced by the program are: (a) increasing the size and diversity of applicants to the program, (b) establishing and maintaining a sense of cohort among the almost exclusively part-time student body, and (c) timely student completion of the degree. Since the previous self-study, faculty and students have engaged in periodic dialog about these challenges and have implemented specific strategies to address them. The addition of two individuals to the core program faculty during the current academic year provides a critical resource for further responding to these challenges.

Domain G: **Public Disclosure**

The program demonstrates its commitment to public disclosure by providing written materials and other communications that appropriately represent it to the relevant publics.

-
1. *The program is described accurately and completely in documents that are available to current students, prospective students, and other "publics."...*
 2. *This information should be presented in a manner that allows applicants to make informed decisions about entering the program.*

The KSU school psychology program is fully described in print and electronic sources that are distributed to and accessible by current and prospective students and other publics. When information is of a confidential nature—such as that which might lead to the identification of personal information about individuals serving the program, or receiving instruction as part of the program—it is password protected and made available only to current students and faculty (e.g., student directory information on program web page). Documents that are available to current students, prospective students, and other publics are more fully described in Appendices A, B, and C, and are posted on the program's web page at <http://spsy.educ.kent.edu>.

The *Program Handbook* (Appendix A) thoroughly describes the training model, course of study, requirements for admission and graduation, faculty, facilities and other resources, and the program's accreditation status. The program web page includes extensive information about the program's policies, its performance-based accountability system, and specific program requirements (e.g., student portfolio, comprehensive examinations, internships).

Domain H: **Relationship With Accrediting Body**

The program demonstrates its commitment to the accreditation process by fulfilling its responsibilities to the accrediting body from which its accredited status is granted.

-
1. *The program abides by the accrediting body's published policies and procedures, as they pertain to its recognition as an accredited program.*
 2. *The program informs the accrediting body in a timely manner of changes in its environment, plans, resources, or operations that could alter the program's quality.*

The KSU School Psychology Program is committed to abiding by the APA CoA accrediting body's published policies and procedures, as they pertain to the program's recognition as an accredited program. It has consistently been the policy and practice of the KSU program to inform the accrediting body in a timely manner of changes in its environment, plans, resources, or operations that could alter the program's quality. The KSU school psychology program is current in its payment of fees to APA, submits annual reports in a timely manner, and is otherwise in "good standing" with the accrediting body in terms of the maintenance of its accredited status. Appendix T contains copies of recent communication with the accrediting body.

References

- Adelman, H.S. & Taylor, L. (2000). Shaping the future of mental health in schools. *Psychology in the Schools*, 37, 49-60.
- American Psychological Association (1998, February). *Archival description of school psychology*. Retrieved December 29, 2003 from <http://www.apa.org/crspopp/schpsych.html>.
- Arnold, M.E., & Hughes, J.N. (1999). First do no harm: Adverse effects of grouping deviant youth for skills training. *Journal of School Psychology*, 37, 99-115.
- Batsche, G.M., & Knoff, H.M. (1994). Bullies and their victims: Understanding a pervasive problem in the schools. *School Psychology Review*, 23, 165-174.
- Bickel, W.E. (1999). The implications of the effective schools literature for school restructuring. In C.R. Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 959-983). New York: Wiley.
- Borgelt, C., & Conoley, J.C. (1999). Psychology in the schools: Systems intervention case examples. In C.R. Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1056-1076). New York: Wiley.
- Botvin, G.J. (1996). Substance abuse prevention through Life Skills Training. In R. DeV. Peters & R.J. McMahon (Eds.), *Preventing childhood disorders, substance abuse, and delinquency* (pp. 215-240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Christenson, S.L. & Buerkle, K. (1999). Families as educational partners for children's school success: Suggestions for school psychologists. In C.R. Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 709-744). New York: Wiley.
- Conoley, J. C. (2003, August). Children first. Presentation to the symposium, *Psychologists leave no child behind: An interdivisional call to action*. Presented to the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, CN.
- Conoley, J.C., & Gutkin, T.B. (1995). Why didn't—why doesn't—school psychology realize its promise? *Journal of School Psychology*, 33, 209-217.
- Curtis, M.J., & Stollar, S.A. (2002). Best practices in systems-level change. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV* (pp. 223-234). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Day, S.L., & Koorland, M.A. (1997). The future isn't what it used to be: Student competencies for the 21st century. *Contemporary Education*, 69, 34-40.
- Dishion, T.J., McCord, J., & Poulin, F. (1999). When interventions harm: Peer groups and problem behavior. *American Psychologist*, 54, 755-764.
- DuPaul, G.J., & Ervin, R.A. (1996). Functional assessment of behaviors related to attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: Linking assessment to intervention design. *Behavior Therapy*, 27, 601-622.
- Dusenbury, L., & Falco, M. (1995). Eleven components of effective drug abuse prevention curricula. *The Journal of School Health*, 65, 420-425.
- Dwyer, K.P. & Bernstein, R., (1998). Mental health in the schools: Linking islands of hope in a sea of despair. *School Psychology Review*, 27, 277-286.

