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Section 1

ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK
FOR NASP ACCREDITATION

National Association of School Psychologists

*All children and youth thrive in school, at home, and throughout life* is the National Association of School Psychologists’ (NASP) vision. NASP’s mission is to empower school psychologists by advancing effective practices to improve students’ learning, behavior, and mental health.

As an important part of its mission, NASP provides a review and accreditation service to specialist and doctoral level school psychology programs in the United States and its territories. NASP accreditation is part of the association's commitment to serving the mental health and educational interests of all children and youth by promoting the preparation of competent professionals in accordance with national standards of quality.

**Significance of NASP Accreditation**

NASP accreditation confers advantages to programs and program graduates. First, NASP accreditation provides recognition for programs that meet national standards for the graduate education of professional service providers in school psychology. Program accreditation suggests higher quality of preparation, comprehensive content, extensive and properly supervised field experiences, and the ability of candidates to perform competently and to positively impact children, youth, families, and others they serve. School psychologists graduating from accredited programs will be comprehensively trained to perform a broad based role and prevent and address the behavioral, social–emotional, mental health, and academic challenges in today's schools.

The second major advantage of program accreditation, especially for program graduates, is direct access to National Certification in School Psychology (NCSP). Graduates of NASP-accredited programs are automatically eligible for the NCSP, pending the completion of an internship consistent with NASP standards and the attainment of a passing score on the National School Psychology Examination administered by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Praxis Series. Additional information on national certification is found at [http://www.nasponline.org/certification/index.aspx](http://www.nasponline.org/certification/index.aspx).

Finally, but perhaps most importantly, NASP accreditation conveys to students, prospective students, potential employers, professional credentialing bodies, and the public an indication of quality preparation that is based on national standards and objective, external peer review.
NASP Values and Principles for Program Review and Accreditation

The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) recognizes the critical importance of quality preparation and accreditation to its commitment to serving the mental health and educational interests of all children and youth. NASP has established the following values and principles for its program standards, review, and accreditation.

- The primary purpose of NASP program accreditation is to encourage and recognize high-quality, graduate level preparation of school psychologists consistent with NASP standards.
- Program review and accreditation, as both a process and a status, symbolizes adherence to professional standards, sets a national standard for rigorous training at the specialist and doctoral levels and is therefore important to the profession and its graduate programs.
- NASP standards for graduate preparation, credentialing, professional ethics, and practice of school psychology are a unified set of national principles that define contemporary school psychology, promote school psychologists’ services for children, families, and schools, and provide a professional foundation for school psychology. NASP accreditation is based upon these national standards.
- NASP program review should be rigorous enough so that graduates continue to qualify for the Nationally Certified School Psychologist credential.
- NASP accreditation should be the basis for state credentialing as a school psychologists.
- A critical performance-based outcome of school psychology programs is the ability of candidates and graduates to have a positive impact on P–12 students.
- The program review/accreditation process (i.e., the standards for preparation, the evaluation criteria, and the basis for decision-making) should be transparent to all stakeholders associated with program review.
- Program review/accreditation should address all key aspects of graduate level preparation, including quality indicators of program structures, processes, and outcomes. Performance-based outcomes should be a key feature.
- Programs seeking NASP accreditation must meet all standards; however, programs maintain flexibility in meeting the standards so as to respect institutional or program priorities and encourage innovation.
- Program faculty should assess program outcomes using the most reliable, credible measures possible.
- The program review/accreditation process should emphasize accountability, self-evaluation, and continuous improvement.
- The NASP accreditation process is premised upon the essential role of volunteers in conducting peer review and providing feedback.
- Program review/accreditation should be as efficient and cost-effective as possible.
- Eligibility for NASP accreditation requires having institutional accreditation so that important issues such as institutional support, faculty full-time equivalents, and financial viability are addressed.
- Application for NASP accreditation should be voluntary.
- The accreditation process and the impact of the standards should be regularly evaluated with the findings used for improvement.
- The credibility of NASP accreditation is predicated upon maintaining high levels of integrity.
NASP is also committed to a policy of nondiscrimination and the promotion of equal opportunity, fairness, justice, and respect for all persons. NASP works to ensure that the association, graduate education programs, and settings in which school psychologists work are safe and welcoming and provide equal opportunity to all persons regardless of actual or perceived characteristics, including race, ethnicity, color, religion, ancestry, age, national origin, immigration status, socioeconomic status, language, disability, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, cognitive capabilities, social–emotional skills, developmental level, chronic illness, or any other personal identity or distinguishing characteristic.

For a full statement of the NASP nondiscrimination and equal opportunity policy, see: https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/About%20School%20Psychology/nondiscrimination_equal_opportunity(0).pdf

The Scope of NASP Accreditation

NASP’s scope of accreditation is the accreditation of specialist level degree programs and doctoral degree programs in school psychology. The degree program must be offered by a higher education institution that is located in the United States or its territories and is accredited by a regional or national accrediting agency recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) or the U.S. Department of Education.

Specialist-level programs are defined as those consisting of a minimum of 60 graduate credit hours, with at least 54 graduate credit hours exclusive of internship credit, and a minimum of a 1,200-hour internship (with a minimum of 600 hours in a school setting). This is the minimum level of preparation required for the credentialing of school psychologists in almost all states, and for the Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP) credential. NASP provides an overview of differences among degree.

Doctoral-level programs are defined as those consisting of a minimum of 4 years of full-time study at the graduate level, or the equivalent if part-time; at least 90 graduate semester hours or the equivalent. At least 78 hours will be exclusive of credit for the supervised doctoral internship experience and any terminal doctoral project (e.g., dissertation). A minimum of 1,500 clock hours for doctoral-level internship are required, including a minimum of 600 hours of the internship completed in a school setting.

Program Accreditation Board

The NASP Program Accreditation Board (PAB) was established in 1987 to oversee the NASP program review process. The PAB is composed of a Chair, Cochair, and seven to nine additional persons including a public member who participates in all Board decisions. The PAB Chair and Cochair are selected from among current Board members with distinguished experience as both a program reviewer and Board member, subject to a majority vote of the Board and notification to the NASP Board of Directors. It is typically expected the Cochair will perform the duties of Chair if the Chair is unable to perform such duties and may be a candidate for the position of Chair when the Chair completes his or her term. The terms of the Chair and Cochair shall each be for 3 years commencing on July 1 and may be renewed once, or along any other timeline if it benefits the Association.
The Chair and continuing Board members nominate new Board members from among those persons with previous training and experience as effective NASP reviewers. To the greatest extent possible, Board members are selected to represent various constituencies, including program levels (i.e., specialist and doctoral), and ethnic and geographic diversity. Every attempt will also be made to include at least one school psychology practitioner familiar with graduate preparation standards and processes.

Nominees are selected as members based on majority vote of Board members. Board members may serve three consecutive, 3-year terms commencing July 1. Member terms are staggered to assure some consistency in ongoing Board membership and maintain organizational memory. If the 3-year term of the Chair or Cochair does not align with the membership policy stated above, they can remain an active member of the Board, and as Chair and Cochair, for 1 year after their term expires, if supported by majority vote of the PAB. The Chair can also remain an active member of the Board for 1 year past their final term as “past Chair” if supported by majority vote of the PAB.

The PAB participates in at least two face-to-face board meetings annually to accomplish several main tasks: (a) consider program reviews completed by individual reviewers who are part of a team that includes an experienced “lead reviewer” (individual reports are submitted by the reviewers prior to the PAB meeting); (b) make program accreditation decisions; (c) draft final reports to programs; (d) address issues and make policy decisions related to accreditation; (e) and conduct other business. The PAB, based on issues that might arise, may conduct official business through virtual meetings. The Chair and Cochair provide training to novice and veteran program reviewers, as well as trainings on procedures for applying for program accreditation. These training sessions are conducted at the annual NASP convention and through other modalities as necessary.

Based on anticipated workload demands, one or more experienced program reviewer(s) may be invited as guests to a PAB meeting by the Chair (subject to the available budget) to assist the PAB in its program review and accreditation process. However, such guest reviewers will have no vote in accreditation or policy decisions.

The Board may meet at the NASP offices, or at another location that can be demonstrated to be at least cost-neutral based on hotel, airfare, and meeting expenses. Members will be reimbursed for their expenses at the rates established by NASP.

**Accreditation Advisory Group**

The NASP Accreditation Advisory Group was created in February 2012 to consider and provide recommendations for continuous improvement of the NASP program review and accreditation process and suggestions for future development. The Advisory Group includes 15 individuals, including Chair and Cochair of the NASP Program Accreditation Board, and at least one member of the NASP Graduate Education Committee, NASP Student Development Committee, and National School Psychology Certification Board. Membership also includes representatives of major organizations representing school psychology, including the Trainers in School Psychology (TSP), Council of Directors of School Psychology Programs (CDSPP), and Division 16 (School Psychology) of the American Psychological Association, a member representing school psychology practitioners, an at-large member representing specialist- or doctoral-level programs, and a public member.
The NASP Accreditation Advisory Group meets on a face-to-face basis at least once annually, with other business conducted electronically. It conducts periodic focus groups related to NASP standards and program reviews, considers reports and recommendations relevant to program review and accreditation, reviews summaries of outcomes and evaluations of the program review process, and makes recommendations for the continuous improvement and/or future development of the NASP program review/accreditation process.

The Advisory Group does not hear complaints or appeals from individual programs regarding their NASP reviews or accreditations (the Program Accreditation Board has an appeal process for handling such matters referenced in Appendix E). However, the Advisory Group may periodically request information from the PAB regarding such issues or survey programs regarding their perspectives.

**Program Reviewers**

One of the greatest resources of the NASP accreditation process is its team of qualified volunteer reviewers. Approximately 180 professionals serve as NASP program folio reviewers. Reviewers include school psychology practitioners, trainers, and administrators selected based on professional experience; leadership or leadership potential; ethnic and geographic diversity; ability to represent the needs of the profession; ability and willingness to provide comprehensive, valid, timely reviews; and ability to represent the diverse characteristics and needs of children. Reviewers are required to be NASP members.

The process to becoming a reviewer involves being nominated and submitting a curriculum vitae (CV) or résumé to the Chair of the PAB. Nominations can be in the form of an email or letter and should briefly state why the person would be a good program reviewer. Nominations can come from current NASP PAB members or reviewers, colleagues or self-nominations. The Chair of the PAB reviews the nominations and CVs and provides the slate of candidates to the PAB for review and approval during a PAB meeting. Once selected, potential reviewers must complete a “Reviewer Background Scan” (see Appendix B) that requests information on past and present institutional affiliations in order to avoid potential conflicts of interest.

Reviewers undergo training in the interpretation and application of NASP standards and periodic training updates. They are initially assigned to review teams consisting of at least two experienced reviewers who provide guidance and mentoring. After achieving a level of competency reflected by high-quality review reports submitted to the PAB, reviewers are eligible to serve on two-person review teams and potentially as mentors to new reviewers. The most experienced, thorough, and effective reviewers are asked to serve as “Lead Reviewers” that lead review teams and provide mentoring.

All reviewers, novice and veteran, are required to participate in formal training session at least every 3 years and any time that NASP standards are revised. Reviewer training is conducted each year at the annual NASP convention and provided virtually as well. All reviewers are expected to sign the Code of Conduct (see Appendix C), emphasizing ethical behavior in the review process. There is no expiration to confidentiality, and this is stressed in the Code of Conduct.
Independence From Parent Association

The Program Accreditation Board establishes its independence from NASP through a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the National Association of School Psychologists Board of Directors (NASP BoD) and NASP Program Accreditation Board (NASP PAB) regarding the review and accreditation of graduate preparation programs in school psychology. The MOU acknowledges the critical role of NASP program review and accreditation to the delivery of effective school psychology services by identifying graduate education experiences and competencies needed by candidates preparing for careers as school psychologists. This agreement also serves to delineate the commitments, roles, and responsibilities of the NASP PAB, NASP BoD, and NASP Leadership Assembly (NASP LA) within the NASP program accreditation process. The NASP BoD and the NASP PAB acknowledge that the NASP PAB must have autonomy in its decision making regarding program accreditation to ensure that its functions are carried out independent of improper influence by NASP.

Neither the NASP BoD nor the NASP LA has a role in decisions regarding the accreditation of school psychology graduate programs. This need for autonomy is grounded upon the avoidance of any conflict of interest, whether real or perceived, in making judgements related to program accreditation.

The NASP BoD will make available the funds reasonably necessary to support the operations of the NASP PAB and its functions. In addition, the NASP BoD, having fiduciary responsibilities for the entire NASP entity, will review and approve the proposed budget for the NASP PAB. Once approved by the NASP BoD, the NASP PAB will manage budgeted expenses consistent with NASP policies and procedures.
NASP STANDARDS FOR THE GRADUATE PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

The History and Development of NASP Standards


NASP was the first National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) specialized professional association (SPA) to develop training standards, and it began reviewing school psychology programs in conjunction with NCATE review of “units” (e.g., all programs leading to state department of education credentials) in the 1970s. It conducted its first independent review and accreditation of programs both in conjunction with and independent from NCATE reviews in 1988, and it continued reviews both independently and through NCATE’s successor, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). In March 2022, NASP achieved recognition from the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) for the accreditation of specialist-level degree programs and doctoral degree programs in school psychology in accredited institutions in the United States.

