**NASP Program Accreditation Board**

**Program Assessments Rubric**

**IMPORTANT NOTE ON NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS REQUIRED**: Two applications are required for Re-accreditation, one application is required for Revised and Response to Conditions, and one year is required for new programs. **Data from the most recent applications of assessment tools must be provided. If applicable, data for each assessment are disaggregated and provided for each program level/degree (Specialist/Doctoral) and/or geographic location (in cases of multiple program locations).**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment** | **Not Acceptable** | **Marginal** | **Acceptable** |
| **1. Praxis II or State Exam** **Note: Although the program must require that its candidates take the Praxis in School Psychology, and should identify whether it uses national or state (if applicable) pass scores when evaluating its own results, it is not required to have established a Praxis pass score as a degree requirement.** | \_\_ Exam is not required for all candidates. | \_\_ Exam is taken by most or all candidates, but it is unclear if it is required. | \_\_ Exam is required for all candidates. |
| \_\_ No data provided, or data provided is less than required number of applications. | \_\_ Required data and total N provided for required number of applications but data for more than two candidates are missing (If applicable, data also provided for each degree or location). | \_\_ Required data and total N provided for the required number of applications, with no more than one or two candidates missing across applications.  |
| \_\_\_ It cannot be determined exactly what data are summarized, or what the program’s expectations are regarding candidate performance.  | \_\_ Data are only in the form of overall cohort means or other form that does not distinguish the number and/or percent of candidates that passed at the national level, state level (if relevant) and program level (if relevant). | \_\_ Data are clearly summarized in the form of frequencies or other form that clearly distinguishes the number and/or percent of candidates that passed at the national level, state level (if relevant) and program level (if relevant). |
|  | \_\_ Test category/subtest data in the form of frequencies are not provided or are grossly incomplete. | \_\_ Test category/subtest data in the form of frequencies are provided, but are somewhat incomplete or confusing.  | \_\_ Test category/subtest data in the form of frequencies are complete and clearly summarized. |
|  | \_\_ Program has not linked test category data to NASP Domains. | \_\_\_ Program has attempted to link test category data to NASP Domains but links are somewhat unclear or sometimes not appropriate. | \_\_\_ Program has clearly linked test category data to relevant NASP Domains. |
|  | \_\_ Pass rate cannot be determined, or is less than 60%. | \_\_ The program has a pass rate of between 60% and 79%. | \_\_ The program has attained a pass rate of at least 80%. |
| **Comment regarding the adequacy of Assessment 1 in determining the percent of candidates who attain *knowledge* consistent with NASP Domains. Explain any ratings of less than “Acceptable” and make recommendations for improvement, as necessary:** |
|  |
| **Assessment** | **Not Acceptable** | **Marginal** | **Acceptable** |
| **2. Course Grades****Evidence:****-Program handbook****-Transcripts** | \_\_ Evidence suggests that some key courses are not required in policy, or are reported to be required but not taken by candidates, with substitutions or exceptions not clearly explained.  | \_\_ Evidence suggests that a few cited courses, although required in policy, are not taken by some candidates, with substitutions or exceptions not clearly explained.  | \_\_ Evidence indicates that cited courses are required, and are taken by all candidates with very few if any substitutions, and substitutions are clearly explained.  |
| **Evidence:** **-Table E (course summary)** | \_\_ Insufficient information provided to determine a link between course content and NASP Domains. | \_\_ Sufficient information provided for most courses to show the link between course content and NASP Domains, but not at the level of the Acceptable response. Substitutions for courses provide limited link between course content and NASP Domains. | \_\_ Sufficient information provided for all courses to show the link between course content and NASP Domains, with only one or two exceptions.Substitutions for courses provide clear link between course content and NASP Domains. |
| **Evidence:****-Assessment 2 grade table**  | \_\_ No grade data provided, or are for less than one full application, or significant data are missing (or not for each degree or location, if applicable).No reason(s) for missing data are provided. | \_\_ Grade data and total N provided for only one full application, or some data are missing. (if applicable, for different degrees and/or locations).Reason(s) for missing data are not clearly explained. | \_\_ Grade data and total N provided for two full applications, with little if any missing data (if applicable, for different degrees and/or locations).Reason(s) for missing data are clearly explained. |
