**NASP Program Accreditation Board**

**Standard 4 – Performance-Based Program Assessment and Accountability**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Element 4.1** | \_\_\_ **Not Acceptable** | \_\_\_ **Marginal** | \_\_\_ **Acceptable** |
| **4.1** | \_\_\_ There is little or very inconsistent evidence that the program employs a variety of methods to assess candidate knowledge, skills, and professional work characteristics including results on licensing exams, course grades, practicum evaluations, intern evaluations, and performance-based products that include assessment of the impact of services on children and youth, families, and schools. Other assessments may also be used.  | \_\_\_ There is some, or slightly inconsistent evidence that the program employs a variety of methods to assess candidate knowledge, skills, and professional work characteristics including results on licensing exams, course grades, practicum evaluations, intern evaluations, and performance-based products that include assessment of the impact of services on children and youth, families, and schools. Other assessments may also be used. | \_\_\_ There is strong, consistent evidence that the program employs a variety of methods to assess candidate knowledge, skills, and professional work characteristics including results on licensing exams, course grades, practicum evaluations, intern evaluations, and performance-based products that include assessment of the impact of services on children and youth, families, and schools. Other assessments may also be used.  |
| \_\_\_ The program collects and adequately summarizes data on four or fewer “core” assessments in a way that demonstrates candidate attainment and is linked to NASP Domains in an apparent manner. | \_\_\_ The program collects and summarizes data on at least five “core” assessments in a way that demonstrates candidate attainment and is linked to NASP Domains in an apparent manner. | \_\_\_ The program collects and adequately summarizes data on six “core” assessments in a way that demonstrates candidate attainment in an apparent manner. |
| **Comments on exemplary practices, areas of concern, and/or recommendations for improvement on Element 4.1:** |
| **Element 4.2** | \_\_\_ **Not Acceptable** | \_\_\_ **Marginal** | \_\_\_ **Acceptable** |
| **4.2** | \_\_\_ There is little or very inconsistent evidence of an assessment of *practicum* outcomes that includes a formal evaluation of all candidates conducted by field supervisors and/or program faculty. The assessment includes, as a minimum, evaluation of professional competencies in (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).  | \_\_\_ There is some, or slightly inconsistent evidence of an assessment of *practicum* outcomes that includes a formal evaluation of all candidates conducted by field supervisors and/or program faculty. The assessment includes, as a minimum, evaluation of professional competencies in (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). | \_\_\_ There is strong, consistent evidence of an assessment of *practicum* outcomes that includes a formal evaluation of all candidates conducted by field supervisors and/or program faculty. The assessment includes, as a minimum, evaluation of professional competencies in (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 evaluation criteria or benchmark is relevant to the professional developmental stage of the candidate at the particular level of the practica. | \_\_\_ The evaluation criteria or benchmark is relevant to the professional developmental stage of the candidate at the particular level of the practica. | \_\_\_ The evaluation criteria or benchmark is relevant to the professional developmental stage of the candidate at the particular level of the practica. |
| \_\_\_ The program may collect and summarize some data on this assessment, but such data does not demonstrate candidate attainment (percent or number who meet minimum criteria) and/or is not linked to NASP Domains in a clear, apparent manner. | \_\_\_The program collects and summarizes data on this assessment, although it is not in a way that clearly demonstrates candidate attainment (percent or number who meet minimum criteria) and links to relevant NASP Domains in a clear, apparent manner. | \_\_\_ The program collects and adequately summarizes data on this assessment in a way that clearly demonstrates candidate attainment (percent or number who meet minimum criteria) and links to relevant NASP Domains in a clear, apparent manner. |
| **Comments on exemplary practices, areas of concern, and/or recommendations for improvement on Element 4.2:** |
| **Element 4.3** | \_\_\_ **Not Acceptable** | \_\_\_ **Marginal** | \_\_\_ **Acceptable** |
