1-1-2002

Evaluation of the School Psychology Program At Marshall University Graduate College

Mary L. Winters
mary.winters@tigertown.com

Evaluation of the School Psychology Program At Marshall University Graduate College

By
Mary L. Winters

Thesis submitted to
the Graduate College
of
Marshall University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

M.A.
in
Psychology

Approved by:
Elizabeth K. Boyles, Ph. D.-Committee Chairperson
Fred J. Krieg, Ph. D.
Barbara O'Byrne, Ph. D.

Psychology
Marshall University Graduate College
South Charleston, W.V.
2002

Abstract

This research evaluates the structure, purpose, and efficiency of the School Psychology Program at Marshall University Graduate College and will be utilized as baseline research for further measures of program efficiency and accountability. This study investigates the satisfaction levels and opinions of the student population, including all current and recent students who have graduated from the program. The methods of data collection were a survey, developed primarily from the goals and objectives of the program, and telephone interviews. The information requested in these methods was structured to provide both qualitative and quantitative data. Frequency analysis of the data resulted in an overall satisfaction rating, indicating that the program is meeting student needs in most areas. Suggestions for program improvement are offered, derived from the student response data, and problems encountered in this research were evaluated.

Table of Contents

Evaluation of the School Psychology Program at Marshall University Graduate College

The purpose of the current study was to provide information to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the school psychology program at Marshall University Graduate College. The data obtained from this study will be used to prepare the groundwork for future performance measures of program evaluation in accordance with the guidelines of the National Association of School Psychologists. This study was initiated by MUGC faculty in response to their concerns of the lack of available data to insure quality measures of program performance and accountability.

The evaluation explored the strengths and weaknesses of the MUGC school psychology program, with the focus upon the student population of program consumers. It investigated performance and suggested ways to improve program effectiveness. Analysis of the resulting data obtained from a student survey and student interviews (Appendix A) were be compared to the goals and objectives of the MUGC program to answer the research question: How effectively is the MUGC school psychology program meeting the needs of the students?

What is Program Evaluation?

Program evaluation is the measurement of program outcomes and comparison of those outcomes with expected or desired results for that program. Program assessment has four purposes:

1. To determine whether a given approach has the intended effect or not, and by determining that information, to differentiate what works from what doesn't;
2. To provide measurable data to support the existence of the program, to encourage program improvement, community support and determination of whether a program merits continued funding and staffing;
3. To inform practice, providing forward-thinking educators with evidence of the ecology of future system trends
4. To identify the serendipitous; the unexpected side effects that may indicate a solution to some other problem or to the understanding of a related issue (Webb, 2000).

Within this assessment analysis are two basic goals; to identify the desired outcomes and to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the current program. Outcomes are identified by focusing the research on the National Association of School Psychologists' training standards and nationwide school psychology programs. Comparative measures of current program effectiveness include the review of the goals and objectives of the program and the design of a student survey questionnaire, developed to provide both qualitative and quantitative measures of analysis.

The Importance of Program Evaluation

Program evaluation is important to consumers, educators, and accreditation organizations for continuing performance measures and accountability (Suvedi, 2000). A review of the literature supports the importance of systematic program evaluation in higher education (Astin, 1991; Banta, 1988; Conrad & Wilson, 1985; Davis, 1987; Ewell, 1987; Ewell & Boyer, 1988; Gray & Diamond, 1989; Hood & Mabry, 1982; Jennings, 1989 and Manning, 1986). Several authors placed an emphasis on using outcome assessment measures to evaluate program effectiveness (Ewell, 1987; Ewell & Boyer, 1988; Gray & Diamond, 1989; and Manning, 1986). During the late 1970's and early 1980's, the major purpose for conducting program reviews was to improve academic programs. More recently, additional reasons have been noted for systematic program evaluation. These include: (a) compliance with state mandates for review, (b) demonstration of institutional responsiveness to their constituencies, (c) providing a foundation for allocation and reallocation of funds, and (d) providing information to decision makers considering program change (Conrad & Wilson, 1985).