| **-Evidence:****-Assessment 2 grade table and discussion of results****-Program handbook or other documentation of grading system.** | \_\_ No university grading system or pass score cited. | \_\_ University grading system and minimum individual pass grade for program and/or university may be discussed but one or the other is unclear. | \_\_ University grading system, and minimum individual pass grade for program and/or university are provided and are clear. |
| **Evidence:** **-Assessment 2 grade table and discussion of results** | \_\_ Data are poorly summarized, noticeably incomplete, or confusing. | \_\_ Data for each application are only in the form of means or other form that does not distinguish the number and/or percent of candidates that meet or surpass expectations. | \_\_ Data for each application are in the form of frequencies or other mode that clearly distinguishes the number and/or percent of candidates that meet or surpass program expectations.  |
| **Evidence:** **-Assessment 2 grade table, Table E, and discussion of results** | \_\_ Program has not linked grade data from three required courses to each relevant NASP Domain, or links are unclear or not appropriate. | \_\_\_Program has attempted to link grade data from three required courses to each NASP Domain, with most, but not all, links clear and appropriate. | \_\_\_ Program has clearly linked grade data from three required courses to each NASP Domain. |
| **Evidence:****-Table E (course summary)****-Assessment 2 grade table** | \_\_ It is mostly unclear if the content/knowledge base portion of all NASP Domains are covered, or it is apparent that more than two are not covered.  | \_\_ The content/knowledge base portion of all but one or two NASP Domains are reflected in course/grades. | \_\_ The content/knowledge base portion of all NASP Domains are reflected in courses/grades. |
| **Comment regarding the adequacy of Assessments 2 in determining the percent of candidates who attain *knowledge* consistent with NASP Domains. Explain any ratings of less than “Acceptable” and make recommendations for improvement, as necessary:** |
|  |
| **Assessment** | **Not Acceptable** | **Marginal** |  **Acceptable** |
| **3. Practica Performance Assessment** | \_\_ Practica performance assessment does not appear to be required.  | \_\_ Practica performance assessment appears to be completed for most or all candidates, but it is unclear if it is required.  | \_\_ Practica performance assessment is required by policy. |
|  | \_\_ Practica performance assessment demonstrates breadth in only one of the following key skill areas: (a) data-based decision making, including psychoeducational assessment with recommendations; (b) the design, implementation, and evaluation of services that support cognitive and academic skills; and (c) the design, implementation, and evaluation of services that support socialization, behavioral and mental health, and emotional well-being (e.g., counseling, behavior analysis and intervention, social–emotional learning). | \_\_ Practica performance assessment demonstrates breadth in two of the following key skill areas: (a) data-based decision making, including psychoeducational assessment with recommendations; (b) the design, implementation, and evaluation of services that support cognitive and academic skills; and (c) the design, implementation, and evaluation of services that support socialization, behavioral and mental health, and emotional well-being (e.g., counseling, behavior analysis and intervention, social–emotional learning). | \_\_ Practica performance assessment demonstrates breadth in all of the following key skill areas, at a minimum:(a) data-based decision making, including psychoeducational assessment with recommendations; (b) the design, implementation, and evaluation of services that support cognitive and academic skills; and (c) the design, implementation, and evaluation of services that support socialization, behavioral and mental health, and emotional well-being (e.g., counseling, behavior analysis and intervention, social–emotional learning). |
|  | \_\_Practica performance assessment lacks sufficient depth for this level of preparation. | \_\_Practica performance assessment demonstrates limited depth in some or all key skill areas for this level of preparation. | \_\_Practica performance assessment demonstrates sufficient depth in all key skill areas for this level of preparation. |
|  | \_\_ The performance criteria, rating scale, or rubric is absent, confusing, vague, or inappropriate for this level of preparation.  | \_\_ The performance criteria, rating scale, or rubric are very broad or general, somewhat unclear, or of questionable appropriateness for this level of preparation.  | \_\_ Clear performance criteria, rating scale, or a rubric that specifies expected levels of performance appropriate for this level of preparation is included. |
|  | \_\_ No data are provided, or data are provided for less than appropriate number of applications (or not for each degree or location, if applicable). | \_\_ Data and total N are provided for appropriate number of applications, with some missing (i.e., data for more than two candidates are missing). (If applicable, data are provided for different degrees and/or locations).Reason(s) for missing data are not clearly explained. | \_\_ Data and total N are provided for appropriate number of applications, with no more than one or two candidates missing across application(s). (If applicable, data are provided for different degrees and/or locations).Reason(s) for missing data are clearly explained. |