NASP revises all its professional standards in an integrated manner that assures consistency between standards. At the NASP 2020 Leadership Assembly in Bethesda, MD, NASP leaders unanimously approved the 2020 revision of the NASP standards. The NASP 2020 standards consist of four integrated sets of standards: (a) *Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists* (formerly *Training and Field Placement Programs in School Psychology*), (b) *Standards for the Credentialing of School Psychologists*, (c) *Principles for Professional Ethics*, and the (d) *Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services* (formerly *Guidelines for the Provision of School Psychological Services*).

The 2020 standards were developed within the context of current issues relevant to education and psychology, with a visionary look to anticipated future developments and issues in the field of school psychology. Over approximately 3 years, the Standards Revision Task Force members and other NASP leaders worked to assure the process of revising the NASP standards was completed with integrity and with input from NASP membership, elected and appointed NASP leaders, and other leaders in the field of school psychology. The adoption of the NASP 2020 standards was accomplished as a result of the commitment of NASP leaders and members, and in consultation with other school psychology organizations.
The process to revise the four NASP standards (Graduate Preparation, Credentialing, Ethics, and Practice Guidelines) formally began in 2016. The comprehensive revision process integrated an analysis of key issues for school psychology and needs of school psychologists with a multistage development and review of draft documents by numerous individuals, including NASP leaders, NASP members, and representatives of other school psychology and related organizations.

Web-based surveys, focus groups held at NASP conventions, and other communications were used throughout the revision process to solicit input about needed revisions for the standards and to obtain feedback about drafts of the standards from NASP leaders, members, and other organizations. From an organizational perspective, the revision process was spearheaded by Writing Teams for each document, which developed drafts of the standards and reviewed all comments and suggestions resulting from multiple surveys and focus groups. Next, Development Groups (representatives from NASP and other school psychology organizations) provided review and feedback, and then Reaction Groups (NASP leadership and membership and related organizations and stakeholders) provided further review and feedback. Many revisions were made as a result of this process. The final versions adopted by the Leadership Assembly in 2020 represent an integration of the expertise and experience of numerous school psychologists.

NASP has historically re-evaluated standards on a 10-year cycle. The process will be equally rigorous and inclusive of feedback from stakeholders in future revisions.

**The 2020 NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists**

The current set of NASP standards used to review and accredit school psychology programs is the 2020 *Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists* (NASP, 2020). The standards are organized into five major areas:

I. School Psychology Program Context/Structure
II. Domains of School Psychology Graduate Education and Practice
III. Supervised Field Experiences in School Psychology
IV. Performance-Based Program Assessment and Accountability
V. School Psychology Program Support/Resources.

The Domains of School Psychology Graduate Education and Practice included in the 2020 NASP standard II, along with their corresponding designator/number are listed below:

2.1 Data-Based Decision Making
2.2 Consultation and Collaboration
2.3 Academic Interventions and Instructional Support
2.4 Mental and Behavioral Health Services and Interventions
2.5 School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning
2.6 Services to Promote Safe and Supportive Schools
2.7 Family, School, and Community Collaboration
2.8 Equitable Practices for Diverse Student Populations

2.9 Research and Evidence-Based Practice

2.10 Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice

The full set of the 2020 NASP Standards for the Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists can be found at: https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/nasp-2020-professional-standards-adopted. The processes by which programs must address the standards are discussed later in this document.

Version of Standards Used for Program Reviews

When NASP approves new standards for graduate preparation, programs submitting for review are not required to respond to the new standards until 24 months after the new standards are formally approved.

The NASP Standards for the Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists that are in effect at the time a program submits its initial full application will be the standards used for that review and for any revised review, rejoinder, or conditional review of that program. Programs should not switch to a newer version of standards while under conditional status. If a program does not respond to the correct set of NASP standards that are in effect at the time of the initial submission, NASP will not conduct a review of the program. Additionally, once an initial review is completed, neither NASP nor the program can change the standards used for a revised review, rejoinder, or conditional review.

If new standards are scheduled to go into effect after a program has achieved candidacy but prior to the program’s initial full application, the program will be apprised of that expected change while it still holds candidacy status.
Section 3

APPLYING FOR NASP ACCREDITATION

Please refer to the NASP Accreditation Flow Chart (Appendix E) for additional guidance.

Eligibility to Apply

School psychology specialist- and doctoral-level graduate programs in the United States and its territories may seek NASP program accreditation. Programs that seek such accreditation do so on a voluntary basis. Such programs are encouraged to engage in a thorough self-study process and carefully consider their consistency with NASP standards and associated requirements, or their willingness to meet such standards, prior to seeking NASP accreditation. Programs that clearly do not meet critical standards regarding program structure and resources, curriculum, field experiences, and assessment are strongly encouraged to make appropriate changes in their programs prior to seeking NASP accreditation. Consultation on this issue is available from the Chair of the NASP Program Accreditation Board.

Candidacy Status

Programs not holding NASP accreditation must apply to the NASP PAB for candidacy status prior to submitting a full application. Candidacy status allows the program to receive feedback on program structure, faculty, curriculum, field experience requirements, assessments, and resources prior to gathering the types of candidate outcome data required for full NASP accreditation. During the time that programs hold candidacy status, faculty and program administrators are encouraged to take advantage of opportunities for professional development related to program review offered by NASP. It is anticipated that the candidacy review and subsequent period of development will increase the likelihood of ultimate program success in seeking NASP accreditation.

Programs interested in submitting for candidacy should contact the Chair of the NASP PAB in order to receive instructions and gain access to the NASP program submission system. The application will consist of the same application components and process as that required for full review, except that candidate assessment data will be not be required. Specifically, the application will address:

- Background information, including description of program administration, location within university, program mission and goals, and other information relevant to understanding the program and those served.
- Summary of program faculty (based on definition contained in the NASP Standards for the Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists) and roles/courses taught or anticipated. Vitae (including Faculty Teaching Equivalents, or FTEs) for current faculty and position announcements for anticipated faculty should be included in an appendix.
- Current or projected student enrollment. If no students are currently enrolled, a brief description of anticipated recruitment strategies, including strategies to recruit minority candidates.
• Information on program structure, including degrees granted or anticipated being offered, total credit hours required, total internship hours, and similar information needed to address elements of NASP Standard 1.
• Required coursework, aligned with the Domains of School Psychology Graduate Education and Practice in the NASP Standards for the Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists (NASP, 2020).
• Required field experiences and requirements, including current or anticipated activities, locations, and supervisor requirements needed to address NASP Standard 3.
• Key assessments (aligned with NASP requirements) and corresponding criteria and rubrics needed to address NASP Standard 4 and required assessments 1–6. (Submission of data is not required for candidacy.)
• Brief discussion of the planned process and structure for using assessment data for program evaluation and improvement.
• Information on program resources needed to address NASP Standard 5.

The deadline for program candidacy applications is February 1 of each year. Programs should expect a report on the outcome of the review by no later than July 1 of the application year that will indicate: (a) whether candidacy status has or has not been granted, (b) a rationale for the decision, (c) feedback on program consistency (or projected consistency) with NASP standards, (d) feedback on program assessments and their consistency with NASP assessment requirements, and (e) recommendations for further program development.

Program candidacy will be granted for a period of 4 years for specialist-level programs and 5 years for doctoral programs. If a full accreditation submission is not received from a program within the specified period beginning when program was first notified of candidacy status, another candidacy application will be required prior to any subsequent accreditation application.

**Submission and Review of Program Materials**

For programs that have been previously NASP accredited and for new programs that have been declared as candidates for full NASP review, materials for full review are submitted electronically through the NASP review system.

For a list of required elements, see later portions of this document and instructions for submission and uploading materials at: https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/graduate-program-approval-and-accreditation

The review and decision-making process for submitted materials are described in more detail later in this document. Teams of two or three trained, volunteer professionals review each submission using rubrics established for each standard and for required assessments and submit individual reports to the NASP Program Accreditation Board.

The PAB reviews these reports, examines program materials as necessary to resolve inconsistencies and differences, and decides the program’s readiness for a site visit. A written report is provided that conveys the final decision. If a site visit is recommended, the report will provide feedback that concludes most (or all) standards appear to be met based on submitted evidence and advises that a site visit be scheduled during the following review cycle (e.g., the spring for reviews conducted in
the fall or fall for reviews conducted in the spring). If a site visit is not recommended, the report will describe areas of concern that lead to the Board’s conclusion.

Site Visits

The purpose of the site visit is to: (a) obtain clarification of information contained in the program written submission, (b) validate data contained in the program written submission, and (c) obtain information about program quality from key constituencies not readily available through written or virtual means.

NASP has designed a site visit process that involves to the maximum extent possible of professionals most familiar with program materials and is efficient and cost-effective for programs and NASP. The NASP site visit process involves two professionals familiar with the written submission and PAB report, visiting the campus and interviewing key program stakeholders. Once a program has been determined to be “site visit ready,” the names and contact information for the site visitors are shared with the program. Typically, a more experienced reviewer, serving as the chair of the site visit team, and one of the other reviewers conduct the site visit at a mutually agreeable time during the semester following the one the PAB determines the program to be “site visit ready.”

It is up to the program to schedule and make travel arrangements for the visit at its own expense.

Available Training and Assistance

A variety of training and assistance for preparing an accreditation application is available to program administrators and faculty. Programs preparing to submit new and continuing applications for NASP accreditation are strongly encouraged to take advantage of such opportunities, as they will likely increase the chances for success and minimize costly, unproductive efforts on the part of program faculty and institutions, and NASP reviewers and PAB members.

Every year, the PAB conducts one or more sessions at the annual NASP convention focusing on preparing a NASP accreditation application. The NASP Graduate Education Committee also offers an annual opportunity for programs to register to seek individual consultation on program development issues, including those specific to meeting NASP standards or seeking NASP accreditation.

A variety of resources are available online at the NASP website to assist in preparing a NASP accreditation applications. The materials include information regarding the NASP standards, required assessments, submission procedures, rubrics used to evaluate program materials, and other information. Materials pertinent to graduate program administrators and faculty may be found at: https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/graduate-program-approval-and-accreditation/program-accreditation.

In addition, the PAB will post, with permission from program directors, samples of well-developed submission documents as they become available. Available documents can be found at https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/graduate-program-approval-and-accreditation/program-accreditation. Programs are reminded that use of samples does not guarantee accreditation but provides ideas on meeting the standards. Programs are asked to credit any program that is listed by name.
The PAB Chair is available throughout the year to discuss issues and answer general questions related to program accreditation. If programs desire extensive one-on-one assistance with program development issues or the accreditation process or application, they may seek out individuals with expertise and experience who might be willing to serve on a fee basis as consultants. However, it is important to understand that such individuals serve as private consultants in such activities and do not represent NASP or the NASP PAB. If consultants are current NASP program reviewers, they would be prohibited from participating in any aspect of the review of a program with which they consulted. NASP Program Accreditation Board members are prohibited from providing fee-based consultation to any school psychology program when the purpose of that consultation relates to seeking NASP accreditation. For more information regarding the Code of Conduct for Reviewers and Board Members, see Appendix C.

Finally, programs preparing to seek NASP accreditation should consider seeking guidance from colleagues at peer institutions who have completed the NASP accreditation process successfully in recent years.

**Application Deadlines and Timelines**

The preparation and review of program materials is a time-consuming process on the part of all involved—program administrators and faculty, individual volunteer reviewers, and volunteer PAB members. In order to assure adequate time for reviews and timely responses to programs, it is important that programs submit all required materials by established deadlines. Failure to do so may result in a delay in the review process until the next review cycle.

The following are key deadlines for submissions and dates by which programs can expect to receive review results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>Submission Deadline</th>
<th>Program Notification Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidacy Application</td>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>July 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial/Full Application</td>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>August 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Reports/Rejoinders</td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>August 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>February 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4

REQUIRED MATERIALS

Preparation of Program Review Materials

Rather than being viewed as a one-time occurrence, the development of a program submission should be only one activity that is part of an ongoing process of self-study and program development. Preparation of program review materials should follow a careful examination of current program characteristics relative to the NASP (2020) Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists.

In order to facilitate a productive review process, it is imperative that programs provide all required information in a well-organized manner, and label all documentation completely and accurately, as per directions provided by the NASP PAB. Documentation that is incomplete, poorly organized, labeled incorrectly, or referenced in narrative statements but not provided in the submission, results in reviewers having to spend more time searching materials. Programs should be cognizant of the fact that reviewers are professional colleagues who volunteer their time to perform this valuable service.