In 1991, Astin provided a comprehensive view of assessment issues in higher education. He stated that programs must define their excellence not only in terms of resources and in reputation but also in changes in their students and the impact they have on communities. Gray & Diamond (1989) noted that if program improvement is to result from evaluation efforts, there must be an institutional commitment to change, the availability of quality information to make decisions, and a willingness to commit resources needed to collect the information and make suggested changes. They stated that the key element in a program improvement plan is the collection of quality information which must be gathered through a logical and sequential process. Hood and Mabry (1982) stated that systematic

program evaluations are necessary to determine program effectiveness and to assess the need for program changes. Manning (1986) proposed that the primary reasons for outcome assessments in higher education were to determine what had been accomplished and how it might be accomplished better. Manning reminded readers that outcome assessments are retrospective in nature and need to be compared with current resources and processes to determine program quality and that if institutions identify their own strengths and weaknesses, they are more likely to make the necessary changes to improve programs.

Ewell (1987) proposed that at least three perspectives be considered as measures of program quality; (a) evaluation of the program by students, (b) appraisal of program graduates by employers, and (c) assessment of program effectiveness by the public. Jennings (1989) noted that accreditation standards should not be used as the sole measure of program quality. Jennings recommended the use of a framework that he described as input, output, and impact in assessing program quality. He defined input as the resources of the program typically reviewed as a part of accreditation standards such as faculty qualifications, organizational structure, and curriculum. He argued that programs must also evaluate output that he defined as the products of the program...the graduates. Jennings defined impact as the effect graduates have on the professional field they enter.

Davis (1987) suggested that the field of evaluation has a contribution to make in the area of educational assessments and identified the concept of formative and summative evaluation as important ideas to consider in defining assessment in higher education programs. Formative assessments focus on person, program, and product improvement and are ongoing in nature. Summative evaluation concepts are used to describe assessments

undertaken for the purposes of accountability and resource allocation. Dr. Davis proposed the use of both formative and summative evaluation methods in program evaluation.

Program Context and Structure

The ultimate goal of any professional program is to produce competent practitioners (Ingersoll, 1996). A first step in a comprehensive program evaluation plan consists of reviewing the program's statement of philosophy and purpose. This plan details what the program does, what the faculty consider the essential characteristics and components of an educational process, and what the graduates are expected to do.

Graduate programs in school psychology assume a tremendous challenge in preparing individuals to respond to the diverse and complex needs of students and their families. The critical questions to be considered are: "What is the state of graduate study in school psychology?" and "Are training programs responding to the demands of the field?

Levels of preparation of those entering the field have statistically improved in recent years. Graden and Curtis (1991) found that 85% of the more than 18,000 school psychologists responding to a 1990 national demographic study reported being trained at the specialist level or beyond; up from 71% in 1986. [Note: Specialist level is defined in these studies as a minimum of 60 graduate hours].

Despite increased levels of preparation, the nature of training seems to be a matter of potentially serious concern. The question of the adequacy of the training school psychologists receive is raised by several authors of published articles, all of which pertain to the nature, rather than the level, of training program curricula (Brown & Minke, 1986)

McMaster, Reschly, and Peters (1989) surveyed over 90% of the existing training programs in school psychology in preparation for the publication of the Directory of School

Psychology Training Programs. Results of the data indicated that most training programs place at least equal emphasis on assessment and intervention at the specialist level. Interestingly, no more attention is given to intervention, which includes consultation, than assessment training at a time when there has been an almost universal call within the profession to expand the role of school psychologists beyond that of assessment. In order for school psychology to become a sophisticated, educationally oriented specialty (Bardon, 1988) training programs must reconceptualize curricula, program goals, and training methods. Specifically, programs should recognize the need to prepare school psychologists in consultation, prevention, interventions, and needs of families and a population that reflects increasing levels of cultural diversity, interdisciplinary collaboration, and systems analysis and change (McMaster, 1989). Preparation of school psychologists with emphasis on what happens in the classroom, the home, and the community as components in the problem-solving process, will lead the field in a direction of better service delivery.

Some programs are responsive to the challenges confronting the field of school psychology. These programs are responding to the changing demographics of society, field-based training demands, the needs of students with more severe disabilities, and methods of service delivery focusing on academic and social change,: not academic and social labeling. Common critical skill areas across these programs include consultation, interventions, family involvement, and interdisciplinary collaboration. In addition, if school psychologists are to have the opportunity to employ such skills, they must also possess system analysis and change skills. An overview of national studies shows little evidence that the majority of school psychology programs across the country are following these examples.

