

TSP in Dallas

Enedina Vazquez, *New Mexico State University*
Mardis Dunham, *Murray State University*

The wonderful spring weather and the hospitality of the Texans enhanced the attendance and participation in the annual TSP Conference. This year's attendance remained steady around 150 attendees, somewhat higher than last year's conference in the colder climes of Canada. Following a nice continental breakfast, sponsored by our long-time supporters at Riverside, and an introduction and welcome from Tammy Hughes, TSP President, John DesRochers provided an update of the Futures Conference. He reiterated the priorities, goals, and challenges facing the field and delineated how trainers and the state associations could play a role in addressing some of these goals. For example, he noted that the shortage of school psychologists and pre-service training needs could be addressed by state associations. Much of John's presentation, including the mission, goals, and action plans stemming from the November 2002 Futures Conference can be found at <http://www.indiana.edu/~futures/home/huml>.

The morning presentation, Contemporary Issues in School Law and Federal Legislation, was paneled by Susan Jacob and Jack Naglieri. Susan discussed some of the changes in the 2002 APA Ethical Code and provided a rationale for training school psychologists in both the NASP and APA codes. She highlighted specific changes in the code, including diversity issues, the interaction between FERPA and HIPPA, and psychologists' greater obligation to protect clients (e.g., through supervision). She added that trainers are ultimately responsible for the misdeeds of their supervisees. Susan provided a comprehensive list of references to

changes to APA's 2002 Ethics Code, needs of GLBTQ students, and updates to the privacy law. Jack, graciously filling in for Ted Feinberg, presented information on the IDEA update with a particular focus on identifying students with specific learning disabilities. He discussed NASP's recommendations for changes in law, including the three-tiered model involving response



Members of the TSP Executive Board and Forum Editorial Board from the left include Steve Webb, Tammy Hughes, Beth Doll, Enedina Vazquez, Jim Deni, Tony Crespi and Mardis Dunham. Not pictured are Antoinette Minonda, Ray DiGiuseppe, Robyn Hess, Mac McFarland, Judith Kaufman, and Catherine Fiorello.

to intervention. Jack presented the pros and cons inherent in these proposed changes. He explained that RTI is already part of the process in identifying students with SLD and that, as a method of establishing eligibility, is inconsistent with the definition of SLD. Lastly, he illustrated that using local norms gives the "illusion of improvement," because what might constitute below average performance in one district may be average in another.

Following the Naglieri and Jacob presentation, Dan Miller reviewed some changes at NASP, including the training program data base, resources for students, trainers, and practitioners, and "what's new at NASP." Dan explained that he needed

assistance from TSP members in identifying new and/or defunct programs and that the data base will be completed fall 2004. He explained the need to link the NASP website with individual training programs in the data base which ultimately would help with funding and recruitment of school psychologists. He provided a number of websites for school psychology practitioners and those

teaching introductory school psychology courses, and explained that members can earn up to 12 hours of CEU via modules free of charge. Additionally, Dan noted that there are loan forgiveness bills pending legislation and a number of new NASP products. His entire TSP presentation is available at: <http://homepage.mac.com/dan-miller1/web>

An Italian lunch, sponsored by AGS, was

followed by a brief update on new AGS products by Larry Hanken. Larry reminded trainers that AGS' University Alliance Program is still available to training programs wishing to receive complimentary assessments and software, provided the tests are part of the program's curriculum. Email requests can be sent to larryh@agsnet.com.

The afternoon panel discussion, Current Issues and Future Directions in National Certification and Accreditation, included Nancy Waldron, Diane Smallwood, George Bear, Boyce Williams and Joe Prus. Pam Kidder-Ashley provided

"TSP in Dallas" continued on page 18

an introduction. Nancy reported that year 2004 is the 15th anniversary of NCSP and that one goal of NASP is to highlight and heighten the visibility of the NCSP. Currently there are 8506 nationally certified psychologists with 21 states accepting the NCSP and two additional states in the process. Barbara Williams is in charge of promotion efforts to enhance visibility. The web site now has student links and substantial information about the NCSP. Training programs are urged to promote

in school psychology may not have the degree so they may need to get a letter from the program outlining how the individual re-specialized.

Diane Smallwood's discussion highlighted the process followed in developing the ETS Praxis exam. A review panel, by telephone and in a meeting at Princeton, was convened to obtain consensus on content specifications. The goal was to speak with school psychologists to determine what they believed graduates would need to

accreditation submissions since 1996. Seventy-five folios were submitted between 1996 and 2000. Of these, 31 were approved and 44 were not approved, yielding an approval rate of 41%. Between 2001 and 2003, 73 folios were submitted, 45 were approved and 28 were not approved (an acceptance rate of 61%). Also, Joe indicated that 33 (of the 73) folios submitted between 2001 and 2003 were initial reviews. Seven programs were approved and 26 were not approved, resulting in an

Table 1 Sample size, means, standard deviations and ranges of scores obtained by all groups

Group	No.	Mean	SD	Range
African-Am	11	633.2	78.223	590-690
Asian-Am	45	674.7	70.478	620-730
Hispanic-Am	128	653.6	82.592	610-710
Native -Am	11	668.2	71.455	630-750
White Am	1386	702.9	66.663	670-750
Total	1819	693.1	72.723	650-740

NCSP by sharing the information with their students.