Checklist of Required Materials

The following is a checklist of required and optional programmatic materials needed for responding to various NASP standards or completing various attachments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Programmatic Items</th>
<th>Relevant Standard or Attachment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program handbook</td>
<td>Standard I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masked transcripts or academic records for three recent (within the last academic year) program graduates</td>
<td>Standard I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant section from graduate catalog or similar document showing grading system and academic eligibility</td>
<td>Grade Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on program completers (most recent 3 years)</td>
<td>Attachment A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on program faculty</td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information from course syllabi for required courses needed to complete Attachment E (Note: Do not submit syllabi)</td>
<td>Attachment E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practica and internship field evaluation forms</td>
<td>Standard 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship summary form—Two options: (a) Completed time and activity logs for two recent interns, or (b) Activity summary for one cohort of interns. (Note: Supervision time must be included.)</td>
<td>Attachment G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sample blank internship written agreement, contract, or plan that addresses NASP Standard 3</td>
<td>Standard 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Programmatic Items</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program of studies showing required courses and sequence (if not in program handbook), or course substitutions (if transcripts show deviations from required program)</td>
<td>Standard 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship or practica handbook (if requirements are not in program handbook or in practica or internship syllabi)</td>
<td>Standard 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of faculty or advisory board meetings documenting use of assessment results for program improvement</td>
<td>Standard 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual program reports documenting use of assessment results for program improvement</td>
<td>Standard 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Note Regarding Transcripts**

NASP asks that transcripts *not include candidate names*. “Unofficial” transcripts of the kind that can be obtained at many universities by faculty advisors or program directors are acceptable as long as student identities are masked.

For programs concerned about FERPA regulations, the following excerpt is provided. For a more complete description visit [http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html).

Generally, schools must have written permission from the parent or eligible student in order to release any information from a student's education record. However, FERPA allows schools to disclose those records, without consent, to certain parties or under the following conditions. (34 CFR § 99.31)

Such parties include accrediting organizations.
Quantity of Data Required

NASP requires six types of performance assessment evidence and allows programs to submit data from two more optional assessments. There are specific quantities required for each of the six performance assessments and they are different based on the type of submission.

1. For New programs (programs that have never been NASP approved or accredited or that have lost accreditation status and are applying as new programs once again)—one application* (defined below) of data.
2. For Full Reaccreditation (programs currently NASP approved or accredited that are submitting for reaccreditation)—two applications of data
3. For Conditional Review (programs designated as conditionally approved)—one application of data.

*Application of data is defined as “one round of data collection.” In most instances, one round is equivalent to 1 year of data. For example, the Praxis scores for one application would be gathered once per year, and one application (or round) of data would be final class grades collected annually. An example where two applications of data could be collected within the same year would be if a program chose to use field-based evaluations for internship as summative data at the end of each semester. Since students complete internships over at least 2 semesters, one application of data could be the result from the fall semester evaluation and one application could be the result from a spring semester evaluation using the same evaluation tool; thus, two applications in one year.

For further guidance, please see A Guide for Performance-Based Assessment, Accountability, and Program Development in School Psychology Programs, the NASP report template, and Instructions for NASP Online Program Submissions, all available from NASP at https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/graduate-program-approval-and-accreditation/program-accreditation

Required Assessments

Of the six required assessments, only Assessments 2 and 4 are required to link to all domains in Standard II. Program faculty should review their evaluation tool for the other four assessments to determine which domains in Standard II align with the instrument. Note that program reviewers will identify evidence of how each domain aligns with standards. For example, if a program indicates Assessment 5 aligns with all domains in Standard II, the program reviewers will look for evidence of each.
• **Assessment 1 (national or state exam):** Licensure assessment or other content-based assessment must be a state or national school psychology credentialing exam. If your state does not require a school psychology credentialing exam, then the ETS Praxis in School Psychology must be required. Programs determine whether to require a cut-score.

• **Assessment 2 (content knowledge):** Assessment of content to ensure assessment of Practice Standard II, Domains 2.1–2.10). Programs are required to provide grades for Assessment 2 and must address all domains in Performance Standard II. Assessment 2 also involves aligning course-embedded assessments with course grades through Attachment E. Grades are required for all courses in Table E.

• **Assessment 3 (practica assessment):** Assessment of candidate ability to plan and conduct the professional responsibilities required of a school psychologist at a level expected for the practicum student.

• **Assessment 4 (intern performance by field supervisor):** Intern evaluations by field supervisors; includes assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional work characteristics/dispositions are applied effectively in practice during internship. Assessment 4 must be linked to all domains of Standard II.

• **Assessment 5 (performance-based assessment by program faculty):** Assessment of performance involves comprehensive, performance-based assessment of candidate abilities evaluated by faculty. At least half of the cases must be completed during internship. This assessment must be broad enough to cover the integration and application of multiple performance-based standards. At a minimum, cases must include psychoeducational assessment, academic intervention, and behavioral intervention. The cases need not cover all domains, especially the knowledge components of domains addressed in Assessments 1 and 2.

• **Assessment 6 (impact on pre-K–12 student learning during internship):** Assessment of impact on pre-K–12 student learning demonstrates that candidates can integrate domains of knowledge and apply professional skills in delivering a comprehensive range of services evidenced by measurable impact on children, youth, families, and other consumers demonstrated during internship. This assessment must include at least one academic and at least one behavioral case, with at least half of all cases being completed during internship. Each case may be at the individual or group/class level.

Note: You need not have a separate assessment of this area if Assessment 5 includes cases that include measurable effects on pre-K–12 student learning. Simply refer to the particular assessments and aggregate the relevant data (e.g., particular items or sections of an assessment). Assessment 6 requires evidence that the intern (not faculty member) can determine their impact on pre-K–12 student learning.

**Optional/Additional Assessment Documentation:**

**Assessment 7 and Assessment 8 (optional):** Assessment 7 and Assessment 8 are additional program assessments that address NASP Standard II, Domains 2.1–2.10; samples include exit interview results, alumni surveys, and employer surveys.
Additional Guidelines for Assessing Candidate Impact on P–12 Students

Despite the fact that NASP has required programs to assess the positive impact of candidates on P–12 students since its 1994 standards, Assessment 6 continues to present challenges to programs. The PAB provides the following guidance:

a. Assessment 6 requires that the candidates themselves conduct at least one academic case and at least one behavioral case and measure impact, with at least one half of cases during internship. As part of the Assessment 6 documentation, faculty analyze and summarize impact data provided by students.

b. The following is a non-exhaustive list of EXAMPLES of techniques that may be useful for assessing and demonstrating measurable impact. In addition, programs are reminded that both behavioral and academic cases need to be included. Two cohorts complete data on behavioral and academic case studies.
   - Goal attainment scaling
   - Percent of nonoverlapping data
   - Effect size
   - Comparisons of pre and post data
   - Progress monitoring data
   - Individual or group data
   - Improvement rate difference

c. The following are examples of other techniques that may be useful for program improvement or candidate growth and development but are not sufficient in themselves to demonstrate evidence of measurable impact.
   - Consumer satisfaction ratings
   - Candidate self-reflections or self-evaluation of p-12 student progress
   - Items on field supervisor evaluation forms
   - Data collected prior to internship
   - Faculty global ratings of candidate positive impact
   - Case studies with no P–12 outcome data
   - Assessment of positive impact that is not required of all candidates

d. Candidates may use multiple and varied methodologies to assess impact, or all candidates may be required to use the same methodology.

e. If all aspects are in place to determine whether candidates are making impact but the results are not stellar, this would be accepted given that the program is required to interpret their findings and indicate how they plan to work with candidates to show stronger positive impact.
Programmatic Standards (I, III, IV)

Lengthy narratives are not necessary in order to adequately explain consistency in policy and practice with NASP programmatic standards (Standards I, III, and IV). Instead, the program should direct reviewers to program documentation that demonstrates consistency with NASP standards. The types of documentation vary depending on the standard and are described below and in samples the NASP PAB provides.

For each standard or element (subcomponent of a standard), the program is asked to make a clear and concise statement that explains programmatic evidence of compliance with that standard. Those statements should be cross-referenced to specific documentation and evidence included in attachments. Specific page numbers in attachments, when applicable, should be referenced to identify sections of the submission. Only pertinent sections of documents should be included, rather than the entire document (e.g., the pages of the graduate catalog that include relevant policy statements).

Please note that Standard V requires a statement of compliance, not the corresponding evidence, which will be examined more as part of the site visit process that will follow the electronic submission.

Policy and Practice

It is important for programs to document policy and practice for all standards and elements because program reviewers and PAB members look for consistency between policy and practice. For example, a program may indicate it has a sequence of courses that align with the program’s philosophy of school psychology and directs the program reviewer to specific pages in the program handbook for documentation of policy. The program would also direct the program reviewer to documentation of practice by referencing candidate transcripts, etc.

Standard I—School Psychology Program Structure

Programs respond to NASP Standard I by completing Attachment D (Response to NASP Standard I), which outlines the program’s policy and practice documentation. In addition, programs must submit program handbooks (which should be located in Attachment C), or comparable documents that describe the program’s philosophy, goals/objectives, curriculum, and policies. Internship policies can be submitted as part of the program handbook or separately as part of practice documentation (see below). Optional/additional policy documentation can include relevant sections of graduate catalogs or bulletins, practica/internship handbooks, and minutes of faculty meetings.
Programs are required to submit the following practice documentation:

- Charts documenting response to NASP Standard I and Standard II, Domains 2.1–2.10 (Attachments D and F).
- Internship Summary Form (Attachment G). The internship summary form includes two options and should not be confused with the Options for Program Review discussed above. Select Option A or B as described in the last column of the form. If selecting Option A, provide in the column, or attach a summary of the percent of time spent by each intern in various school psychology activities required for internship. If selecting Option B, attach a complete log or comprehensive summary of activities for two interns listed in the table whose activities were typical of those performed by most interns. Examples of evidence documenting internship activities include internship logs, summary forms, and verification forms.
- Practica and internship evaluation forms.
- A sample blank internship written agreement, contract, or plan that addresses NASP Standard III.
- Two completed internship logs or summaries, as per Attachment G (See Option B above, Internship Summary Form).

Optional/Additional practice documentation can also be submitted:

- Minutes of faculty meetings
- Annual program reports

**Standard II—Domains 2.1–2.10**

Standard II requires that programs submit evidence that it addresses and assesses the competencies in each domain, and that all candidates attain competencies in each domain. Thus, performance documentation is required. All programs submit Table E, which should include no fewer than two and no greater than three courses for each domain. Note that the internship should not be cited in Table E, as candidates should have acquired the requisite knowledge in courses other than internship. Documentation for Standards II should also include a table containing aggregated grades for all required courses cited in Table E.

**Standard III—Supervised Field Experiences in School Psychology**

Programs must demonstrate policy and provide practice documentation for Standard III. All programs submit Attachment F (Response to NASP Standard III) and Attachment G (internship policies or handbook or other documents). Practice documentation can be found in transcripts, practicum and internship evaluations, internship summaries, and internship agreements.

**Standards IV—Performance-Based Program Assessment and Accountability**

Programs must demonstrate systematic, comprehensive assessment of candidate knowledge, skills, and professional work characteristics needed for effective practice. A key aspect of program accountability is the assessment of candidate ability to provide, and evaluate the impact of, direct and indirect services to children and youth, families, and schools. Faculty must be involved in the evaluation of candidate skill application (e.g., psychoeducational evaluations, assessment of academic and behavioral interventions completed at the individual, group, or system-wide level)., and use assessment results to evaluate and improve the program. Attainment of this standard will be
judged by assessments cited for other standards and systematic use of assessment results for program improvement.

**Standard V—Program Resources**

Programs make a statement of policy or practice regarding each element of Standard V. No further documentation is required. However, the evaluation of program resources is done as part of the site visit that follows the review and accreditation of submitted materials.
Section 7

NASP REVIEW AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Initial Evaluation of Program Materials

School psychology graduate program faculty, administrators, and practitioners who have acquired training and experience in the application of the NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists and associated requirements and rubrics evaluate program materials. Each program is examined independently by at least two experienced reviewers, one of whom is assigned as the lead reviewer. If a less experienced reviewer is assigned to the review, that person is assigned as the third person evaluating the program.

Prior to evaluating materials, each reviewer is asked to consider whether a potential conflict of interest might exist or be perceived to exist for any reason, including factors such as prior involvement with the institution, program, or personnel at that institution. A program review is never assigned to reviewers who reside or work in the state in which the institution is located.

Reviewers evaluate the program's compliance with each standard and element using rubrics that have been created for this purpose. These rubrics are available to programs at: https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/graduate-program-approval-and-accreditation/program-accreditation.

Preponderance of Evidence

NASP reviewer ratings and PAB judgments regarding whether each elements is Acceptable, Marginal, or Not Acceptable are based on the evidence presented. Reviewers and the PAB then determine whether each standard is Met or Not Met; this decision as well as decisions on Full Accreditation, Conditional Accreditation, or Denial of Accreditation are based on the preponderance of evidence. Full Accreditation requires that all standards are met.

Evaluating Particular Standards

As stated above, reviewers use rubrics to evaluate each standard and judge whether each standard is met based on a preponderance of evidence.