The purpose of the School Psychology Program at Marshall University Graduate College is to prepare professional school psychologists to work within the schools as social systems to meet the following goals:

1. Apply their knowledge of psychology and education in order to prevent or remove the barriers to optimal growth and development at the community, school, classroom, and individual child level
2. Apply the problem-solving process within a collaborative consultation model that embraces both direct and indirect service delivery
3. Ensure professional competence based on a solid foundation of ethical, legal, and responsible practice that respects human diversity and individual differences
4. Apply knowledge and skills in conducting and interpreting research applied to practice
5. Apply knowledge and understanding of the multiple systems that influence growth and development
6. Ensure a broad range of quality services in primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention to serve universal, targeted, and selected populations
7. Apply skills in program evaluation to improve service to individuals, families, schools, and communities Integrate technological applications to facilitate all the above goals.

These goals include all of the components this research found to be vital to the training of full service school psychologists. This study is designed to determine how effectively the current program is meeting the needs of the students.

Methods

Participants:

The subjects included in this survey analysis included all MUGC students registered within the last five years with identifying records as an Educational Specialist degree student or a General Psychology Master degree student working toward the Ed.S. degree. The list of names and current addresses were obtained from the MUGC School Psychology program. All students on the list were mailed the survey, a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study, and a postage-paid envelope. Every 10^{th} person on the list of names was chosen for a telephone interview and reminder letters were mailed. The researcher attended school psychology class meetings and handed out copies of the cover letter and survey to students that had not received the materials.

Instrumentation:

Students were mailed a survey questionnaire developed for this research (Appendix A) which also included a cover letter of explanation, a follow-up reminder letter mailed two weeks after the initial mailing, and the four telephone interview questions. The survey was designed to produce both qualitative and quantitative data and developed primarily from the comparison of the goals and objectives of the program. Literature research other school

psychology programs nationwide was incorporated into the survey format to increase the validity of the study.

The questionnaire was structured by specific topic categories with instructions listed for the completion of each section. The first section asked demographic information to provide data relevant to the geographic and time restrictions concerns of the students. The second section, specific to program curriculum, was structured on a Likert-format rating scale of one through five, and yielded quantitative data of the students' level of satisfaction with the current program curriculum. The third section, program delivery, provided both qualitative and quantitative data from a multiple choice format. Additional spaces for further comments or concerns followed each section in the survey. The last section included three global questions designed to provide the student with the opportunity to present further information. The last page asked for all concerns or comments the student would like to make concerning the school psychology program at MUGC. This was to produce information that may not have been specifically asked for in the survey.

Procedures:

The survey, with the cover letter and a postage-paid envelope was mailed from MUGC o the students' listed residential address on November 15, 2001. The reminder letter was mailed on November 28, 2001. The students were asked to return the survey by mail to the MUGC psychology department, where they were accepted by the researcher for data analysis. Additionally, every tenth person on the mailing list was randomly chosen for telephone interview responses to four open-ended questions concerning overall program satisfaction. Class meetings were attended by the researcher to provide the materials to students that had not been contacted. This combination of procedures was implemented for

the purpose of increased validity of results. The data were analyzed by descriptive statistical measures. Each question was assigned a numerical value and a mean and standard deviation calculated. Interview question responses were analyzed qualitatively.

Results

A total of 135 surveys were mailed to MUGC students. Of these, 49 were returned to the psychology department, 21 of which were undeliverable. Of the 28 completed surveys, five were not valid for this study. Three respondents were graduates and two were not in the school psychology program. The results of a frequency analysis of the data, as depicted in Appendix B, are as follows:

The demographic data show that the age group most reflective in this study was 20-29 years (69.6%), most (56.5%) are married and 69.6% do not have children under the age of 18 years of age. Of those responding, 39.1% travel two hours or more to reach the South Charleston campus. [Note: The data on travel time may be affected by responses of students who take classes in off-site facilities.] Many work 31-40 hours per week (26.1%) in addition to a full time schedule of 9-12 enrolled graduate hours (30.4%). Nearly half of the reporting student population (47.8%) are financing their graduate work through student loans. Most have attained undergraduate degrees in the field of psychology (82.6%), consider themselves to be school psychology students (95.7%), and have completed over 55 credit hours toward their degree program (52.2%). The majority plan to work as school psychologists (95.7%) and more than half of these students (60.9%) would prefer to work within the state of West Virginia as opposed to out-of-state.