|  | \_\_ Minimum performance score is not apparent or cited, or does not appear appropriate for this level of preparation. | \_\_ Minimum performance score is somewhat unclear or is of questionable appropriateness for this level of preparation; may be explained in program response but documentation of expected level of performance provided to candidates and raters is unclear. | \_\_ Minimum performance score is clear and is appropriate for this level of preparation. |
|  | \_\_ Data are poorly summarized or grossly incomplete or confusing.  | \_\_ Data are in the form of only means or some other form that provides some information to distinguish the number and/or percent of candidates that meet or surpass minimum program expectations. However, while data are generally adequate, it is not unambiguously clear what percent of candidates meet or surpass minimum program expectations. | \_\_ Data are in the form of frequencies or other form that clearly distinguishes the number and/or percent of candidates that meet or surpass minimum program expectations. |
|  | \_\_ Program has not linked data to NASP Standards.  | \_\_\_ Program has attempted to link data to NASP Standards but links are somewhat unclear or sometimes not relevant. | \_\_\_ Program has clearly linked data to relevant NASP Standards. |
|  | \_\_ The assessment does not appear to discriminate at all between levels of performance across candidates and thus provides no data for program improvement. | \_\_ The manner by which the assessment discriminates levels of performance across candidates or provides data useful for program improvement is unclear. | \_\_ Data show that the assessment discriminates levels of performance across candidates so that the program can use data for program improvement. |
| **Comment regarding the adequacy of Assessment 3 in determining the percent of candidates who attain *skills* consistent with NASP Domains. Explain any ratings of less than “Acceptable” and make recommendations for improvement, as necessary:** |
|  |
| **Assessment** | **Not Acceptable** | **Marginal** | **Acceptable** |
| **4. Internship Performance Assessment** | \_\_ Internship performance assessment is not required for all candidates. | \_\_ Internship performance assessment is completed for all or most candidates but it is unclear if it is required. | \_\_ Internship performance assessment is required by policy for all candidates. |
|  | \_\_ It is apparent that two or more of the ten Domains are not covered.  | \_\_ It is unclear if all ten Domains are covered, or it is apparent that one Domain is not covered. | \_\_ All ten Domains are clearly covered by the assessment. |
|  | \_\_Internship performance assessment lacks sufficient depth for this level of preparation. | \_\_Internship performance assessment demonstrates limited depth in some or all Domains for this level of preparation. | \_\_Internship performance assessment demonstrates sufficient depth in all Domains for this level of preparation. |
|  | \_\_ The performance criteria, rating scale, or rubric is absent, confusing, vague, or inappropriate for this level of preparation.  | \_\_ The performance criteria, rating scale, or rubric are very broad or general, or of questionable appropriateness for this level of preparation.  | \_\_ The performance criteria, rating scale, or a rubric clearly specifies expected levels of performance appropriate for this level of preparation is included. |
|  | \_\_ No data are provided, or data are provided for less than appropriate number of applications (or not for each degree or location, if applicable). | \_\_ Data and total N are provided for appropriate number of applications, with some missing (i.e., data for more than two candidates are missing). (If applicable, data are provided for different degrees and/or locations).Reason(s) for missing data are not clearly explained. | \_\_ Data and total N are provided for appropriate number of applications, with no more than one or two candidates missing across application(s). (If applicable, data are provided for different degrees and/or locations).Reason(s) for missing data are clearly explained. |
|  | \_\_ Minimum performance score is not apparent, or does not appear appropriate for this level of preparation. | \_\_ Minimum performance score is somewhat unclear; may be explained in program response but documentation of expected level of performance provided to candidates and raters is unclear. | \_\_ Minimum performance score is clear and is appropriate for this level of preparation. |
|  | \_\_ Data are poorly summarized or grossly incomplete or confusing.  | \_\_ Data are in the form of only means or other form that provides some information to distinguish the number and/or percent of candidates that meet or surpass minimum program expectations. However, while data are generally adequate, it is not unambiguously clear what percent of candidates meet or surpass minimum program expectations. | \_\_ Data are in the form of frequencies or other form that clearly distinguishes the number and/or percent of candidates that meet or surpass minimum program expectations. |
| Did the program clearly and accurately link items on the internship evaluation form to NASP Standards? | \_\_ Program has not linked data to NASP Domains. | \_\_\_ Program has attempted to link data to NASP Domains but links are somewhat unclear or sometimes not relevant. | \_\_\_ Program has clearly linked data to the respective NASP Domains. |