Standard I focuses on the foundation and structure of the program. Emphasis is placed on program philosophy and must show policy and practice evidence that aligns with a program defined as representing the profession of school psychology. Further, this standard should provide evidence that human diversity is represented, that there is an integrated sequential program of study and field experiences, and that the program is comprised of appropriately credentialed faculty and meets minimum credit hours for specialist- and doctoral-level programs.
Respecialization: There has been some confusion regarding respecialization programs, so the PAB has separated this section for clarification. A respecialization program is appropriate for individuals that have a graduate degree in an area similar to school psychology (e.g., counseling, social work) and seeks coursework that allows them to become licensed or certified as a school psychologist in their state. This person is not earning a degree from your university. Instead, program faculty are reviewing the curriculum of each individual prospective student and creating a series of courses unique to the student’s needs. A student earning a degree (MA, EdS, etc.) is not part of a respecialization program; they are part of your degree program. Programs that offer the respecialization option should document (for policy purposes and in their program handbook) a procedure for reviewing pertinent information and how decisions for course work completion are determined. Practice for respecialization should be documented by offering a transcript of a student that completed a respecialization option.

If Standard I is judged as Not Met, the program will not be considered for further accreditation. (Please note: Reviewers will still evaluate all standards in order to provide programs with feedback on program quality and strength of assessments.)

See Standard I rubric for further guidance.

**Standard II, Domains 2.1–2.10**

Standard II, Domains 2.1–2.10 encompass the criteria focused on School Psychology Graduate Education and Practice and are evaluated based on evidence of the performance of program candidates/graduates. Reviewers must evaluate the extent to which programs have documented how each domain is assessed, and attained by the program. Domains must be adequately assessed, and attained for the standard to be rated as met or Marginal/Acceptable, as appropriate. For each domain, reviewers provide specific comments labeled as assessed, and attained to explain the basis for any domain judged to be not met.

To determine whether each of the NASP domains have been adequately assessed, programs are required to submit two types of information for Standard II: (a) aggregated and disaggregated grades for all required courses cited in Table E and (b) complete Attachment E. Reviewers examine this form and all pertinent attachments for Assessment 2. In addition, reviewers are required to evaluate the quality of assessments submitted and then judge whether each domain has been met (or Marginal/Acceptable), as appropriate.

See Standard II rubric for further guidance.

**Standard III**

The Practica and Internship Standard is judged based on required policy and practice documentation. Reviewers evaluate policy documents such as program and internship handbooks, Attachments F and G, and other documents. Practice documentation is found in transcripts, aggregated and disaggregated data from practicum and internship field-based evaluations, and internship summaries and agreements.

Reviewers judge measurable impact on children, families, schools, and other consumers as part of this standard. Reviewers will evaluate Assessment 6 attainment data to determine measurable positive impact.

See Standard III rubric for further guidance.
**Standard IV**  
This standard, which focuses on the program’s performance assessments and use of results for program improvement, is judged based on assessments cited in response to previous standards, and documentation of faculty use for program improvement. Reviewers examine documentation of assessments and results cited for prior standards, and documentation in program materials (e.g., program annual reports, minutes of faculty meetings) that assessment results have been examined and used for program improvements. An important part of Standard IV is documentation that candidates/interns systematically assess their impact on pre-K–12 students and that faculty evaluate such impact.

See Standard IV rubric for further guidance.

**Standard V**  
Standard V requires only that the program provide a statement of policy and/or practice regarding compliance with each element. Reviewers will accept that statement unless other evidence in the submission (e.g., the student or faculty tables) suggests possible noncompliance.

**Review Process**

**PAB Review**  
The PAB reviews programs at various stages. In the initial stage of earning candidacy, the PAB reviews Standards I, III, IV, and V and the six assessments for Standard II. This initial report allows the PAB to determine whether the program is ready to progress toward full review. Given that two to three reviewers provide the initial full review of the program, the PAB reviews individual reviewer reports for consistencies and that the standards were adequately applied.

The PAB also reviews reports following the completion of the site visit. Procedures used are discussed in the section below. The PAB completes the final report and makes the final accreditation decision.

**The Reviewer Report**  
Reviewers provide a confidential written report to the PAB that contains judgments on program compliance with each standard along with specific comments on each standard evaluated as *not met*; a summary of ratings across standards, comments on program strengths and weaknesses, evaluation of assessments, and an overall judgment concerning perceived quality of the program.

**Preliminary Review to Determine Site Visit Readiness**  
The PAB determines the program’s readiness for site visit based on a sound program structure, adequate assessments and evidence of appropriate practica and internship experiences. Programs with the requisite data applications and evidence of knowledge and skill attainment will typically be designated as ready for the site visit. This could also occur if one or two assessments require additional data, or components need further clarification. Programs receive notice that they are ready for the site visit with possible dates for the site visit and a final deadline for completion of the site visit.

**Prior to the Visit**  
The program director will be provided with a preliminary PAB report which will include a list of standards judged as met or not met during the preliminary review as well as a list of questions, information, and or data that need to be ready to be addressed during the site visit. At a minimum,
site visitors will need to see sample student documents or scores and/or faculty or field supervisor evaluations of such work that served as the basis for aggregated or disaggregated data for assessments in the program’s written report (e.g., a sample of case studies and associated evaluations that were used by the program to demonstrate positive impact on P–12 students, or Praxis score reports that were aggregated and submitted by the program).

The program director will be provided with the contact information for the professionals who have been selected to conduct the visit. It is incumbent on the program to coordinate the review dates and travel and lodging arrangements with the visitors and complete the visit by April 15 for fall written submissions or by October 15 for spring submissions. If institutional or reviewer schedules prohibit meeting these deadlines, the program may ask for a brief extension from the Chair or Cochair of the PAB.

Coordination of the schedule by the program and institution in collaboration with the site visitors should allow the program to coordinate the visit and associated schedule with program constituencies and university administrators, and to follow institutional travel procedures. Site visitors must be notified of institutional travel and reimbursement policies and the documentation needed for reimbursement prior to the visit. It is recommended that any reimbursement forms that need a hard copy signature be provided during the visit.

The site visitors review the preliminary PAB report, and consult with each other and with the Chair (or Cochair) of the Program Accreditation Board on standards that were judged as not being fully met in the initial review, and associated questions, information, and/or data that need to be addressed during the site visit. See Appendix F for additional information on site visit process and Appendix G for the Site Visit Evaluation Form.

**Plan for Institutional/Program Site Visits**

Institutional/program site visits are an important part of the accreditation process. Site visits provide an opportunity for reviewers to (a) discuss various aspects of the program with faculty and administrators in ways that go beyond the review of documents from a distance; (b) examine program facilities; and (c) interact with and gain information from key program stakeholders and university officials. Thus, site visits can yield information that provides a more robust and valid means by which to judge program quality and compliance with standards. Visits to an institution also provide an opportunity for the program to showcase strengths to internal and external audiences. The PAB conducts an initial review of the program’s written submission in order to determine eligibility for a site visit. Once eligibility is ascertained, a site visit is scheduled.

Despite the benefits of a site visit, the PAB recognizes that university faculty and administrator time is valuable, as is the time of volunteer site visitors, and that universities and programs have limited budgets. Thus, the PAB has designed what it believes to be an efficient and cost-effective site visit process.

NASP site visits occur after the review of the program’s written submission by two or three trained reviewers “vetted” as having no conflict of interest with the program and institution and the drafting of a Preliminary Program Report based on those reviews by the NASP PAB.
Two reviewers will be selected by the Chair or Cochair of the PAB to conduct the site visit (In cases in which a specialist and doctoral program are being reviewed, the visit may either include a third visitor, or an extra day). Site visitors will be vetted as having no conflict of interest with the program and will become familiar with the program’s submission and the PAB program report to serve as a site visitor.

At a minimum the visit will include:

1. Interviews with program administrators, including the person who compiled the NASP submission report, and other program faculty.
2. Interviews with other faculty teaching required courses.
3. Interviews with key program stakeholder groups, including a representative sample of students, interns, and field supervisors of practicum students and/or interns.
4. Interviews with university administrators with direct supervisory roles over the program.
5. An opportunity to follow up with program faculty on questions raised in prior phases of the program review that have not yet been answered sufficiently to conclude a valid review. This may include the validation or clarification of data included in the written submission.
6. An opportunity to see and evaluate the facilities as appropriate.

Program Accreditation Review and Decisions

The members of the Program Accreditation Board consider the reviewers' ratings and recommendations when making program decisions. Members of the PAB carefully examine the information provided by reviewers and, as necessary, program materials, and formulate a decision concerning accreditation. Each program under review is discussed at board meetings and decisions are made as a group. A Decision Matrix is used to assist the PAB in making accreditation decisions allowing the PAB to make conclusions based on preponderance of evidence.

A written summary of the findings is then prepared and transmitted to the appropriate institutional representative, (e.g., typically the director of the School Psychology Program and the Dean of the College).

There are three possible outcomes of reviews:

1. Full Accreditation
2. Conditional Accreditation
3. No Accreditation

Programs receive Full Accreditation when the preponderance of evidence revealed a solid foundation, policy and practice align, and the six assessment tools were determined to be high quality. Programs may obtain Full Accreditation for a period of 7 years, commencing January 1 of the year in which the review was conducted (for initial accreditation) or the following year (for continuing accreditation). Programs receiving this designation are automatically listed as NASP Accredited, and their graduates are exempt from transcript review and case study requirements when they apply for the National Certificate in School Psychology.

Programs receive Conditional Accreditation in circumstances where, in the judgment of the PAB, adequate documentation of policy or practice has not been provided. This may include concerns about the quality of the six assessment tools and presentation of data. Conditional Accreditation is
typically provided for a 2-year period and carries with it the same benefits and conditions as programs with full accreditation. It is important to note that programs choosing to post this status on their webpage must acknowledge Conditional Accreditation. Before the end of the Conditional Accreditation period, the program must submit materials that address all Standards identified as not met. Programs then receive either Full Accreditation for the balance of the accreditation period starting when accreditation was first granted or are not accredited. It is the policy of the Board to not extend Conditional Accreditation except in unusual circumstances.

Programs receive No Accreditation status when significant NASP Standards have been judged to be not met. The issues may relate to concerns about program structure, content, field experiences, or performance. Issues may also involve poorly designed assessment tools, incomplete data, or lack of interpretation of data. Decisions also may result from the cumulative effect of inconsistencies across Standards.

**Inactive Status**

A program can request to go on inactive status if there is an impending closure of the program. This allows candidates to graduate from an accredited program but does not require a program to complete the full review cycle to continue accreditation.

**Removal of Accreditation**

Removal of Accreditation may be required by the PAB in cases where a program is found to be in serious ethical violation to the extent the program cannot function in a principled manner, or if a significant number of school psychology faculty leave the program and, thus, quality of education is seriously questioned.

**Access to Review Reports**

Programs and relevant department heads and deans can request access to reports from the PAB chair. Notices of program accreditation are listed online, as well as the status of the program’s accreditation. NASP does not provide a list of programs that are not approved.

Requests for a copy of the review report should be initially made to the program director or other individuals designated to have a copy (e.g., department chair, dean). If this request is not granted, a request for the review report can be made in writing to the Chair of the NASP Program Accreditation Board. Requests should include a rationale for needing access to the report and documented attempts (and responses) to receive the report through the avenue described above. Information regarding the overall review findings and/or the program’s current status is available from program directors and online.

**Conveying NASP Accreditation Status**

It is incumbent on school psychology programs to accurately convey their NASP accreditation status to students, prospective students, and the public. In fact, NASP ethical standard III 1.4 states, “Graduate program directors are responsible for ensuring that the descriptions of their programs accurately represent the nature of accreditation and/or approval by various bodies. If a program has not been awarded NASP approval, directors ensure that descriptions of the program do not imply
that it meets NASP’s *Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists.*” (NASP, 2020, p. 61).

Only programs that have undergone review by the NASP Program Accreditation Board and been granted full accreditation by that Board may state that they are fully accredited by NASP. It should be noted that NASP accredits only school psychology programs, not departments or institutions. NASP accreditation is also specific to program level (specialist or doctoral). The following is a statement that a fully accredited specialist program might use to convey its NASP status: “The [institution name] specialist program in school psychology is fully accredited by the National Association of School Psychologists.” In cases in which both a specialist and doctoral program at an institution are fully accredited, the statement can include a reference to both programs.

Programs that are conditionally accredited by NASP must reference the conditional nature of their accreditation in public statements. The following is an example of such a statement: “The [institution name] doctoral program in school psychology is conditionally accredited by the National Association of School Psychologists.”

Programs that are not accredited should refrain from suggesting that they hold or anticipate such accreditation, or that a judgment has been made that they meet NASP standards without having undergone program review by NASP. Statements such as “Our program meets NASP standards,” or “Our program has been designed to meet NASP standards,” or “We anticipate achieving NASP accreditation in the near future” must be avoided. Likewise, programs should note that “provider” or “unit” accreditation by CAEP has no relevance to *program* accreditation by NASP.

In cases in which a previously accredited program loses its NASP accreditation status after exhausting available review options, or in cases in which a program’s NASP accreditation status is changed from Full Accreditation to Conditional Accreditation, it is incumbent on the program to notify its students, prospective students, and the public of the change in its NASP accreditation status as soon as possible after receiving official, written documentation from NASP.
Section 8

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROGRAM RESPONSE TO REVIEW

Revised Reports

If the initial decision was No Accreditation, the program is entitled to submit a revised report by the deadline for a regular fall or spring review cycle within 18 months of first receipt of the initial decision. The revised report must be organized in the same manner as the initial submission and address only those Standards rated as not met, through the provision of further explanation or documentation. General program weaknesses cited in the initial evaluation report must also be addressed in the revised report. Programs must attend to all feedback before resubmitting a revised report. This is especially important with regard to collection of required data. Submitting prior to collecting adequate data may result in nonaccreditation.