The results of program curriculum data were that 39.1% of the surveyed students felt that their undergraduate education prepared them for graduate level training. Many felt that the current MUGC program curriculum is reasonable (39.1%), the coursework is mostly applicable to the training (47.8%), and 39.1% reported confidence that they are receiving the information necessary for program completion. They reported confidence in their knowledge of training in public schools (30.4%), issues of ethics (39.1%), and knowledge of diverse populations (30.4%). Students felt less confident in technological training (30.4%). Their levels of confidence rated at 43.5% in special needs evaluations and 47.8% in their level of preparedness as future school psychologists.

Program delivery analyses revealed a high level of satisfaction with the faculty (87%). Students preferred, based on this sample size, evening classes (73.9%) and lecture style of instruction (52.2%). Some dissatisfaction with advising was reported; 47.8% reported being somewhat satisfied with the availability and level of communication with their advisor. Adjunct faculty performance was rated at a 56.5% student satisfaction level and 65.2% reported that they felt that students are treated with respect by the faculty. The students' main concern in program delivery, according to these results, was a lack of collaboration within interdepartmental course requirements, with 22 of the 23 respondents reporting dissatisfaction. Of the surveyed students, 69.6% would recommend the program to new students.

The facilities and resources data revealed a 52.2% satisfaction rate of available technological support facilities. A dissatisfaction rate of 65.2% was reported by students concerning the current availability of test kits for evaluation and assessment training. The

students reported a high dissatisfaction rate of 82.6% with the level of communication and collaboration between the South Charleston and Huntington Marshall University campus.

The qualitative data derived from telephone interviews and the information provided from student responses of concerns and comments added to their questionnaires showed similar patterns of opinion. Students appreciate the convenience of evening classes due to work obligations and consider the major strengths of the program to be the high quality of experience and knowledge of the faculty. These students felt that the statistics department is weak and there is a need for more classes on assessment, interpretation of tests, report writing, and ethics training specific to the field of school psychology.

Many expressed concern with the comprehensive exams. They suggested a school psychology based comprehensive exam be structured for this program. They also requested that study materials for the exam be made more accessible due to the expense of these extra materials. They requested that textbooks be utilized for more than one term to help defray student costs. The students expressed concern about the accreditation of the program. Specific curriculum concerns were dissatisfactions with Biological Bases as a Web CT course and numerous comments concerning the leadership class, which students felt was not productive to their training.

Of the four major barriers to progress reported repeatedly, three deal with issues of communication: lack of communication among those involved in the process of the program, lack of guidance, and inconsistencies in information. The other barrier for students is lack of time. They list their attributions of success in the program as good teachers, personal motivation, determination, and hard work.

Discussion

Overall, the majority of students voiced positive comments concerning the school psychology program at MUGC. Their suggestions of ways to improve the program included more faculty, continued small classes, and more testing materials for assessment purposes. They generally agreed that the curriculum needs to be reviewed and set to meet NASP accreditation requirements. They suggested the development of a system of informing students of important changes occurring within the department that may affect their degree program. They also recommend improved communication with the Huntington campus as well as instruction or links to internship possibilities. Several students suggested a forum be held of practicing school psychologists from different states, which they felt would provide information of actual experience in the field, in addition to open forum departmental meetings.

The major limitation to this research was the low response rate, partially due to inconsistencies in the current student contact list. Recommendations for further studies include improving the method of attaining student contact information and revising the questions on the student questionnaire so that they are applicable to the student population who are not based in South Charleston as well as the local students. Restructuring some of the survey questions in the demographics and facilities and resources sections should be considered to make the survey more applicable to all students in the program.

Further investigation should be considered into the communication problems between the South Charleston and Huntington Marshall University campus. The students responding to this study requested clarification of rules and procedures required by all parties that pertain to their total program requirements. The results obtained from the limited number of respondents in this study provided a high rate of student input per survey from their

additional concerns and comments. Though measurable results are limited due to the small sample size, future studies of program performance measures are recommended based on these results.

It is suggested that further qualitative studies be developed to address the issues of the students' reported difficulties in managing their resources of time, economics, and family life in addition to the academic demands of the program. Age and gender issues related to these problems could be investigated as well as the perceptions of the students with professional work experience, in comparison to the students entering the program directly from their undergraduate training.

References

Astin, A. (1991). Achieving academic excellence. San Francisco, Ca.: Jossey-Bass.

Banta, T. (1988). Implementing outcomes assessment. San Francisco, Ca.: Jossey-Bass.