| Did the program collect and analyze data in a form that allows program faculty to discriminate between low, medium, and high performance (aggregated by intern and aggregated by skill) on skills related to internship? | \_\_ The assessment does not appear to discriminate at all between levels of performance across candidates and thus provides no data for program improvement. | \_\_ The manner by which the assessment discriminates levels of performance across candidates or provides data useful for program improvement is unclear. | \_\_ Data show that the assessment discriminates levels of performance across candidates so that the program can use data for program improvement. |
| **Comment regarding the adequacy of Assessment 4 in determining the percent of candidates who attain *skills* consistent with NASP Domains. Explain any ratings of less than “Acceptable” and make recommendations for improvement, as necessary:** |
|  |
| **Assessment** | **Not Acceptable** | **Marginal** | **Acceptable** |
| **5. Performance****Based Skills Assessment**  | \_\_ Performance-based assessment does not appear to be required, or choice of what to include is left to candidates.  | \_\_ Performance-based assessment is completed for all or most candidates, but it is unclear if it is required. | \_\_ Performance-based assessment is required by policy and documented in practice for all candidates. |
|  | \_\_ Assessment does not appear to focus on performance during internship or advanced practicum (up to 50% of cases/projects). | \_\_ Assessment focuses mostly on performance during internship or advanced practicum (up to 50% of cases/projects) but policy and/or practice is somewhat inconsistent. | \_\_ Assessment focuses solely on performance during internship or advanced practicum (up to 50% of cases/projects). |
|  | \_\_ Performance-based assessment is very limited and addresses fewer than two of the following key skill areas: (a) data-based decision making, including psychoeducational assessment with recommendations; (b) the design, implementation, and evaluation of services that support cognitive and academic skills; and (c) the design, implementation, and evaluation of services that support socialization, behavioral and mental health, and emotional well-being (e.g., counseling, behavior analysis and intervention, social–emotional learning). | \_\_ Performance-based assessment addresses two of the following key skill areas: (a) data-based decision making, including psychoeducational assessment with recommendations; (b) the design, implementation, and evaluation of services that support cognitive and academic skills; and (c) the design, implementation, and evaluation of services that support socialization, behavioral and mental health, and emotional well-being (e.g., counseling, behavior analysis and intervention, social–emotional learning).  | \_\_ Performance-based assessment addresses all of the following key skill areas: (a) data-based decision making, including psychoeducational assessment with recommendations; (b) the design, implementation, and evaluation of services that support cognitive and academic skills; and (c) the design, implementation, and evaluation of services that support socialization, behavioral and mental health, and emotional well-being (e.g., counseling, behavior analysis and intervention, social–emotional learning).  |
|  | \_\_ The performance criteria or rubric are missing, vague, or very unclear. | \_\_ The performance criteria or rubric is very general or somewhat unclear.  | \_\_ Clear performance criteria or a rubric are included.  |
|  | \_\_ Faculty do not appear to evaluate candidate performance. | \_\_ It appears that faculty evaluate candidate performance, although policy or practice may be unclear. | \_\_ It is clear that faculty evaluate candidate performance. |
|  | \_\_ No data are provided, or data are provided for less than the appropriate number of applications, (or not for each degree or location, if applicable). | Data and total N are provided for the appropriate number of applications. However, data for more than two candidates are missing without explanation (If applicable, data are provided for different degrees and/or locations). | \_\_ Data and total N are provided for the appropriate number of applications, with no more than one or two candidates missing across applications. (If applicable, data are provided for different degrees and/or locations). Reason(s) for missing data are provided. |
|  | \_\_ Minimum program performance score is not apparent, or does not appear appropriate. | \_\_ Minimum program performance score is somewhat unclear; may be explained in Program response but documentation of expected level of performance provided to candidates is unclear. | \_\_ Minimum performance score is documented and provided to candidates and appears appropriate for this level of preparation. |
|  | \_\_ Data are poorly summarized or grossly incomplete or confusing.  | \_\_ Data are in the form of only means or other form that does not distinguish the number and/or percent of candidates that meet or surpass minimum program expectations. | \_\_ Data are in the form of frequencies or other form that clearly distinguishes the number and/or percent of candidates that meet or surpass minimum program expectations. |