Revised reports are evaluated using the same procedures employed in the initial reviews (typically by the same reviewers). The reviewers examine the evidence and then provide an evaluation of the program's compliance with those Standards originally rated as not met. Reviewers' comments and recommendations concerning program accreditation are then transmitted to the Program Accreditation Board. The Program Accreditation Board examines the information and then formulates a decision of Full Accreditation, Conditional Accreditation, or No Accreditation.

Although programs are entitled to submit a revised report, doing so when substantial programmatic changes are still needed is not advised.

Conditional Reports

Programs holding Conditional Accreditation are required to submit a “Conditional Report” in order to attain Full Accreditation. Such a report must address only those Standards judged as not met in the previous submission. Program reviewers evaluate the program submissions and follow the established procedures for all program reviews. The reviewers examine the evidence and then provide an evaluation of the program’s compliance with those Standards originally rated as not met. Reviewers' comments and recommendations concerning program accreditation are then transmitted to the Program Accreditation Board. The Program Accreditation Board examines the information and then formulates a decision of Full Accreditation or No Accreditation.

Programs must attend to the feedback before resubmitting a Response to Conditions report. This is especially important with regard to collection of required data. Submitting prior to collecting adequate data may result in nonaccreditation.
Appeal of Program Accreditation Board Decisions

Programs that are found to be No Accreditation following the review of a revised report may file an appeal if they believe the Program Accreditation Board erred in its decision. The Chair of the Program Accreditation Board must receive the appeal in writing within 30 days of first receipt of the decision regarding the revised report, either unofficial or official. The appeal must reference the standards judged as “Not Met,” the relevant documentation in the program’s revised report, and the program’s rationale as to how the documentation demonstrates program adherence to standards.

A three-member appeal panel is appointed, composed of experienced reviewers who have had no prior involvement with the program, the initial review, or the revised report. An appeal must be based on the contention that the Board erred in making its decision about the program based on the information that was submitted in the original materials or in the revised report. Changes in the program following the submission of initial materials and information or documentation not included in either the initial submission or the revised report will not be considered in an appeal. An appeal may include arguments concerning the misapplication of Standards or the misinterpretation of information or documentation by reviewers or the Board. The decision of the appeal panel will be considered final.
COMPLAINT PROCEDURES

The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) Program Accreditation Board (PAB) considers complaints regarding program compliance with NASP Standards from students, faculty and individuals from other programs. Only written, signed complaints related to a program’s noncompliance with NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists will be considered. Complaints regarding NASP Program Accreditation Board policies, procedures and accreditation decisions should follow the appeals procedures. Ethical complaints against individuals should be directed to the NASP Ethics and Professional Practices Committee (https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/professional-ethics).

NASP strongly recommends that internal institutional processes be followed to first attempt resolution of complaints against a program or its faculty. NASP does not act in admissions, appointment, and promotion/dismissal of faculty, staff or students. The NASP complaint policy and procedures are designed to address complaints related to adherence to NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists.

Complaint Against an Accredited/Approved Program

An initial, written complaint may be made to the Chair of the NASP PAB for consideration of merit. This step does not require that the complainant is identified to the program but NASP cannot guarantee the confidentiality and anonymity once the investigation commences.

Complaint Submission

A complainant submits an initial written complaint with appropriate documentation within 6 months of when the individual becomes aware of the alleged noncompliance with standards. The complainant is advised to complete the NASP Accreditation Noncompliance Form (see Appendix D), and to sign and submit the form to the Chair of the NASP PAB. The procedures below are to be followed.

1. The complaint must be in writing and clearly identifies the complainant.
2. Present evidence that documents the program’s noncompliance with specific NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists.
3. Describe other actions the complainant followed to resolve the issue, if applicable.
4. Action to resolve the issue(s) requested by the complainant.

Complaint Review Procedures

A. The NASP Program Accreditation Board Chair forwards the complaint to the Appeals and Complaint Review Committee (ACRC). The ACRC is composed of three current or past reviewers familiar with NASP standards; one of the three members serves as chair.
   1. The chair of the ACRC notifies the complainant that the complaint has been received.
   2. The ACRC will review the complaint and supporting documentation.
3. If the ACRC determines the complaint does not provide sufficient evidence of noncompliance with NASP standards, the recommendation that merit is not evident is forwarded to the Chair of the NASP PAB, who then notifies the complainant within 30 days. The complainant at that time can terminate the complaint or provide further evidence of noncompliance.

4. If the ACRC determines the complaint presents evidence of noncompliance with NASP standards, the complaint is noted as having merit and will lead to an investigation.

B. Investigation Phase—If the ACRC determines that the complaint has merit, the following investigation steps are followed.

1. The complainant is notified of the decision within 30 days, and steps for investigation are outlined.

2. The program is simultaneously notified that a complaint against the program has been received and acknowledged to have merit. The official complaint submitted (NASP Accreditation of Noncompliance Form) is sent to the program and steps for the investigation are outlined.

3. The program is asked to respond to the complaint and required to submit evidence to support the response within 30 days.

4. Relevant data will be collected from faculty, student, complainant, and other stakeholder interviews as part of the investigation phase and a site visit may be required.

5. The Appeals and Complaint Review Committee evaluates all evidence and determines an outcome.

**NASP Program Accreditation Board Action**

The ACRC will notify the Chair of the NASP PAB with the results of the investigation, noting if noncompliance has been determined. The PAB can take the following actions:

1. If noncompliance cannot be determined, the Board will notify the program via email and mailed letter that no further action is required. The Board will also inform the complainant of the outcome.

2. The Board will send a letter educating the program, the complainant, or both related to appropriate adherence to NASP standards.

3. If noncompliance is determined, the Board will notify the program of actions to be taken. Minor noncompliance typically results in educating the program faculty about the issues, while major/serious noncompliance can result in suspension or removal of program accreditation.
NASP awards accreditation only to those school psychology programs that have demonstrated effective performance in terms of student/candidate outcomes. It expects NASP-accredited programs to make such information publicly available. To that end, each NASP-accredited program is required to complete an annual program data report. Annual report data are useful for providing relevant information to the public and prospective students, and for contributing to aggregated data regarding school psychology graduate preparation.

The annual data report consists of two sections: (a) program information and (b) program outcomes/candidate performance. Program information includes information pertaining to program level (specialist versus doctoral); accreditation status; student financial support; student applications, enrollment, and characteristics; internships; respecialization options (if any); and faculty. Program outcomes include such information as:

- School Psychology Praxis scores reported by ETS for the previous 2 years (NASP will upload data received directly from ETS). A program with Praxis examination data that reflects less than an 80% pass rate will be required to provide an explanation for this outcome. Based on the program’s explanation, further outcome data may be examined, and the program may be required to identify steps for remediation. A program with Praxis examination data that reflects less than an 80% pass rate for 3 consecutive years will be categorized as underperforming and may be put on conditional accreditation status.
- The number of students who successfully completed the respective program by the end of the previous academic year and years to completion.
- The number and percentage of students completing the program the prior academic year who obtained positions as school psychologists, psychologists, mental health specialists, or school or program faculty or administrators, or (for specialist-level students) admission into a doctoral program in school psychology, psychology, education, or a related field within 1 year of graduation or by the time of data entry.

The data report is to be completed on the NASP website using a secure login link sent to the program administrator (programs are responsible for notifying NASP of any change in administrator). This method of annual data reporting minimizes duplication and time requirements for program administrators, makes data accessible to the public and prospective students, and maximizes the availability and use of data for the field of school psychology.

Each accredited program must provide a link to its program entry in the NASP database from its homepage. Programs should label the link “Program Annual Report and Student Outcomes” and may include a brief description of the available data if desired. Additionally, programs choosing not to link to NASP’s program data website may choose to display its annual report on its homepage using a reporting template provided by NASP.
Nonaccredited school psychology programs are also encouraged to enter their data in the NASP National Program Database. Completion of such data will be considered as a precondition if and when such programs apply for NASP accreditation.

As is reflected in both the NASP Values and Principles for Program Review and Accreditation and in the NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists, NASP expects programs to engage in ongoing quality improvement. To that end, it expects programs to review candidate and program completer performance data on an ongoing basis, and to use such information to examine and improve the program. The ultimate goal of such review is to prepare school psychologists able to effectively address the diverse needs of children and youth, families, and schools.
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ALTERNATIVE REVIEW OPTION FOR PREVIOUSLY ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

An accreditation review provides an important opportunity for self-examination by program faculty and evaluation by external peers. In order to afford programs that have consistently demonstrated quality preparation and compliance with NASP standards based on external review the opportunity to focus more on self-improvement and innovation as part of the accreditation process, NASP offers the option of an Alternative Reaccreditation Review (ARR) for qualifying programs.

In order to qualify for an ARR, a program must:

1. Hold full NASP accreditation;
2. Have undergone two consecutive prior successful NASP reviews that resulted in full accreditation;
3. Submit a written ARR proposal to NASP at least 2 years prior to the due date for the program’s NASP review that is approved by the Program Accreditation Board. Due dates for ARR proposals will be the same as those for all NASP program submissions (see NASP PAB deadlines).
4. Be up-to-date on its annual data entry in the NASP Program Database.

ARR Proposals

The ARR proposal should be submitted using the prescribed format and shall consist of a cover page and a brief (two to three page) written description of the:

1. rationale or need for the project;
2. goal(s) of project (in terms of project improvement), and the associated NASP standard(s) that such goals will address;
3. methods by which the program expects to reach its improvement goal(s);
4. measures by which the improvement process will be evaluated (including a virtual site visit with the targets of the intervention, such as program candidates, faculty, field supervisors, alumni, etc., and one or more outcome measures such as survey results, test scores, and graduate employment rates).
5. criteria or benchmarks by which the program will judge the outcomes of the project and document that goal(s) have been reached. These may include proximal benchmarks that can be assessed and reported within 1 year of the project’s onset (required) as well as more distal, longer term goals.

The proposal should also include a proposed timeline, with the inclusion of a virtual site visit with two NASP reviewers and/or PAB members at or near the end of the project, and completion and report submission date no later than the deadline for the program’s next regular NASP submission.

In addition to the ARR proposal the program is required to provide:
1. program handbook showing the required program curriculum requirements;
2. the transcripts (unofficial are acceptable) of three program candidates who graduated within the past year;
3. a summary of program changes made since the time of the last review (including those made in response to the last NASP review, along with documentation or assessment data to demonstrate such changes);
4. faculty and student summary tables.

The proposal and associated documentation (handbook, transcripts, etc.) must be submitted to the chair of the NASP Program Accreditation Report at least 2 years prior to the program’s next submission for reaccreditation.

The Program Accreditation Board will review the proposal using a rubric that will be available to applying programs. It will notify the program if the project has been approved as soon as possible and no later than the date by which all programs reviewed in that cycle receive feedback. The PAB may make recommendations regarding aspects of the project.

**ARR Projects**

Programs interested in the ARR option are urged to undertake projects that are under program control and have a strong likelihood of success, even if not every goal is reached (as might be expected in more ambitious and innovative projects). A failure to complete, document, and submit to the NASP PAB the project within the specified timelines, or to reach most goals may result in a change in the program’s NASP accreditation status to Conditional Accreditation and/or being required to submit a full, standard accreditation report.

A few examples of improvement/innovation projects that might be considered by programs include:

- Diversification/globalization of the program curriculum
- Increasing financial support for students, including the percent of students receiving paid internships
- Strengthening the system by which faculty assess candidates on an ongoing basis and determine their readiness for internship.
- Restructuring practica requirements and experiences to better reflect program goals and NASP standards
- Improving program performance assessments and corresponding use of data
- Increasing the ability of program candidates to assess their impact on P–12 learning
- Enhancing communication and collaboration with internship field sites/field supervisors
- Broadening internship requirements to better address the NASP Practice Model

The breadth and depth of the project should require, at a minimum, an amount of faculty time and effort approximately equivalent to that which would have been expended preparing for and submitting a full accreditation review. It is expected that most projects, or at least key, measureable benchmarks of the project will be completed in 1 year. Projects that would require longer to complete, such as increasing the diversity of the student body or student retention may be considered as long as short term, achievable goals and methods can be established, evaluated, and reported by the original due date for the program report.
The submission and approval of an ARR proposal will not change the program’s NASP accreditation cycle. Extensions for ARR reports will not be granted except in highly unusual circumstances. Thus, it is important that programs wishing to undertake an ARR follow all deadlines and timelines.

Although most projects are expected to be specific to individual programs, multiple programs in one state or in close geographic proximity that qualify for an ARR and that are on the same NASP review cycle may collaborate on a multiprogram improvement project. However, each program must submit an application and the goals, methods, criteria or benchmarks by which the success of the project for that program is to be judged for that program.