- Elias, M.J., & Tobias, S.E. (1996). *Social problem-solving: Interventions in the schools*. New York: Guilford.
- Elias, M. J., Zins, J. E., Graczyk, P. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2003). Implementation, sustainability, and scaling up of social-emotional and academic innovations in public schools. *School Psychology Review, 32*, 303-319.
- Elliott, S. N., Kratochwill, T. R., & Roach, A. T. (2003). Commentary: Implementing social-emotional and academic innovations: Reflections, reactions, and research. *School Psychology Review, 32*, 320-326.
- Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2002). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Erchul, W.P., & Raven, B.H. (1997). Social power in school consultation: A contemporary view of French and Raven's bases of power model. *Journal of School Psychology, 35*, 137-171.
- Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review, 32*, 365-383
- Farmer, T.W., Pearl, R., & Van Acker, R.M. (1996). Expanding the social skills deficit framework: A developmental synthesis perspective, classroom social networks, and implications for the social growth of students with disabilities. *Journal of Special Education, 30*, 232-256.
- Flanagan, D.P., & Miranda, A.H. (1995). Best practices in working with culturally different families. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.) *Best practices in school psychology III* (pp. 1049-1060). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Fowler, E., & Harrison, P.L. (1995). Continuing professional development for school psychologists. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.) *Best practices in school psychology III* (pp. 81-89). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Frisby, C.L. (1990). Toward a broader role for school psychology in the thinking skills movement. *School Psychology Review, 19*, 96-114.
- Frisby, C.L. (1999). Straight talk about cognitive assessment and diversity. *School Psychology Quarterly, 14*, 195-207.
- Goldstein, A.P. (1999). Aggressive reduction strategies: Effective and ineffective. *School Psychology Quarterly, 14*, 40-58.
- Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., O'Brien, M. U., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., & Elias, J. J. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist, 48*, 466-474.
- Gresham, F.M. (1997). Social competence and students with behavior disorders: Where we've been, where we are, and where we should go. *Education and Treatment of Children, 20*, 233-249.
- Hawkins, J.D., Doueck, H.J., & Lishner, D.M. (1988). Changing teaching practices in mainstream classrooms to improve bonding and behavior of low achievers. *American Educational Research Journal, 25*, 31-50.
- Hayes, S.C., Nelson, R.O., & Jarrett, R.B. (1987). The treatment utility of assessment: A functional approach to evaluating assessment quality. *American Psychologist, 42*, 963-974.

- Henning-Stout, M., & Brown-Cheatham, M. (1999). School psychology in a diverse world: Considerations for practice, research, and training. In C.R.Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1041-1055). New York: Wiley.
- Hester, P. P., & Kaiser, A. P. (1998). Early intervention for the prevention of conduct disorder: Research issues in early identification, implementation, and interpretation of treatment outcome. *Behavioral Disorders, 24*, 57-65.
- Hibbs, E.D., & Jensen, P.S. (1996). (Eds.) *Psychosocial treatments for child and adolescent disorders: Empirically based strategies for clinical practice*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Hyman, I., Weiler, E., Perone, D., Romano, L., Britton, G., & Shanock, A. (1997). Victims and victimizers: The two faces of school violence. In A.P. Goldstein & J.C. Conoley (Eds.), *School violence intervention: A practical handbook* (pp. 426-459). New York: Guilford.
- Jacob-Timm, S. (2000). School psychology in the new millennium: Legal influences and ethical issues. *Psychology in the Schools, 37*, 39-48.
- Kavale, K.A., & Forness, S.R. (1999). Effectiveness of special education. In C.R.Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 984-1024). New York: Wiley.
- Keith, T.Z. (1999). Structural equation modeling in school psychology. . In C.R.Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 78-107). New York: Wiley.
- Lambert, N.M. (1993). Historical perspective on school psychology as a scientist-practitioner specialization in school psychology. *The Journal of School Psychology, 31*, 163-193.
- Lentz, F.E., Jr., Allen, S.J., & Ehrhardt, K.E. (1996). The conceptual elements of strong interventions in school settings. *School Psychology Quarterly, 11*, 118-136.
- Lonigan, C.J., Elbert, J.C., & Johnson, S.B. (1998). Empirically supported psychosocial interventions for children: An overview. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 27*, 138-145.
- Lovett, M.W., Lacerenza, L., Borden, S.L., Frijters, J.C., Steinbach, K.A., & De Palma, M. (2000). Components of Effective remediation for developmental reading disabilities: Combining phonological and strategy-based Instruction to improve outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*, 263-283.
- McNamara, J.F., Grossman, B.G., Lapierre, C.B., & Lajja, W. (1998). The school psychologist: A source of expertise available to school principals for collaborative problem solving. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 7*, 80-94.
- Meltzer, L., Roditi, B., Houser, Jr., R.F., Perlman, M. (1998) Perceptions of academic strategies and competence in students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 31*, 437-451.
- Moncher, F.J., & Prinz, R.J. (1991). Treatment fidelity in outcome studies. *Clinical Psychology Review, 11*, 247-266.
- Murphy, J.P., DeEsch, J.B., & Strein, W.O. (1998). School counselors and school psychologists: Partners in student services. *Professional School Counseling, 2*, (2), 85-87.
- National Association of School Psychologists. (2000). *Standards for training and field placement programs in*

