

**TIPS FOR PROGRAMS AND REVIEWERS**  
**FALL 2013 NASP PROGRAM APPROVAL BOARD MEETING**

**NOTE:** The PAB made some important decisions that the Board anticipates will help programs. An excerpt of the PAB spring meeting minutes is provided below regarding Assessments 2 and 6.

**Assessment 2** – As a result of the 2010 Standards pilots, rubrics were refined using clearer language. For example, it became clearer that Table E (Attachment E Response to NASP Standards II-VIII) was more cumbersome to programs and reviewers than helpful. The original intent of the revised Table E was to adjust to the fact that syllabi are no longer required. The expectation was that information on this table would give insight to what content would be addressed in courses. The Table was revised and is available to programs. Also, a sample grade table was created to offer programs.

**Assessment 6** continues to present challenges to programs.

1. **Assessment 6 – Effects on Student Learning Environments and/or Learning:** Assessment that demonstrates that candidates are able to integrate elements of knowledge and apply professional skills in delivering a comprehensive range of services evident by measurable positive impact on children, youth, families, and other consumers.
  - a. The goal for Assessment 6 requires that the *candidates themselves* measure positive impact. As part of the Assessment 6 Documentation, faculty analyzes and summarizes positive impact data for each application. Cases may be at the individual or group/class level.
  - b. The following is a *non-exhaustive* list of EXAMPLES of techniques that may be useful for program improvement or candidate growth and development, *but are not sufficient* to demonstrate evidence of measurable positive impact.
    1. Consumer satisfaction ratings
    2. Candidate self-reflections or self-evaluation of p-12 student progress
    3. Items on field supervisor evaluation forms
    4. Data collected prior to internship
    5. Faculty global ratings of candidate positive impact
    6. Case studies with no P-12 outcome data
    7. Assessment of positive impact that is not required of all candidates
  - c. The following is a *non-exhaustive* list of EXAMPLES of techniques that may be useful for program improvement or candidate growth and development, *but are sufficient* to demonstrate evidence of measurable positive impact. In addition, programs are reminded that both behavioral and academic cases need to be included. Two applications of complete data on behavioral and academic case studies.
    1. Goal attainment scaling
    2. Percent of non-overlapping data
    3. Effect size
    4. Comparisons of pre and post data
    5. Progress monitoring data
    6. Individual or group data
    7. Improvement rate difference
  - d. Provide examples – The PAB will identify examples; one where candidates used multiple methodologies and another where candidates use a single method.
  - e. The Board decided that if all aspects demonstrating positive impact are in place 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.
  - f. “Applications” is defined as two administrations of the identical tool for each assessment. Operationalized two applications consist of data for two administrations for all assessments.