Bardon, J. (1988). NASP as perceived by the Division of School Psychology. American Psychological Association, Past and future interactions. School Psychology Review, 18, 209-214.

Brown, D. & Minke, K. (1986). School psychology graduate training: A comprehensive analysis. American Psychologist, 14, 1328-1338.

Conrad, C. & Wilson, R. (1985). Academic program reviews: Institutional approaches, expectations, and controversies. Higher Education Report No. 5, Washington, D.C.

Davis, B. (1987). Learning from the field of evaluation: Achieving assessment goals using evaluation techniques. (pp. 5-21). San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass.

Ewell, P. (1987). Establishing a campus-based assessment program. Student outcomes assessment. (pp. 9-25). San Francisco, Ca.: Jossey-Bass.

Ewell, P. & Boyer, C. (1988). Acting out state mandated assessments. Change. July/August, 40-46.

Gray, P. & Diamond. R. (1989). Improving higher education. Achieving assessment goals using evaluation techniques. (pp. 89-109). San Francisco, Ca.: Jossey-Bass.

Graden, J & Curtis, M. (1991). A demographic profile of school psychology. Report to the NASP Delegate Assembly: Silver Spring, MD: NASP.

Hood, J & Mabry, K. (1982). Follow-up service in guidance. Scholar and Educator: Vol. 6, 53-56.

Ingersoll, G. (1996). Evaluation research. Nursing Administration Quarterlly, 20 (4), 28-40.

Jennings, E. (1989). Accountability: Program quality, outcome assessment and graduate education. Public Administration Review, 49, 438-446.

Manning, T. (1986, October). The why, what and who of assessment. The accrediting association perspective. Paper presented at Educational Testing Service Invitational Conference, New York City, N. Y.

McMaster, M. & Reschly, D. & Peters, J. (1989). Directory of school psychology graduate programs. Washington, D.C.: NASP.

Suvedi, M. (2000). Introduction to Program Evaluation. Department of agricultural and extension education: East Lansing, Mi.

Webb, F. (2000). The necessary art of program assessment. Thrust for Educational Leadership: Vol.25, p30-32 F/Mr'96.

Appendix A

November 2, 2001

Marshall University Graduate College
Psychology Department
Angus E. Peyton Drive,
South Charleston, W.V. 25303-1600

Dear Student,

We are a group of graduate students in the school psychology program at MUGC. For the purpose of our theses, we wanted to conduct a program evaluation that could prove useful to our own training program. As a part of this effort, we are surveying all current and recent students in the program. We will also be conducting phone interviews with a subset of students.

Would you please complete the accompanying survey and return it in the postage-paid envelope? We will be reviewing the completed surveys, entering the data, and analyzing the results. No faculty member will see your individual survey and your responses will be entirely confidential.

Call any of the following numbers to reach us with any questions. Thanks!

Mary Winters (304) 586-3163

Alicia Hill (304) 574-3702

Larry Lester (704) 630-1085

Student Survey

Please circle your answer to each of the following questions:

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION:

1. Please indicate your age range.

   20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60+

2. Please indicate your marital status.

   Married Unmarried

3. Do you have children 18 and under.

   Yes No

4. Estimate your distance in travel time from the South Charleston campus.

   0-30 min. 30-60 min. 1hr-1 ½ hrs. 1 ½ hrs.-2 hrs. 2hrs.+

5. How many hours per week are you employed.

   None 1-10 11-20 21-30 31-40 40+

6. Number of graduate hours currently enrolled_____

7. Do you have a graduate assistantship? (Required work hour to pay tuition)

   Yes No

8. Do you have a graduate fee waiver? (No work hours required)

   Yes No

9. Are you financing this program all or in part through student loans?

   Yes No

10. What was your undergraduate major?_____

11. How many credit hours have you completed toward your degree(s) in this program?

    0-18 19-36 37-54 55 or more

12. Do you consider yourself a school psychology student?

    Yes No Other Classification_____

13. What are your goals upon completion of this program?

14. What is your preference for location of future employment?

    West Virginia Out of state

PROGRAM CURRICULUM:

Please circle one response to each of the following questions to indicate your level of satisfaction with the current program curriculum.