| **4.3** | \_\_\_ There is little or very inconsistent evidence, of an assessment of *internship* outcomes, including a) an intern evaluation by field supervisors that covers some NASP Domains; b) an evaluation of internship products/cases evaluated by faculty; and c) an evaluation of intern professional work characteristics needed for effective practice.  | \_\_\_ There is some, or slightly inconsistent evidence of an assessment of *internship* outcomes, including a) an intern evaluation by field supervisors that covers almost all or all NASP Domains; b) an evaluation of internship products/cases evaluated by faculty; and c) an evaluation of intern professional work characteristics needed for effective practice.  | \_\_\_ There is strong, consistent evidence of an assessment of *internship* outcomes, including a) an intern evaluation by field supervisors that covers *all* NASP Domains; b) an evaluation of internship products/cases evaluated by faculty; and c) an evaluation of intern professional work characteristics needed for effective practice.  |
| \_\_\_ The program may collect and summarize some data on this assessment, but such data do not demonstrate candidate attainment (percent or number who meet minimum criteria) and/or is not linked to NASP Domains in any clear, apparent manner. | \_\_ The program collects and summarizes data on this assessment, although it is not in a way that clearly demonstrates candidate attainment (percent or number who meet minimum criteria) and links to relevant NASP Domains in a mostly clear, apparent manner. | \_\_ The program collects and adequately summarizes data on this assessment in a way that clearly demonstrates candidate attainment (percent or number who meet minimum criteria) and links to relevant NASP Domains in a clear, apparent manner. |
| **Comments on exemplary practices, areas of concern, and/or recommendations for improvement for Element 4.3:** |
| **Element 4.4** | \_\_\_ **Not Acceptable** | \_\_\_ **Marginal** | \_\_\_ **Acceptable** |
| **4.4** | \_\_\_ There is little or very inconsistent evidence that candidates must demonstrate, through at least one academic/cognitive case and one mental/behavioral health case (one of which *may* be completed during advanced practicum the year before internship, with the other completed during internship) evidence of the ability to provide and evaluate the impact of direct and/or indirect intervention-based services for children and youth, families, and schools. Only one type of case may be required, or the process by which results are obtained and evaluated by faculty may be very unclear. | \_\_There is some, or slightly inconsistent evidence that candidates demonstrate, through at least one academic/cognitive case and one mental/behavioral health case (one of which may be completed during advanced practicum the year before internship, with the other completed during internship) the ability to evaluate the impact of direct and/or indirect intervention-based services for children and youth, families, and schools. However, such methods may be more subjective, or the process by which results are obtained and evaluated by faculty may be somewhat unclear.  | \_\_\_There is strong, consistent evidence that candidates demonstrate, through at least one academic/cognitive case and one mental/behavioral health case (one of which *may* be completed during advanced practicum the year before internship), with the other completed during internship) the ability to evaluate the impact of direct and/or indirect intervention-based services for children and youth, families, and schools. The methods and process by which results are obtained and evaluated by faculty are clear.  |
| **Comments on exemplary practices, areas of concern, and/or recommendations for improvement for Element 4.4:** |
| **Element 4.5** | \_\_\_ **Not Acceptable** | \_\_\_ **Marginal** | \_\_\_ **Acceptable** |
| **4.5** | \_\_\_ There is little or very inconsistent evidence that systematic procedures are used to evaluate and improve the quality of the program. It is unclear if/how different sources of process and performance information (e.g., instructional evaluation, performance portfolios, field supervisor evaluations, candidate/graduate performance on licensing/certification examinations) are used for that purpose. | \_\_\_ There is some, or slightly inconsistent evidence that systematic procedures are occasionally used to evaluate and improve the quality of the program, and that different sources of process and performance information (e.g., instructional evaluation, performance portfolios, field supervisor evaluations, candidate/graduate performance on licensing/certification examinations) are used for that purpose. | \_\_\_ There is strong, consistent evidence that systematic procedures are used to evaluate and improve the quality of the program and that different sources of process and performance information (e.g., instructional evaluation, performance portfolios, field supervisor evaluations, candidate/graduate performance on licensing/certification examinations) are used for that purpose.  |
| **Comments on exemplary practices, areas of concern, and/or recommendations for improvement for Element 4.5:** |
| **STANDARD 4** | \_\_\_**Not Met** |  | \_\_\_**Met** |
| **Additional comments (if applicable):** |