Credentialing as an NCSP continues to follow national standards but currently these reflect the 1994 NASP standards. The 2000 standards will be used as soon as a cohort of students graduates from programs following the 2000 standards. Students who graduate from NASP approved programs will see an expedited process; however, credentialing will not be automatic. The expedited process will still require submission of passing scores on the ETS Praxis and verification of the 1200-hour internship. For non-NASP approved programs graduates will still need to submit verification of coursework/curriculum.

Once NCSP moves to include the 2000 standards, the emphasis will be on how competence has been reached. Individuals requesting NCSP credentialing may need to submit a case study and other evidence reflecting competence. For the internship, an appraisal of internship analysis may need to be submitted. Individuals re-specializing

know to successfully perform their duties. Item writing and content specialists worked together to formulate the questions. Practitioners reviewed test items, they answered the questions and provided feedback, question pools were revised, and items were re-worked for the final pool of questions.

Diane also provided information on the school psychology specialty exam score distribution between 9/1/2002 and 8/31/2003. There were 1819 examinees. The median was 700 with a range of 650-740. The mean was 693.1 (72.723 Standard Deviation). The highest mean was found among the White examinees. All other groups are shown in Table 1. ETS recommends a cut-off score of 660, which is at the 25th percentile.

Questions from the audience yielded a lively discussion. Trainers posed a number of questions including how items were field-tested and how relevance in curriculum is maintained.

Joe reported data on the number of

approval rate of 24%. In addition, 7 programs that were originally not approved submitted rejoinders and of these 3 were approved and 4 not approved. This shows an approval rate of 43%.

George's presentation on the approval process centered on the question "Why are programs not approved?" Within Standard 1 a major concern seen in programs was in relation to the number of faculty—specifically that programs do not have the necessary faculty for the program. In Standard 2 some common reasons for ratings of NA and NON related to programs relying heavily on statements made in the folios regarding addressing, assessing and attainment without providing sufficient evidence. Programs provide information and samples of forms without submitting aggregate results. For example, information on students' scores such as Praxis results, supervisor ratings, and evaluations are provided for individual students but are not aggregated. In addition, folios do not provide adequate data on how students practice

domain specific skills. Skills are addressed and assessed but little evidence on attainment is provided. With regard to coursework, it is not necessary to have a course in every area but content clearly needs to be infused in the curriculum.

George added that some programs present summative data with little formative data making it difficult to determine how data are used for subsequent program improvement. Further, some programs emphasize assessment of skills prior to internship with little evidence on how interns' experiences are assessed following the internship. There is also lack of evidence that interns integrated the domains in offering a comprehensive range of services. Some programs lack evidence on how interns positively impact children, youth, families and other consumers.

Boyce shared information on what NCATE is proposing but not before stating that Joe was the "social conscious" of NCATE and the reason school psychology has made many gains. Given that the school psychology specialty has been part of NCATE and because the profession follows the standards of the organization as well as licensing standards, school psychology will not be as deeply affected by major changes made in the NCATE process.

NCATE wants to streamline the process beginning fall 2004. It appears that an approach similar to NASP's regarding aggregating data and



Jack Naglieri and Susan Jacob following their presentation



Tammy Hughes presenting Dan Miller with a memento of the Dallas Conference



TSP Conference attendees participating in the afternoon session

demonstrating the use of the data to assess skills will be followed. NASP, if it participates with NCATE, will still identify the reviewers and follow the NASP process. The results will be sent to NCATE. If problems arise with the review, the folio will be sent out for auditing and be sent out for review again. Reviews will be electronic. Finally, NASP will be reviewing standards in 2007 instead of 2005. NCATE is on a 7-year cycle, with re-approvals going to 7 years as well.

The Psychological Corporation sponsored a well attended and catered Trainer's Reception Thursday night where trainers enjoyed making new acquaintances and renewing old ones. We hope that you enjoyed the TSP conference and look forward to seeing you next year in Atlanta.

Programming for next year:

TSP does not accept formal submissions for conference programming but welcomes ideas and suggestions relevant to the training of school psychologists. The Executive Board of TSP reviews these ideas, decides on themes, and contacts potential presenters. If you would like to submit an idea please send it to Mardis Dunham, the Forum newsletter editor, at

marty.dunham@coe.murraystate.edu.