ARR Reports

The ARR report shall consist of a description of:

1. goal(s) of improvement/innovation efforts and the associated NASP standards that such improvements addressed;
2. methods used by the program to reach its improvement goal(s);
3. measures by which the improvement process was evaluated, including a virtual site visit with the targets of the intervention (such as program candidates, faculty, field supervisors, alumni) and one or more outcome measures (such as survey results, test scores, graduate employment rates);
4. an evaluation of the outcome of the project in relation to criteria or benchmarks established by the program; and
5. a brief discussion of future plans to further address the goals of the project.

ARR reports from programs will be reviewed by the PAB using a standard rubric that will be provided to the program prior once the project is approved. The PAB may request a virtual site visit if needed to evaluate the outcome of the project. If so, the program director and PAB chair will make arrangements for such a visit.

Full approval of the project will result in full accreditation of the program for 7 years. Nonapproval of the project will result in Conditional Accreditation with a request for the program to either (a) alter or extend the project and resubmit the project report by a specified date or (b) submit a full review by a specified date.

Questions regarding the NASP Alternative Accreditation Review Option may be directed to the chair of the NASP Program Accreditation Board.
THE IMPORTANCE OF ATTENDING AN ACCREDITED SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM

The state and national recognition status of the school psychology program that students attend may well have an impact on state and national credentials that they qualify for upon graduation. If a school psychology program is approved in the state in which it is located, students are likely be able to practice in the public schools of that state upon completing the program. But if individuals want to be credentialed in other states, or to attain national certification, it is important that they attend a nationally accredited program. Such status indicates that external experts have reviewed the program using national standards and suggests that the program provides quality preparation.

There are two national professional organizations that review and recognize school psychology graduate programs. NASP reviews and accredits specialist and doctoral programs. The American Psychological Association (APA) accredits programs at the doctoral level only. Programs that are recognized by NASP may be found at its website at: https://apps.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/graduate-education/index.aspx. NASP also provides an online database of school psychology programs organized by state at https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/graduate-program-approval-and-accreditation/program-approval/approved-programs.

The graduates of programs that are recognized by NASP can be credentialed to work in the schools in the majority of states (many of which either use NASP reviews to determine which programs are state-approved or use NASP standards for their own state reviews). Additionally, pending the passing of a national exam and documentation of an internship consistent with NASP standards, the graduates of NASP-approved programs qualify for the Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP) credential. The graduates of programs that are not NASP-approved may also apply for the NCSP, but they must submit considerably more documentation regarding their preparation and are less assured of qualifying for the credential.

Some nonaccredited programs likely provide quality preparation. However, prospective students should be aware of institutions and programs that engage in deceptive practices or that offer degrees without providing quality training. One example of a deceptive practice is when a program cites its institutional accreditation as evidence that the program is accredited. It is the program’s recognition by a national professional organization in their field, and not institutional status, that is linked to being credentialed in that field upon graduation.
Consumers also need to beware of entities that provide, often at substantial cost, a degree without providing quality preparation delivered by quality professionals. The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) provides very helpful guidance on diploma mills and accreditation mills at its website at: https://www.chea.org/combating-site-distance-based-degree-mills
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REVIEW OF STATE STANDARDS

NASP is committed to collaborating with state departments of education and other state agencies that review school psychology programs and/or credential school psychologists to assure that all school psychologists are prepared in accordance with national quality standards and able to provide the most effective services to P–12 students and their families. Upon the request of the appropriate state authorities, the NASP PAB will review state standards for graduate programs in school psychology, provide feedback on the extent to which state standards are consistent with those of NASP. NASP will also collaborate with states interested in having NASP review school psychology programs for purposes of quality assurance and possible state approval, or in establishing a partnership through which joint NASP-state reviews of programs might occur. Such a partnership can preserve valuable and limited state resources, make use of NASP resources and experience, and reduce duplication and burdensome reporting for programs. State representatives interested in exploring such a partnership should contact the Chair of the NASP Program Accreditation Board.
Policy Regarding NASP Program Accreditation/APA Accreditation

NASP recognizes school psychology doctoral program accreditation by the American Psychological Association (APA) and grants accreditation to doctoral programs that submit documentation of their APA accreditation in school psychology and of program internship requirements consistent with NASP standards. In lieu of submitting full materials, APA-accredited school psychology programs should submit several documents to the Chair of the Program Accreditation Board: (a) a written request for recognition as being NASP accredited; (b) one copy each of the most recent APA Site Team Report, follow-up submissions by the program (if any), and the action letter from the APA Committee on Accreditation; and (c) documentation of program compliance with NASP internship standards (e.g., program handbook or internship handbook documenting requirements for all candidates consistent with NASP standards pertaining to such areas as supervisor credentials and the portion of the internship or equivalent experience that must be completed in a school setting). Policies, if any, regarding credit for prior internship experiences should also be documented. APA programs may give credit for prior school-based internship or equivalent experiences (please see NASP Policy on Credit for Prior Internship below). Materials for NASP accreditation must be resubmitted each time APA reviews the program. In addition, the Chair of the NASP Program Accreditation Board must be notified in writing immediately of any change in the program's APA accreditation status. Correspondence and submission of documents can be made electronically and will serve as an official method of communication.

Policy on Credit for Prior Internships

Credit for up to half of the program’s required internship may be given to a candidate who completed a prior graduate program and associated internship or equivalent experience in school psychology or a closely allied field if the following conditions are met:

1. The internship must have been preceded by appropriate graduate coursework and practica and must include a range of activities consistent with both program goals and NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists;
2. The experience must have been consistent with NASP internship standards, particularly those pertaining to conditions of supervision and credentials of field supervisors; at least 600 hours of the total internship must be in the schools, including any portion thereof for which credit for prior internship or the equivalent is granted;
3. Evidence that the candidate successfully completed the internship and has continued to utilize the resulting knowledge and skills on a continuous basis since the time of the internship (Programs should note that they will ultimately be responsible for assessing and documenting the culminating performance of interns/graduates); and
4. The internship and associated supervision must be appropriately documented for such purposes as program accreditation and candidate application for state and national certification. NASP’s Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP) Internship Verification Form or similar documentation can be used for this purpose.

Requests for Extensions

In some cases, a program may request an extension of accreditation due to extenuating circumstances. Programs requesting a 1–2-year extension for extenuating circumstances will be required to submit a formal written request to the Chair of the PAB. In these cases, the Chair will consult with the Board to determine approval of that extension. For programs requesting more than a 2-year extension, regardless of reason, submission of a formal written request and an Interim Report to the Chair of the PAB is required in order to extend accreditation beyond the current expiration date.

An Interim Report should consist of a brief discussion of each of the following items:

- The institutional/programmatic circumstances for making the request,
- When applicable, evidence of progress toward addressing each standard/guideline found to be not met in the most recent review,
- Any other changes in the program (e.g., assessments; curriculum; faculty; field experiences; resources) since the last review and the perceived impact of such changes on program compliance with NASP standards, and
- Changes anticipated prior to the next review.

Programs are required to submit this report electronically along with their request for the extension. The Board will review the materials and decide to approve or decline the request. Programs will be notified in writing of the board’s decision.

Retention of Review Materials

The NASP office and the Chair of the PAB maintain copies of program review summaries for 7 years. A copy of each program submission is maintained for 7 years. Programs are asked to retain copies of the original data submitted to NASP, including the artifacts or instruments on which the data were based, for 7 years.

Programs With Multiple Sites

For the purposes of this policy, a site refers to either the physical location of the campus and/or the medium for delivery of instruction (e.g., distance education).

Some school psychology programs deliver their curriculum and training to different candidates/cohorts in multiple sites. If the admissions requirements, curriculum requirements, course delivery methods, practica and internship requirements, assessment requirements, teaching and supervising faculty, and documentation of program completion (e.g., degree or certificate on transcript) are the same or essentially the same for candidates/cohorts in multiple sites, then the program may submit one accreditation application to the NASP PAB and provide the required assessment data for candidates/cohorts at each site. The sites should be clearly identified in the
program description/contextual information at the beginning of the application and in the assessment tables that are presented.

A program already holding full accreditation by NASP that wishes to add an additional site or sites where other candidates/cohorts are to be prepared must notify the Chair of the NASP PAB in writing of its plans to do so at least 6 months prior to admitting students to the new site (please see Appendix H for complete policy).

Programs With Multiple Delivery Modalities

NASP recognizes that there are school psychology graduate programs which deliver their curriculum through delivery modalities that differ among various candidates/cohorts. For example, a NASP-accredited program that offers a wholly or primarily campus-based curriculum in which students and faculty are together in the same physical location for the majority of courses may wish to start a wholly or primarily distance-delivered program that serves a different student population. In those instances, there are a number of variables that pertain to accreditation that must be considered (please see Appendix I for complete policy).

Substantive Change Policy

School psychology programs often make changes that do not change programmatic scope, operations, or contents in significant ways. Such changes do not usually affect accreditation status. Other changes are more significant, however, and may affect accreditation. Substantive change is a significant modification or expansion in the nature and/or scope of a school psychology program accredited by or in the process of applying for accreditation by the National Association of School Psychologists. NASP-accredited programs or programs having submitted an application for NASP accreditation that are considering substantive changes must notify the NASP Program Accreditation Board chair of the change prior to implementation (please see Appendix I for complete policy).
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RELEVANT CONTACT INFORMATION AND WEBSITES

Eric Rossen
Director, Professional Development and Standards
NASP
4340 East West Highway, Suite 402
Bethesda, MD 20814
Phone: 301-657-0270
Phone: 301-346-1674, direct
Email: erossen@naspweb.org
Note: Review fees should be submitted directly to NASP at the address above.

Natalie N. Politikos, PhD, NCSP
Chair, NASP Program Accreditation Board
Director, School Psychology Program
Associate Professor
University of Hartford
Phone: 860-768-4545
Email: nasppab@naspweb.org

NASP Website: http://www.nasponline.org
# NASP REVIEWER BACKGROUND SCAN
INFORMATION FORM
2020

| Name: |  |
| Ethnicity: |  |
| Language Proficiency (include all languages): |  |
| Gender |  |
| Work Address: |  |
| Home Address: |  |
| Preferred Email: |  |
| Preferred Phone: |  |

Are you a member of NASP? (Required in order to be a program reviewer): __Yes__ No

**Educational history:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Appendix B**

Policies and Procedures for the Review and Accreditation of Graduate Programs in School Psychology
A resource from the National Association of School Psychologists  |  [www.nasponline.org](http://www.nasponline.org)  |  301-657-0270  |  866-331-6277
### Other graduate institutions attended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Location (City/State)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Colleges or universities at which you have held appointments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Location (City/State)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Potential Conflicts of Interest:

List colleges or universities, *other than those listed above or those in your present state of residence*, that might constitute a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest in a NASP program review of that institution’s school psychology program (e.g., a close professional or personal relationship with the program director or faculty member, a history of significant interaction or conflict with the program, ongoing research conducted with a faculty member in the program).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Location (City/State)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return form via email attachment to Chair, NASP Program Accreditation Board, [nasppab@naspweb.org](mailto:nasppab@naspweb.org).
Appendix C

NASP PROGRAM ACCREDITATION BOARD
CODE OF CONDUCT FOR REVIEWERS AND
BOARD MEMBERS

The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) provides a program review and accreditation service to graduate programs in school psychology. This process is part of NASP’s commitment to serving the mental health and educational interests of all children and youth by promoting the preparation of competent professionals in accordance with national standards of quality. The NASP Values and Principles for Program Review and Accreditation serve as the foundation for program accreditation and help promote objective, ethical and fair reviews in accordance. NASP Program Accreditation Board members and reviewers adhere to the following requirements.

Commitment

1. Board members and program reviewers engage in reviewer training prior to conducting the first review, attend annual training at the NASP annual convention, and participate in full reviewer training every 3 years.
2. Board members and program reviewers are familiar with and follow NASP standards governing program accreditation.
3. Board members will attend all PAB meetings and perform the work assigned to them in a timely manner, including program review responsibilities and policy development.
4. Board members and program reviewers who believe that another Board member or program reviewer may have violated the Code of Conduct are responsible for assuring that the Chair of the Program Accreditation Board is appraised of the potential violation.

Bias

1. Board members and program reviewers rely on standards of professionalism and judgment to avoid any appearance of personal or partisan interpretations of standards.
2. Board members and program reviewers will examine materials objectively as presented and not be influenced by a program/institution’s past reputation or media accounts in the program review process.
3. Board members and program reviewers will exclude themselves from participating in NASP program review activities if there are predisposing factors that could prejudice them with respect to a program’s accreditation.
4. Board members and program reviewers will exclude themselves if the Board member or reviewer is philosophically opposed to or is on record criticizing a specific program or type of program.
Conflict of Interest

1. Board members and reviewers owe a loyalty to NASP to avoid all forms of conflict of interest. Board members and reviewers will not participate in a decision-making capacity of a program’s accreditation if a close, active association with a program or institution being considered for accreditation exists.
   a. Decision-making capacity includes participating in discussion during Board decisions.
   b. A close active association is defined as the following.
      i. Member of the faculty or staff, or a student at the institution within the past 10 years.
      ii. Research participant or investigator at the institution/program in the past 10 years.
      iii. Authored research or literature with faculty at that institution/program in the past 10 years.
      iv. Immediate family member attends/attended, is/was employed by the institution/program.
      v. Former graduate advisees or advisors are employed by the institution/program.
      vi. Applied for a position at the institution/program.
      vii. Consulted for pay with the institution/program in the past 10 years.
      viii. Served as commencement speaker, honorary degree recipient, and profited or appeared to benefit from service to the institution/program in the past 10 years.
      ix. Board members are employed in same state as programs being reviewed.