school psychology. Bethesda, MD: Author.

No Child Left Behind. Retrieved December 13, 2003 from www.nclb.org/

Peverly, S.T. (1994) An overview of the potential impact of cognitive psychology on school psychology. *School Psychology Review, 23*, 292-309.

Phillips, B. N. (1999). Strengthening the links between science and practice: Reading, evaluating, and applying research in school psychology. In C.R.Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 56-77). New York: Wiley.

Pledger, C. (2003). Discourse on disability and rehabilitation issues: Opportunities for psychology. *American Psychologist, 58*, 279-284.

Polkinghorne, D.E., & Gribbons, B.C. (1999). Applications of qualitative research strategies to school psychology research problems. In C.R.Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 108-136). New York: Wiley.

President's Council on Special Education Excellence (2002). *A NEW ERA: Revitalizing special education for children and their families*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Raimy, V.C. (1950). *Training in clinical psychology (Boulder Conference)*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Rand Corporation (2003). *A decade of whole-school reform: The New American School experience*. Retrieved December 13, 2003 from <http://www.rand.org/publications/RB/RB8019/>.

Reid, J. B. (1993). Prevention of conduct disorder before and after school entry: Relating interventions to developmental findings. *Development and Psychopathology, 5*, 243-262.

Reschly, D. J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (2002). Paradigm shift: The past is not the future. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV* (pp. 3-20). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Rosenfield, S., & Gravois T.A. (1999). Working with teams in the school. In C.R.Reynolds & T.B. Gutkin (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1025-1039). New York: Wiley.

Sandoval, J. & Brock, S.E. (1996). The school psychologist's role in suicide prevention. *School Psychology Quarterly, 11*, 169-185.

Sheridan, S. M., Napolitano, S. A., & Swearer, S. M. (2002). Best practices in school-community partnerships. In A. Thomas and J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology (4th ed.)* (pp. 322-336). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Shinn, M. R., Walker, H. M., & Stoner, G. (2002) (Eds.). *Interventions for academic and behavior problems II: preventive and remedial approaches*. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Stanovich, P.J., Jordan, A., & Perot, J. (1998) Relative differences in academic self-concept and peer acceptance among students in inclusive classrooms. *Remedial and Special Education, 19*, 120-126.

Task Force on Evidence Based Interventions in School Psychology. (2003, November 25). Retrieved December 6, 2003 from <http://www.sp-ebi.org/>

Telzrow, C. F. (1999). IDEA Amendments of 1997: Promise or pitfall for special education reform? *Journal of School Psychology, 37*, 7-28.

- Telzrow, C.R., & Beebe, J. J. (2002). Best practices in facilitating intervention adherence and integrity. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV* (pp. 503-516). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Torgesen, J. K., Alexander, A. W., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Voeller, K. K. S., & Conway, T. (2001). Intensive remedial instruction for children with severe reading disabilities: Immediate and long-term outcomes from two instructional approaches. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 34*, 33-58, 78.
- Upah, K. R. F., & Tilly, W.D., III (2002). Best practices in designing, implementing, and evaluating quality interventions. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology IV* (pp. 483-502). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- U.S. Department of Education (2003). *The condition of education 2003* (NCES 2003-067). Washington, DC: Author.
- Walker, H., Severson, H.H., Feil, E. G., Stiller, B., Golly, A. (1998). First Step to Success: Intervening at the point of school entry to prevent antisocial behavior patterns. *Psychology in the Schools, 35*, 259-269.
- Weissberg, R. P., Kumpfer, K. L., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2003). Prevention that works for children and youth: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 48*, 425-432.
- What Works Clearinghouse. (2003, June 20). Retrieved December 5, 2003 from <http://www.w-w-c.org/>
- Ysseldyke, J.E., Dawson, P., Lehr, C., Reschly, D., Reynolds, M., & Telzrow, C.F. (1997). *School psychology: A blueprint for training and practice II*. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Zlatos, B. (1994). Don't Test, Don't Tell: Is 'academic red-skirting' skewing the way we rank our schools? *The American School Board Journal, 24*-28.