1 = Yes 2 = Mostly 3 = Sometimes 4 = Occasionally 5 = No

1. Did your undergraduate program prepare you for the school psychology program?

   1 2 3 4 5

2. Is the coursework reasonable?

   1 2 3 4 5

3. Is the coursework applicable to the field of study?

   1 2 3 4 5

4. Do you feel that you are obtaining the information necessary for completion of this program?

   1 2 3 4 5

5. Are you being provided with knowledge of public school organization and operation?

   1 2 3 4 5

6. Are you being taught the roles and function of a school psychologist?

   1 2 3 4 5

7. Are you being informed of ethical and legal considerations in the field?

   1 2 3 4 5

8. Are you developing the skills to assess children's needs, particularly those needs to evaluate behavior and learning exceptionalities?

   1 2 3 4 5

9. Are you developing skills in selecting and utilizing appropriate assessment instruments and evaluation technique for diverse populations?

1 2 3 4 5

10. Have you attained ample training in technological resources?

    1 2 3 4 5

11. Please list any concerns or comments regarding program curriculum:

PROGRAM DELIVERY:

Please circle one response to the following questions:

1. When do you prefer to take classes?

   Evening Weekends On-line Other (specify)_____

2. What type of instructional style do you most benefit from?

   Group-work Lecture Individual Other (specify)_____

3. How available are your instructors?

   Very Somewhat Not at all

4. How available is your advisor?

   Very Somewhat Not at all

5. Do you have good communication with your advisor?

   Very Somewhat Not at all

6. Do you feel that your professors are well trained?

   Yes Somewhat No

7. Do you believe your professors are experienced in the field?

   Yes Somewhat No

8. Are you being provided with an understanding of, and an appreciation for, human diversity and multicultural awareness in education
   and school psychology?

   Yes Somewhat No

9. Are you being taught the skills necessary to interpret and explain assessment results?

   Yes Somewhat No

10. Do you feel that you are treated with respect by faculty and support personnel?

    Yes Somewhat No

11. Has your experience with adjunct faculty been as productive as with full-time professors?

    Yes Somewhat No

12. Do you feel that there is good collaboration within interdepartmental course requirements?

    Yes Somewhat No

13. Would you recommend the school psychology program to new students?

    Yes Somewhat No

14. Please list any concerns or comments regarding program delivery:

FACILITIES AND RESOURCES:

Please circle one response to each of the following questions:

1. Are there adequate technological support facilities on campus?

   Yes Somewhat No

2. Is there an adequate supply of test kits and testing materials for assessment purposes?

   Yes Somewhat No

3. Are off-site classrooms adequate for the learning process?

   Yes Somewhat No

4. Are the library resources meeting your needs?

   Yes Somewhat No

5. Is there clear communication and cooperation between the South Charleston and Huntington Marshall University campus?

   Yes Somewhat No

6. Please list any concerns or comments regarding the facilities and available resources:

Please write in responses to the following questions so that your suggestions for program improvement can be included in this research.

1. What have been the major barriers to your progress in this program?

2. To what do you attribute your progress in this program?

3. Please list 3 or more ways the school psychology program can be improved:

Please respond with any additional concerns or comments you would like to make concerning the school psychology program at Marshall University Graduate College:

Telephone Interview Questions

1. What aspects of the program do you like best?
2. What aspects of the program do you like least?
3. What do you consider to be the strengths of the program?
4. What do you consider to be the weaknesses of the program?

November 16, 2001

Psychology Department
Marshall University Graduate College
100 Angus E. Peyton Drive,
South Charleston, W.V. 25303-1600

Dear Student,

We theses students are in the process of accumulating all of the data possible for our evaluation of the School Psychology program at Marshall University Graduate College. A few weeks ago we mailed you a survey to help us toward this goal. If you have returned it, we sincerely thank you. If you have not had the time to do so yet, would you please take a look at it again? Together, we can make our program better, for us and for future students.

We assure you that your responses will be entirely confidential. No faculty member will see your individual survey. Thank you for your cooperation and input into the evaluation of our program.