2. Board members will recuse themselves during board meeting discussions and votes of a program seen as a conflict of interest, based on definition of close active association.

3. Program reviewers will not review programs located in their states.

4. Board members and reviewers refrain from accepting gifts that may be perceived to influence the member or reviewer from discharging their duty to the accreditation process.

5. Board members and program reviewers must inform the chair of changes to conflict of interests.

Professional Consulting

1. Program reviewers who accept a personal consultation with an institution/program are clear that they do not serve as a NASP or NASP Program Accreditation Board agent but are providing their own professional expertise for consulting purposes.

2. Program reviewers who serve as consultants will inform the institution/program that their advice and recommendations do not guarantee accreditation outcomes.

3. Program reviewers will not advertise their reviewer status for the purpose of building a consulting clientele.

4. Program reviewers will not accept a consulting arrangement for a program that the reviewer evaluated in the past 3 years.

5. Program reviewers will not voice an opinion about the program to other reviewers or board members.

6. Program Accreditation Board members including the Chair will not engage in formal consulting services, for remuneration or for free, with school psychology programs and associated administrators and faculty when the focus of such consultation pertains to current or future NASP accreditation.
Confidentiality

Confidentiality is at the core of the accreditation process. Board members and reviewers have access to sensitive and proprietary materials and will protect the confidentiality of this information. Confidentiality has no expiration date—it lasts forever. The duty to maintain confidentiality includes the period of service and extends permanently after service is concluded.

1. Board members and program reviewers will treat all elements of the NASP accreditation process and information gathered as part of that process as confidential. Confidential information includes but may not be limited to documents, interviews, discussion, interpretations, analyses and decisions.
2. Board members and program reviewers will not discuss the particulars of a program review with anyone other than the review team, Program Accreditation Board chair or Board.
3. Board members and program reviewers cannot list programs they reviewed by name or initial on CVs, résumés, or any document that might be shared in public. Board members and program reviewers can list the number of reviews completed on their CV or résumé.
4. All discussions among review teams or at Board meetings are deemed confidential.

Acknowledgment

I ____________________________ (printed name) have read, understand, and acknowledge the principles contained in the NASP Program Accreditation Board Code of Conduct and the relevant policies governing service to the NASP Program Accreditation Board. I agree to comply with these values, principles, and policies.

I understand that any breach to the Code of Conduct may result in removal from the Board or reviewer teams.

Signature: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________
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ACCREDITATION NONCOMPLIANCE
COMPLAINT FORM

Complainant: Name, address, phone, and email

Program: University, name (Program Coordinator/POC), address, phone, and email

Relationship of complainant to program

Date when alleged noncompliance occurred

Describe efforts to date made to address alleged noncompliance (specify institutional procedures pursued).
Describe any legal actions taken, and current status of those legal actions.

Indicate specific NASP standards, domains/elements involved: Describe how noncompliance has occurred related to each standard/domain/element or assessment that you believe the program has not complied with.

Append documentation to the complaint form, including relevant policies/procedures violated, relevant correspondence (e.g., email), and timeline of events, student evaluations, and other material deemed as relevant. Number all appended documentation linked to specific standard/element/domain and/or assessment noted for noncompliance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard/Assessment</th>
<th>Page # of Relevant Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARD I: School Psychology Program Context/Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate education in school psychology is delivered within the context of a comprehensive program framework based on clear goals and objectives and on a sequential, integrated course of study in which human diversity is emphasized. Graduate education develops candidates' strong affiliation with school psychology, is delivered by qualified faculty, and includes substantial coursework and supervised field experiences necessary for the preparation of competent school psychologists whose services positively impact children and youth, families, schools, and other consumers. A school psychology program may additionally offer nondegree opportunities that lead to a school psychology credential and are based on the NASP graduate preparation standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARD II: Domains of School Psychology Graduate Education and Practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school psychology program should be based on the completion of an integrated and sequential program of study that is explicitly designed to develop knowledge and practice competencies in each of the following domains of school psychology practice. School psychologists provide comprehensive and integrated services across 10 domains as described in the NASP (2020) <em>Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services</em> and NASP (2020) <em>Standards for the Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists</em>. The domains reflect the following principles:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. School psychologists have a foundation in the knowledge bases for both psychology and education, including theories, models, research, evidence-based practices, and implementation strategies within the domains, and the ability to communicate important principles and concepts.

b. School psychologists use effective strategies and skills in the domains to help students succeed academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally.

c. School psychologists apply their knowledge and skills by creating and maintaining safe, supportive, equitable, and effective learning environments and enhancing family, school, and community collaboration for all students.

d. School psychologists demonstrate knowledge and skills relevant for professional practices and work characteristics in their field.

e. School psychologists ensure that their knowledge, skills, and professional practices reflect understanding and respect for human diversity and promote effective services, advocacy, and social justice for all students, families, and schools.

f. School psychologists integrate knowledge and professional skills across the 10 domains of school psychology in delivering a comprehensive range of services in professional practice that result in direct, measurable outcomes for students, families, schools, and/or consumers.

### STANDARD III. Supervised Field Experiences in School Psychology

The program assures that all candidates complete supervised and sequenced practica and internship experiences consistent with program goals and objectives and Program Standard 1. Specific competency outcomes are clearly articulated for each field experience. Practicum outcome measures focus on distinct knowledge, skills, and professional work characteristics, and do not necessarily address all NASP Domains of School Psychology Practice as specified in Program Standard 2. Internship outcome measures comprehensively assess all NASP domains and their integration. Field experiences contribute to the preparation of candidates who demonstrate the professional competencies needed to effectively deliver school psychological services to children and youth, families, and schools.

### STANDARD IV. Performance-Based Program Assessment and Accountability

The school psychology program employs systematic, comprehensive assessment of candidate knowledge, skills, and professional work characteristics needed for effective practice as early practitioner, independent school psychologists. A key aspect of program accountability is the assessment of candidate ability to provide, and evaluate the impact of, direct and indirect services to children and youth, families, and schools. Faculty must be involved in the evaluation of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate skill application (e.g., products such as individual, group, or system-wide case studies, program evaluations, and psychoeducational evaluations), and use assessment results to evaluate and improve the program</td>
<td>STANDARD X: School Psychology Program Support/Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate resources are available to support the school psychology program and its faculty and candidates. Such resources are needed to ensure accomplishment of program goals and objectives and candidates' attainment of competencies needed for effective school psychology services that positively impact children and youth, families, schools and/or school personnel, and communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPLAINANT PERMISSION**

I grant NASP permission to send this complaint, with relevant documentation, to the program. The permission waives any right to subpoena documents or information concerning the case from NASP or its agents for purposes of private civil litigation. Permission must be granted for complaint to be processed.

Date:

Complainant Printed/Typed Name:

Complainant Signature:

**COMPLAINT SUBMISSION**

Complaints may be submitted in electronic or hard copy. A maximum of 10 pages is required, not including supporting documentation. Electronic submissions should be in PDF format and sent to nasppab@naspweb.org with the subject heading, “NASP PAB Complaint.”
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NASP ACCREDITATION FLOW CHART

NASP Program Accreditation Process

Program Not Holding Current Approval/Accreditation

Program applies for Candidacy Status
Submission Deadlines: February 1 & August 1

Not Approved for Candidacy

Candidacy Status
Application for Candidacy approved
(valid for up to 4 years for Specialist Level and 5 years for Doctorate Level)
Notified July 1 or January 1

Program With Current Approval/Accreditation

Program submits self-study
Submission Deadlines: September 15 & March 15

Site Visit Eligibility Status
Eligible for site visit
Notified via email: January 1 or July 1
Full Report: February 1 or August 1

Schedule site visit
Programs with January 1 notification must complete site visit by April 15; July 1 notification must complete site visit by October 15.

Does not meet eligibility for site visit
Program may resubmit self-study once at no additional cost.

Approved

Approved with conditions

Return to submission of self-study

Appeal

Not Approved

If rejected go back to Candidacy
Notified July 1 or January 1

2 year conditional (with option for 1 year extension)
May require additional site visit, documentation, or data.
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PROGRAM ACCREDITATION BOARD
INSTITUTIONAL/PROGRAM SITE VISITS

Plan for Institutional/Program Site Visits

Institutional/program site visits are an important part of the accreditation process. Site visits provide an opportunity for reviewers to (a) discuss various aspects of the program with faculty and administrators in ways that go beyond the review of documents from a distance, (b) examine program facilities, and (c) interact with and gain information from key program stakeholders and university officials. Thus, site visits can yield information that provides a more robust and valid means by which to judge program quality and compliance with standards. Visits to an institution also provide an opportunity for the program to showcase strengths to internal and external audiences. For these reasons, NASP program reviewers conduct site visits subsequent to the submission by the program of a written report and a determination by the NASP Program Accreditation Board (PAB) that the program is eligible for such a visit.

Despite the benefits of a site visit, the PAB recognizes that university faculty and administrator time is valuable, as is the time of volunteer site visitors, and that universities and programs have limited budgets. Thus, the PAB has designed what it believes to be an efficient and cost-effective site visit process.

NASP site visits occur after the review of the program’s written submission by two to three trained reviewers vetted as having no conflict of interest with the program and institution and the drafting of a Preliminary Program Report based on those reviews by the NASP PAB.

Two reviewers will be selected by the Chair or Cochair of the PAB to conduct the site visit. (In cases in which a specialist and doctoral program are being reviewed, the visit may either include a third visitor, or an extra day.) Site visitors will be vetted as having no conflict of interest with the program and will become familiar with the program’s submission and the PAB program report to serve as a site visitor.

At a minimum the visit will include:

1. Interviews with program administrators, including the person who compiled the NASP submission report, and other program faculty;
2. Interviews with other faculty teaching required courses;
3. Interviews with key program stakeholder groups, including a representative sample of students, interns, and field supervisors of practicum students and/or interns;
4. Interviews with university administrators with direct supervisory roles over the program;
5. An opportunity to follow-up with program faculty on questions raised in prior phases of the program review that have not yet been answered sufficiently to conclude a valid review (This may include the validation or clarification of data included in the written submission.);
6. An opportunity to see and evaluate the facilities as appropriate.
Prior to the Visit

The program director will be provided with a Preliminary PAB report, which will include a list of standards judged as met or not met during the preliminary review as well as a list of questions, information, and or data that need to be ready to be addressed during the site visit. At a minimum, site visitors will need to see sample student documents or scores and/or faculty or field supervisor evaluations of such work that served as the basis for aggregated or disaggregated data for assessments in the program’s written report (e.g., a sample of case studies and associated evaluations that were used by the program to demonstrate positive impact on P–12 students, or Praxis score reports that were aggregated and submitted by the program).

The program director will be provided with the contact information for the professionals who have been selected to conduct the visit. It is incumbent on the program to coordinate the review dates and travel and lodging arrangements with the visitors and complete the visit by April 15 for fall written submissions or by October 15 for spring submissions. If institutional or reviewer schedules prohibit meeting these deadlines, the program may ask for a brief extension from the Chair or Cochair of the PAB.

Coordination of the schedule by the program and institution in collaboration with the site visitors should allow the program to coordinate the visit and associated schedule with program constituencies and university administrators and to follow institutional travel procedures. Site visitors must be notified of institutional travel and reimbursement policies and the documentation needed for reimbursement prior to the visit. It is recommended that any reimbursement forms that need a hard copy signature be provided during the visit.

The site visitors review the preliminary PAB report, and consult with each other and with the Chair (or Cochair) of the Program Accreditation Board on standards that were judged as not being fully met in the initial review, and associated questions, information, and/or data that need to be addressed during the site visit.

Schedule Templates

These templates are provided for illustration purposes; days and times may vary depending on program and university administrator needs and schedules and those of visitors. However, programs are asked not to plan receptions or other social events with/for reviewers.

Template One has been designed to allow visitors to arrive early the morning of the first day if possible given the distance of travel and flight schedules. Template Two has been designed under the assumption that visitors will arrive the evening before the first scheduled session. It is assumed that all meetings will be held on campus. However, Skype or similar technology may be used to communicate with constituencies who may not be able to attend face-to-face meetings. But in such instances, it is incumbent on the program to make such arrangements with those constituencies and pilot test the planned technology to assure that it will work. Ensuring that site visitors have the opportunity to meet with all critical stakeholders is the responsibility of the program. Requests for virtual meetings with stakeholders after the site visit will not be honored or considered in the final report.
Note that it is incumbent on the program to provide site visitors with the final schedule prior to or upon their arrival. In cases in which participants in sessions are known beforehand, visitors should be provided the names of participants. For sessions in which larger groups are invited to attend and it may not be known who might attend, the program should provide a list for the session that participants can sign when arriving for the session. These lists may be shared by visitors with the program administrators but will be retained by visitors for their records.

