

NASP Program Approval Board Update

Report Prepared January 2009

Enedina García Vázquez, Chair

Program Approval Board Members: Joe Prus, Nancy Waldron, Susan Bartels, Leslie Munson, Dan Olympia, Kathy Bradley-Klug and Katherine Wickstrom

FALL 2008 Review Cycle

During the fall 2008 cycle, 52 program reviews involving 83 NASP reviewers and Board members were completed. The outcomes of the fall reviews are summarized in the table below.

Outcomes of NASP Program Review: Fall 2008 Review Cycle

Type of Review	Number Reviewed	NASP Approval/National Recognition Decision		
		Full	With Conditions	Not Approved
Full Reviews for New Approval ^a	3		1	2
Full Reviews for Re-approval ^a	12	7	5	
Conditional Reports ^b	3	3		
Revised Reports ^c	3	3		
APA Doctoral Program Requests for Approval ^d	6	6		
NASP/Non-NCATE Full Reviews for New Approval ^e	2	1	1	
NASP/Non-NCATE Full Reviews for Re-Approval ^e	5	5		

Paper Rejoinders ^f	18	15	3	
TOTAL	52	40	10	2

^a All programs that submitted for full review for new approval or re-approval used the new NASP-NCATE online submission process.

^b "Conditional Reports" were from programs previously granted NASP approval/national recognition with conditions. Conditional reports in fall 2008 were submitted online, using the NCATE online submission process.

^c "Revised Reports" were re-submissions from programs previously reviewed but not granted NASP approval/national recognition in the previous review. Revised reports in fall 2008 were submitted online, using the NCATE online submission process.

^d "APA Doctoral Program Requests" included those APA accredited doctoral programs seeking initial approval or re-approval by documenting their APA accreditation, combined with documentation of compliance with NASP internship standards.

^e In fall 2008, NASP programs not in NCATE units were required to submit their folios using the new NASP online system. This system was used for new full and full re-approvals for Non-NCATE NASP programs.

^f The fall 2008 review cycle was the last cycle to include paper rejoinders. All programs, in NCATE units or not, will submit folios electronically. In this cycle the board also reviewed the folio for one program submitting a three-year review to submit a paper folio. As state previously only electronic folios will be submitted beginning spring 2009.

During the fall 2008 review cycle, 77% of programs received full approval. Only 19% of programs that submitted folios were approved with conditions. However, it is important to note that programs conditionally approved receive similar benefits as fully approved programs. Less than 4% of programs were not approved. As a result 96% of programs undergoing full review were approved on a full or conditional basis. This continues the trend of increased approval rates in comparison to those prior to and immediately following the implementation of the 2000 NASP standards. Such success likely reflects greater consistency nationally in school psychology program requirements and implementation of the performance-based aspects of the 2000 standards as well as increased NASP efforts to assist programs with both performance assessment and program review. Perhaps the greatest struggles programs experience is with some performance assessment expectations.

The fall 2008 cycle saw the last of the paper submissions. These paper submissions were from those programs that were conditionally approved in 2007. The PAB conducted all evaluations of these programs. As a result, PAB members conducted from four to five reviews prior to the PAB meeting. In

addition, one program submitted a three-year approval (current options include five or seven year approvals) folio. As of spring 2009 all program folios will be submitted electronically, except for requests from APA accredited programs.

The NASP Program Approval Board continues to rely on volunteer reviewers. Reviewer expertise varies and the board continues to provide training at the NASP convention. The PAB hosted two workshops in Boston: (1) for new reviewers and for (2) more advanced reviewers. The PAB is planning to provide more hands-on training to assist reviewers with the most difficult aspects of reviews.

The PAB is also committed to assisting programs with their submissions. Two workshops, one discussing the online submission process and another the use of case studies were offered as paid workshops at the 2009 NASP Convention in Boston, MA. The nominal fee of \$40 has been established to make the workshops easily accessible to programs.