Please call any of the following numbers to reach us with any

questions:

Mary Winters (304) 586-3163

Alicia Hill (304) 574-3702

Larry Lester (704) 630-1035

Appendix B

(Appendix B)

Frequencies

DEMOGRAPHICS

Statistics

		age	status	under18	travel time	#work hours
N	Valid	23	22	23	23	23
	Missing	0	1	0	0	0
Mean		1.43	1.41	1.70	3.13	4.57
Std. Error of Mean		.15	.11	9.81E-02	.36	.29
Median		1.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	5.00
Mode		1	1	2	5	5
Std. Deviation		.73	.50	.47	1.71	1.38

Statistics

		currently enrolled	workhrs	nowork	student loans	undergrad
N	Valid	23	23	23	23	23
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.70	1.57	1.91	1.52	1.83
Std. Error of Mean		.23	.11	6.01E-02	.11	8.08E-02
Median		3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Mode		4	2	2	2	2
Std. Deviation		1.11	.51	.29	.51	.39

Statistics

		hrs completed	school psy student	future plans	preference
N	Valid	23	23	23	23
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.04	1.04	1.04	1.39
Std. Error of Mean		.25	4.35E-02	4.35E-02	.10
Median		4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		4	1	1	1
Std. Deviation		1.19	.21	.21	.50

Frequency Table

age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20-29	16	69.6	69.6	69.6
	30-39	4	17.4	17.4	87.0
	40-49	3	13.0	13.0	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	13	56.5	59.1	59.1
	no	9	39.1	40.9	100.0
	Total	22	95.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	4.3		
Total		23	100.0		

under18

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	7	30.4	30.4	30.4
	no	16	69.6	69.6	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

travel time

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-30 min	6	26.1	26.1	26.1
	30-60 min	4	17.4	17.4	43.5
	1-1 1/2 hrs	3	13.0	13.0	56.5
	1 1/2 -2 hrs	1	4.3	4.3	60.9
	2 hrs+	9	39.1	39.1	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

#work hours

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	4.3	4.3	4.3
	1-10	1	4.3	4.3	8.7
	11-20	3	13.0	13.0	21.7
	21-30	3	13.0	13.0	34.8
	31-40	9	39.1	39.1	73.9
	40+	6	26.1	26.1	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

currently enrolled

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	4	17.4	17.4	17.4
	6	6	26.1	26.1	43.5
	9	6	26.1	26.1	69.6
	12	7	30.4	30.4	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

workhrs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	10	43.5	43.5	43.5
	no	13	56.5	56.5	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

nowork

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	2	8.7	8.7	8.7
	no	21	91.3	91.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

student loans

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	11	47.8	47.8	47.8
	no	12	52.2	52.2	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

undergrad

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	education	4	17.4	17.4	17.4
	psychology	19	82.6	82.6	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

hrs completed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0-18	4	17.4	17.4	17.4
	19-36	3	13.0	13.0	30.4
	37-54	4	17.4	17.4	47.8
	55+	12	52.2	52.2	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

school psy student

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	22	95.7	95.7	95.7
	no	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

future plans

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	school psy employment	22	95.7	95.7	95.7
	private practice	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

preference

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	in W.Va.	14	60.9	60.9	60.9
	out of state	9	39.1	39.1	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

Frequencies

PROGRAM CURRICULUM

Statistics

		undergrad degree	reasonable	coursework	program completion	organization/operation	professional roles
N	Valid	23	23	23	23	23	23
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.13	2.00	1.74	2.35	2.39	1.87
Std. Deviation		1.25	1.04	.69	1.23	1.27	.81

Statistics

		ethical/legal	evaluations	diverse populations	technological training
N	Valid	23	23	23	23
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.13	2.09	2.70	3.00
Std. Deviation		1.22	1.04	1.55	1.24

Frequency Table

undergrad degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	9	39.1	39.1	39.1
	mostly	8	34.8	34.8	73.9
	sometimes	1	4.3	4.3	78.3
	occasionally	4	17.4	17.4	95.7
	no	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

reasonable

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	9	39.1	39.1	39.1
	mostly	7	30.4	30.4	69.6
	sometimes	6	26.1	26.1	95.7
	no	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

coursework

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	9	39.1	39.1	39.1
	mostly	11	47.8	47.8	87.0
	sometimes	3	13.0	13.0	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

program completion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	6	26.1	26.1	26.1
	mostly	9	39.1	39.1	65.2
	sometimes	4	17.4	17.4	82.6
	occasionally	2	8.7	8.7	91.3
	no	2	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

organization/operation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	7	30.4	30.4	30.4
	mostly	6	26.1	26.1	56.5
	sometimes	6	26.1	26.1	82.6
	occasionally	2	8.7	8.7	91.3
	no	2	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