**Template One**

**Day One**

11:00–12:00 Members of the site team meet to finalize questions to be asked, data to be requested, and specific roles and functions.

12:30 Meet with the program director/administrator(s) to obtain an overview of program and schedule and discuss key issues, questions, or data needs, if any arising from preliminary PAB report.

1:30 Meet with department chair/head. Tour program/department facilities.

2:30 Meet with core school psychology faculty.

3:45 Break.

4:00 Meet with graduate students (one site visitor) and interns (one site visitor).

5:00 Meet with practicum supervisors (one site visitor) and intern supervisors (one site visitor). If intern supervisors are not available in person (e.g., due to distance) this meeting may be conducted via Skype or other distance technology arranged by the program.

6:00 Meet briefly with director to discuss any additional issues or questions that may have arisen as a result of prior sessions.

6:30 Members of the site-team meet for working dinner.

**Day Two**

8:00 Breakfast with program faculty.

9:15 Meet with program director/administrator to discuss program issues or review requested data.

10:15 Meet with university administrators (academic dean of the college or school in which the program is located, and provost/chief academic officer or designee are required).

11:15 Meet with noncore faculty members that teach courses in the program, and with adjunct faculty.

12:00 Members of the site team meet to confer regarding key findings and plan exit conference.

1:00 Exit conference with program administrator(s) and selected program faculty (if desirable and available), department chair/head, and dean of the college or school in which the program is located.

Note: If time allows, site visitors will be provided space to work at some point during the visit while allowing for opportunities for unscheduled, unsolicited feedback about the program from relevant stakeholders on a drop-in basis.
Template Two

Day One

7:30 Members of the site team meet for breakfast and finalize questions to be asked, data to be requested, and specific roles and functions.

8:30 Meet with the program director/administrator(s) to obtain an overview of program and schedule and discuss key issues, questions, or data needs, if any arising from preliminary PAB report.

9:30 Meet with department chair/head. Tour program/department facilities.

10:15 Break.

10:30 Meet with university administrators (academic dean of the college in which the program is located, and provost/chief academic officer or designee are required).

11:30 Meet and have lunch with core school psychology faculty.

1:00 Meet with noncore faculty members that teach courses in the program, and with adjunct faculty.

2:00 Meet with graduate students (one site visitor) and interns (one site visitor).

3:00 Meet with practicum supervisors (one site visitor) and intern supervisors (one site visitor). If intern supervisors are not available in person (e.g., due to distance) this meeting may be conducted via Skype or other distance technology arranged by the program.

4:00 Meet with director to review data and/or discuss any additional issues or questions that may have arisen as a result of prior sessions.

6:30 Members of the site team meet for working dinner to discuss findings and prepare for exit conference.

Day Two

8:00 Breakfast.

9:00 Exit conference with program administrator(s) and selected faculty (if desirable and available), department chair/head, and academic dean of the college or school in which the program is located.

Note: If time allows, the site visit team will be provided space to work at some point during the visit while allowing for opportunities for unscheduled, unsolicited feedback about the program from relevant stakeholders on a drop-in basis.

After the Site Visit

Subsequent to the site visit, the site visit team leader, after considering all findings from the Preliminary Report and from the site visit, will submit to the Chair or Cochair of the PAB a revised written report. The PAB will review the report and issue to the program a Final Program Review Report.

As per NASP policies, the program will have the opportunity to submit a rejoinder/revised report if it does not receive Full or Conditional Accreditation. It will also be given the opportunity to provide an evaluation of the site visit process during the postreview evaluation of the overall NASP review process.
Name of Institution Visited: ________________________________________________________________

Program Levels: _____ Specialist _____ Doctoral _____ Both Specialist & Doctoral

Date(s) of Visit:
Please take a few minutes to provide us with important feedback regarding your NASP site visit. The information will be used to improve the NASP accreditation process, and to identify any qualities of the visiting team chair or member(s) that warrant recognition or attention. Due to the nature of this evaluation, it is obviously not possible to keep it anonymous or confidential. However, results will not be shared outside of the review team and Program Accreditation Board except as part of group data. Thank you for your cooperation.

____________________________________________________________________________

Instructions: Indicate your rating for the following items.

Rating scale: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Fair; 1 = Poor; NA = Not Applicable

1. Team chair’s management of the site visit
2. Preparation of the site visit team
3. Professionalism/ethical conduct of the site visit team
4. Helpfulness of the site visit team
5. Overall evaluation of the site visit

____________________________________________________________________________

Comments:
Please note any specific helpful or effective aspects of the visit or members of the site visit team:

Please note any specific unhelpful or ineffective aspects of the visit or members of the site visit team:

What suggestions do you have for improving the site visit component of the NASP accreditation process?
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PROGRAMS WITH MULTIPLE SITES

For the purposes of this policy, a site refers to either the physical location of the campus and/or the medium for delivery of instruction (e.g., distance education).

Some school psychology programs deliver their curricula and training to different candidates/cohorts in multiple sites. If the admissions requirements, curriculum requirements, course delivery methods, practica and internship requirements, assessment requirements, teaching and supervising faculty, and documentation of program completion (e.g., degree or certificate on transcript) are the same or essentially the same for candidates/cohorts in multiple sites, then the program may submit one accreditation application to the NASP Program Accreditation Board (PAB) and provide the required assessment data for candidates/cohorts at each site. The sites should be clearly identified in the program description/contextual information at the beginning of the application and in the assessment tables that are presented.

A program already holding full accreditation by NASP that wishes to add an additional site or sites where other candidates/cohorts are to be prepared must notify the Chair of the NASP PAB in writing of its plans to do so at least 6 months prior to admitting students to the new site, and explain how admissions requirements, curriculum requirements, course delivery methods, practica and internship requirements, assessment requirements, teaching and supervising faculty, and documentation of program completion (e.g., degree or certificate) are the same or essentially the same in terms of qualifications and experience and in meeting the NASP standards as those for the site (and candidates/cohorts) that was fully accredited. Subsequent to such notification, the PAB will consider the request and notify the program of its decision to add or not add the additional site to the program’s accreditation. Unless a concern or objection is raised by the PAB, the additional site(s) will be considered as having the same accreditation and accreditation cycle as that afforded to the program. In subsequent re-accreditation submissions, one application may be submitted to NASP with transcripts and disaggregated data (including student and faculty tables and required assessments) for each site.

If a program has multiple sites that are not the same or essentially the same based on the criteria listed above, both sites would need to submit separately for program accreditation.

Programs holding Conditional Accreditation are not encouraged to add additional sites until reaching Full Accreditation.
Appendix I

PROGRAMS WITH MULTIPLE DELIVERY MODALITIES

NASP recognizes that there are school psychology graduate programs which deliver their curriculum through delivery modalities that differ among various candidates/cohorts. For example, a NASP-accredited program that offers a wholly or primarily campus-based curriculum in which students and faculty are together in the same physical location for the majority of courses may wish to start a wholly or primarily distance-delivered program that serves a different student population. The following guidance regarding NASP accreditation is provided to such programs. The advice is also applicable to programs with multiple delivery options seeking initial NASP accreditation.

This guidance uses the Higher Learning Commission’s definitions of “distance-delivered courses” and “distance-delivered programs,” which can be found at https://www.hlcommission.org/General/glossary.html#InstitutionalChange. Specifically,

- **Distance-delivered courses** are courses in which at least 75% of the instruction and interaction occurs via electronic communication, correspondence, or equivalent mechanisms, with the faculty and students physically separated from each other.
- **Distance-delivered programs** are certificate or degree programs in which 50% or more of the required courses* may be taken as distance-delivered courses.

Additionally, the NASP Program Accreditation Board (PAB) uses the following definition:

- **Campus-based programs** are certificate or degree programs in which 50% or more of the required courses* are completed in a physical location (e.g., a classroom) where both the instructor and students are present at the same time. Fewer than 50% of courses in campus-based programs are *distance-delivered*.

If the admissions requirements, curriculum requirements, practica and internship requirements, assessment requirements, teaching faculty, and documentation of program completion (e.g., degree or certificate on transcript) are the same or essentially the same as for candidates/cohorts in different delivery modalities, then the program may submit one accreditation application to the NASP Program Accreditation Board (PAB) and provide the required assessment data disaggregated by candidates/cohorts in each delivery modality. The different modalities should be clearly identified (e.g., campus-based versus distance-delivered) and the case made for their equivalency in the program description/contextual information at the beginning of the NASP submission, and clearly labeled in the assessment tables provided.
A program already holding full accreditation by NASP that wishes to add an additional delivery modality by which candidates/cohorts are to be prepared must notify the Chair of the NASP PAB in writing of its plans to do so at least six months prior to admitting students under the new modality. Within this correspondence, the program must explain how admissions, curriculum requirements, course delivery methods, practica and internship requirements, required assessments, teaching and supervising faculty, and documentation of program completion (e.g., degree or certificate) are the same or essentially the same in terms of candidate preparation and experience in meeting the NASP standards as those in place for the already fully accredited modality. Subsequent to such notification, the PAB will consider the request and notify the program of its decision to add or not add the additional program delivery modality to the program’s accreditation. Assuming PAB approval, the additional program modality will be granted the same accreditation and be placed in the same accreditation review cycle as that afforded to the already existing program modality. In subsequent re-accreditation submissions, one application may be submitted to NASP with transcripts and aggregated data (including student and faculty tables and required assessments) for each site. If the request is not approved due to the PAB’s judgment that there are substantive differences in program admissions requirements, curriculum requirements, assessments between the program delivery modalities, then the program will have to submit a separate application for each delivery modality. Programs may also choose to submit separate accreditation applications for different delivery modalities offered by the program.

Programs holding Conditional Accreditation are not encouraged to add additional cohorts using a different delivery modality until first reaching Full Accreditation.

*Notes: In calculating the % of courses taken as distance-delivered or campus-based in school psychology programs, internship courses should be excluded.
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE POLICY

School psychology programs often make changes that do not change programmatic scope, operations, or contents in significant ways. Such changes do not usually affect accreditation status. Other changes are more significant, however, and may affect accreditation. Substantive change is a significant modification or expansion in the nature and/or scope of a school psychology program accredited by or in the process of applying for accreditation by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). NASP accredited programs or programs having submitted an application for NASP accreditation that are considering substantive changes must notify the NASP Program Accreditation Board chair of the change prior to implementation.

Types of Substantive Change

NASP considers substantive changes to include any of the following that have occurred since the last time the program was reviewed and accredited, or since the most recent program review submission:

- Any change in legal status, regional accreditation status, or ownership of the institution with which the program is affiliated.
- A significant departure in program structure (e.g., including course sequence) and/or delivery method (from in-person to online) in the majority (more than 50%) of required courses cited as meeting NASP standards.
- A change in the practica or internship structure, location(s), hours, supervision and/or supervisor requirements, except for those designed to strengthen compliance with NASP standards.
- The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different than that included in the program’s NASP accreditation (e.g., an institution with a specialist-level degree program adding a doctoral-level program).
- A change in title in the program or degree or similar institutional documentation of program completion except for those designed to make it clearer that the program is in school psychology.
- A substantial (greater than 10%) increase or decrease in the number of credit hours or length of time required for successful completion of the program.
- The offering of the program at a geographical site not mentioned in the program’s last NASP submission, and for which disaggregated data were not provided (see NASP statement regarding multiple sites).
- The elimination of one or more full-time program faculty positions or “lines” (see definition of program faculty in the NASP Standards for the Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists).
- Closing a program or plans to close a program (note that the NASP PAB will work with programs and institutions to assure that remaining students who entered what they believed to be a NASP accredited program will be able to complete such a program unless there are other significant changes in the program that jeopardize compliance with NASP standards).
Procedures for Reporting Substantive Change

Programs intending to implement substantive change will need to notify the NASP PAB chair in writing at least 90 days before the implementation. Notifying the NASP PAB early gives programs an opportunity for consultation and direction on procedures to be followed. The written report should include the following:

- Detailed description of the change,
- Anticipated timeline/implementation date,
- Purpose of or need for the change,
- Comparison between existing and proposed changes in program,
- Changes in resources (faculty, staff needs, library, physical location, equipment),
- If the program is adding a new site, documents required as part of the Multiple Sites statement, and
- A description of how such changes will result in either sustained or improved alignment with the NASP Standards for the Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists and associated requirements for accreditation.

Programs that do not report substantive changes to NASP in a timely manner may result in a request for resubmission for NASP accreditation or the possibility of status change to accreditation.

Evaluation of Substantive Change Report

The NASP PAB will review the report and respond with one of the following decisions:

- Approve the substantive change; the program retains accreditation without conditions,
- Approve the substantive change with conditions,
- Require additional steps/information be completed (i.e., site visit, additional candidate data, additional actions),
- Acknowledge certain changes as equivalent to starting a new program, requiring a new submission for program accreditation, and/or
- Not approve the change.

The NASP PAB will provide a date when the substantive change can be implemented, if approved. If the change is not approved, the program will be provided reasons for the decision. If the program implements the change without approval, the program must notify the chair of the NASP PAB. The PAB will determine whether a change in accreditation status is warranted.