|  | \_\_ Program has not linked data to NASP Domains. | \_\_\_ Program has attempted to link data to NASP Domains but links are somewhat unclear or sometimes not relevant. | \_\_\_ Program has clearly linked data to relevant NASP Domains. |
|  | \_\_ The assessment does not appear to discriminate at all between levels of performance across candidates and thus provides no data for program improvement. | \_\_ It is unclear that the assessment discriminates levels of performance across candidates or provides data useful for program improvement. | \_\_ Data show that the assessment discriminates levels of performance across candidates so that the program can use data for program improvement. |
| **Comment regarding the adequacy of Assessment 5 in determining the percent of candidates who attain *skills* consistent with NASP Domains. Explain any ratings of less than “Acceptable” and make recommendations for improvement, as necessary:** |
|  |
| **Assessment** | **Not Acceptable** | **Marginal** | **Acceptable** |
| **6. Assessment of Candidate Impact** | \_\_ Assessment of impact of services on P-12 children and youth, families, and schools is not required of all candidates, or policy or practice documentation is grossly lacking. | \_\_ Assessment of impact of services on P-12 children and youth, families, and schools appears to be completed for most or all candidates, but it is unclear if policy or practice is always consistent. | \_\_ Assessment of impact of services on P-12 children and youth, families, and schools is required of all candidates, and is consistently documented in policy and practice. |
|  | \_\_ The specification as to type of case(s) to be submitted, if any, is grossly lacking or makes it clear that only one type of case is required. | \_\_ Most candidates appear to submit a behavioral case *and* anacademic case, although policy and/or practice is somewhat unclear. | \_\_ Policy and practice document that at least one behavioral and one academic case are required and submitted by all or almost all candidates.  |
|  | \_\_ It is not clear when cases must be completed, or that some cases may come from classes or experiences *prior to* advanced practica. | \_\_ Although it appears that two cases are from internship, or at least one is from internship and one is from advanced practica, program policy or practice is somewhat unclear.  | \_\_ Policy and practice document that two cases are from internship, or at least one is from internship and one is from advanced practicum. |
|  | \_\_ The program does not require candidates to generate and evaluate any objective data to assess impact.  | \_\_ It is either unclear if the program requires candidates to generate and evaluate data that assesses impact or the evaluation of impact is limited to subjective evaluation.  | \_\_ The program requires candidates to generate and evaluate data that assesses impact, and faculty analyze this data to evaluate candidates’ ability to do so. |
|  | \_\_ Faculty do not appear to evaluate candidate impact. | \_\_ It appears that faculty evaluate candidate impact, although policy or practice may be unclear. | \_\_ It is clear that faculty evaluate candidate impact. |
|  | \_\_ No data are provided, or are for less than one full application. | Data are provided for one full application, or data for more than two candidates are missing (if applicable, data are provided for different degrees and/or locations). | \_\_ Data and total N are provided for the appropriate number of applications, with no more than one or two candidates missing across applications. (If applicable, data are provided for different degrees and/or locations). |
|  | \_\_ Minimum performance expectation is not apparent, or does not appear appropriate. | \_\_ Minimum performance expectation is somewhat unclear and/or is of questionable appropriateness. | \_\_ Minimum performance expectation is apparent, or is cited and appears appropriate. |
|  | \_\_ Data are poorly summarized or grossly incomplete or confusing.  | \_\_ Data are in the form of only means or other form that does not distinguish the number and/or percent of candidates that meet or surpass minimum program expectations. | \_\_ Data are in the form of frequencies or other form that clearly distinguishes the number and/or percent of students that meet or surpass minimum program expectations. |
|  | \_\_ The assessment does not appear to discriminate at all between levels of performance across candidates and thus provides no data for program improvement. | \_\_ It is unclear that the assessment discriminates levels of performance across candidates or provides data useful for program improvement. | \_\_ Data show that the assessment discriminates levels of performance across candidates so that the program can use data for program improvement. |
| **Comment regarding program evidence of candidate effects on P-12 student learning. Explain any ratings of less than Acceptable and make recommendations for improvement, if necessary:** |
| **7. Comments on Optional Assessment 7:** |
| **8. Comments on Optional Assessment 8:** |
| **Comments on the program’s analysis of results and use of results for program improvement. Does the program appear to have validly analyzed results and drawn conclusions? Does the program appear to have made improvements based on assessment results?**  |
| **Overall comments on exemplary practices, areas of concern, and/or recommendations for improvement, if any:** |