professional roles

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	8	34.8	34.8	34.8
	mostly	11	47.8	47.8	82.6
	sometimes	3	13.0	13.0	95.7
	occasionally	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

ethical/legal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	9	39.1	39.1	39.1
	mostly	7	30.4	30.4	69.6
	sometimes	3	13.0	13.0	82.6
	occasionally	3	13.0	13.0	95.7
	no	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

evaluations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	7	30.4	30.4	30.4
	mostly	10	43.5	43.5	73.9
	sometimes	4	17.4	17.4	91.3
	occasionally	1	4.3	4.3	95.7
	no	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

diverse populations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	7	30.4	30.4	30.4
	mostly	5	21.7	21.7	52.2
	sometimes	4	17.4	17.4	69.6
	occasionally	2	8.7	8.7	78.3
	no	5	21.7	21.7	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

technological training

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	2	8.7	8.7	8.7
	mostly	7	30.4	30.4	39.1
	sometimes	7	30.4	30.4	69.6
	occasionally	3	13.0	13.0	82.6
	no	4	17.4	17.4	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

Frequencies

PROGRAM DELIVERY

Statistics

		time	instruction	available	contact	advisor	teachers
N	Valid	23	23	23	23	23	23
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.43	2.04	1.70	1.74	1.78	1.13
Std. Deviation		.79	.71	.47	.69	.74	.34

Statistics

		experience	knowledge	results	facutly	faculty
N	Valid	23	23	23	23	23
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.04	1.30	1.70	1.61	1.48
Std. Deviation		.21	.56	.70	.78	.73

Statistics

		interdepart mental	reccomen d
N	Valid	23	23
	Missing	0	0
Mean		2.39	1.61
Std. Deviation		.58	.94

Frequency Table

time

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulativ e Percent
Valid	evenings	17	73.9	73.9	73.9
	weekends	2	8.7	8.7	82.6
	on-line	4	17.4	17.4	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

instruction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	group-work	5	21.7	21.7	21.7
	lecture	12	52.2	52.2	73.9
	indiividual	6	26.1	26.1	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

available

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very	7	30.4	30.4	30.4
	somewhat	16	69.6	69.6	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

contact

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very	9	39.1	39.1	39.1
	somewhat	11	47.8	47.8	87.0
	not at all	3	13.0	13.0	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

advisor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very	9	39.1	39.1	39.1
	somewhat	10	43.5	43.5	82.6
	not at all	4	17.4	17.4	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

teachers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very	20	87.0	87.0	87.0
	somewhat	3	13.0	13.0	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	very	22	95.7	95.7	95.7
	somewhat	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

knowledge

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	17	73.9	73.9	73.9
	somewhat	5	21.7	21.7	95.7
	no	1	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

results

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	10	43.5	43.5	43.5
	somewhat	10	43.5	43.5	87.0
	no	3	13.0	13.0	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

facutly

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	13	56.5	56.5	56.5
	somewhat	6	26.1	26.1	82.6
	no	4	17.4	17.4	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

faculty

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	15	65.2	65.2	65.2
	somewhat	5	21.7	21.7	87.0
	no	3	13.0	13.0	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

interdepartmental

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	1	4.3	4.3	4.3
	somewhat	12	52.2	52.2	56.5
	no	10	43.5	43.5	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

reccomend

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	16	69.6	69.6	69.6
	no	7	30.4	30.4	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

Frequencies

FACILITIES AND RESOURCES

Statistics

		support	materials	classrooms	adequate	Huntington
N	Valid	23	23	23	23	23
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.70	2.57	1.52	1.74	2.78
Std. Deviation		.82	.66	.67	.75	.52

Frequency Table

support

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	12	52.2	52.2	52.2
	somewhat	6	26.1	26.1	78.3
	no	5	21.7	21.7	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

materials

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	2	8.7	8.7	8.7
	somewhat	6	26.1	26.1	34.8
	no	15	65.2	65.2	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

classrooms

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	13	56.5	56.5	56.5
	somwhat	8	34.8	34.8	91.3
	no	2	8.7	8.7	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

adequate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	10	43.5	43.5	43.5
	somewhat	9	39.1	39.1	82.6
	no	4	17.4	17.4	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	

Huntington

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	yes	1	4.3	4.3	4.3
	somewhat	3	13.0	13.0	17.4
	no	19	82.6	82.6	100.0
	Total	23	100.0	100.0	