

1-1-2010

The Remediation of School Psychologist Trainees

Michael J. Powell
powell32@marshall.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://mds.marshall.edu/etd>

 Part of the [School Psychology Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Powell, Michael J., "The Remediation of School Psychologist Trainees" (2010). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. Paper 323.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact zhangj@marshall.edu.

The Remediation of School Psychologist Trainees

A Thesis Submitted to
the Graduate College of
Marshall University

In partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Education Specialist in
School Psychology

By Michael J. Powell

Approved By:

Sandra S. Stroebel, Ph.D., Committee Chairperson

Fred Jay Krieg, Ph.D.

Stephen O'Keefe, Ph.D.

Marshall University, May 2010

Abstract

School Psychology training programs have an important responsibility of making sure their graduates are competent professionals. The current study gathered data from National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) approved training programs in order to explore how they have handled competency problems in their program. A survey was sent to all NASP approved training programs via e-mail. Surveys were also completed by 32 program representatives at the 2010 Annual NASP Conference. The results of the survey were analyzed using Chi Square and a frequency analysis. The Chi Square analysis did not yield any significant differences at $p < 0.05$ between educational specialist or equivalent degree programs and doctorate degree programs. The frequency analysis, however, did disclose pertinent data in regards to the remediation of school psychology trainees.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank Dr. Stroebel for helping me with this study every step of the way. She helped keep me on track and was there when I needed guidance. Second, I would like to thank Dr. Krieg for sharing with me the idea for this study. Next I would like to thank Dr. O'Keefe for his assistance with the statistical aspect. I would also like to thank Leasha Trimble for her assistance in the creation of the survey. Finally I would like to thank my friends and family who provided me with support and encouragement throughout this entire process.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables.....	vi-vii
Chapter I: Review of Literature.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Definition.....	1
Competency.....	3
Remediation.....	4
Purpose of Study.....	7
Research Questions.....	7
Chapter II: Method.....	9
Participants.....	9
Instrument.....	9
Design and Procedure.....	9
Chapter III: Results.....	11
Chapter IV: Discussion.....	16
Limitations and Future Considerations.....	19
References.....	21
Tables.....	24
Survey.....	38

Table 1.....	24
Table 2.....	25
Table 3.....	25
Table 4.....	25
Table 5.....	26
Table 6.....	26
Table 7.....	27
Table 8.....	27
Table 9.....	27
Table 10.....	28
Table 11.....	28
Table 12.....	28
Table 13.....	29
Table 14.....	29
Table 15.....	30
Table 16.....	31
Table 17.....	32
Table 18.....	32
Table 19.....	33
Table 20.....	33
Table 21.....	34
Table 22.....	34

Table 23.....	35
Table 24.....	35
Table 25.....	35
Table 26.....	36
Table 27.....	36
Table 28.....	36
Table 29.....	36
Table 30.....	37

Chapter I

Review of Literature

Introduction

School psychologists are trained to provide children, youth, families, and other consumers with services in which they are competent and impactful. If services are provided by a school psychologist who is not competent it could have a detrimental effect on the children, youth, families, and other consumers they serve. Lack of competence is an important issue school psychology training programs must face with each class of students they graduate. It is their responsibility to screen, select, and train their students (Wester, Christianson, Fouad, & Santiago-Rivera, 2008). Training programs must also assure that their graduates are competent in the necessary knowledge and skills that will be needed once they are employed. According to NASP's 2000 Standard for Training and Field Placement Programs in School Psychology: "A key aspect of program accountability is the assessment of the knowledge and capabilities of school psychology candidates and of the positive impact that interns and graduates have on services to children, youth, families, and other consumers" (p. 19). Those students who do not possess competence with regards to the required knowledge and skill should be identified and some method of remediation should be implemented (Schwartz-Mette, 2009). Cruise & Swerdlik (2010) state that school psychology training programs serve as the initial gatekeeper for the profession securing public safety and trust.

Definition

There have been many articles that address the definition that should be used when identifying students with competency problems (Cruise & Swerdlik, 2010; Elman

& Forrest, 2007; Kaslow et al., 2007). Elman & Forrest (2007) address the need to discontinue the use of the word impairment when identifying students with competency problems because of the overlap with the definitions used under Americans with Disabilities Act (1990). Instead they propose new terminology that captures three concepts: problems, professional, and competence. Kaslow et al. (2007) broke competence into two categories, foundational and functional. Foundational consists of communicating/thinking critically, judgment, adherence to ethical guidelines, responding to feedback, working with others, demonstrating appropriate character, interacting effectively, and professionalism. Functional consists of exhibiting the expected level of knowledge and skills, assessment/diagnosis/conceptualization, intervention, and training. The 2000b National Association of School Psychologists definition of professional competence pages 16-17 is stated as:

1. School psychologists recognize the strengths and limitations of their training and experience, engaging only in practices for which they are qualified. They enlist the assistance of other specialists in supervisory, consultative, or referral roles as appropriate in providing services. They must continually obtain additional training and education to provide the best possible services to children, families, schools, communities, trainees, and supervisees.
2. Competence levels, education, training, and experience are declared and accurately represented to clients in a professional manner.
3. School psychologists do not use affiliations with persons, associations, or institutions to imply a level of professional competence that exceeds that which has actually been achieved.
4. School psychologists engage in continuing professional development. They remain current regarding developments in research, training, and professional practices that benefit children, families, and schools.

5. School psychologists refrain from any activity in which their personal problems or conflicts may interfere with professional effectiveness. Competent assistance is sought to alleviate conflicts in professional relationships.

6. School psychologists know the *Principles for Professional Ethics* and thoughtfully apply them to situations within their employment setting or practice. Ignorance or misapplication of an ethical principle is not a reasonable defense against a charge of unethical behavior.

Competency

No matter how a program defines competency they should clearly define tasks and levels of skill trainees must meet to be deemed competent and ensure trainees have been informed of these competencies (Cruise & Swerdlik, 2010). For the purposes of this study these competency problems will be identified as nonacademic (foundational) competencies and academic (functional) competencies. These terms are used in order to minimize confusion as much as possible. Competency areas that are required by NASP's 2000 Standards for Training and Field Placement Programs in School Psychology are as follows:

- Data-Based Decision Making and Accountability
- Consultation and Collaboration
- Effective instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills
- Socialization and Development of Life Skills
- Student Diversity in Development and Learning
- School and System Organization, Policy Development, and Climate
- Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health
- Home/School Community Collaboration

- Research and Program Evaluation
- School Psychology Practice and Development
- Information Technology

The required knowledge/skills and how to assess them are well defined in the NASP 2000 Standards for Training and Field Placement Programs in School Psychology; however, what training programs should do once a competency problem is identified is not well defined. The NASP Standards for Training and Field Placement Programs in School Psychology does state in Section IV that programs must ensure that candidates receive ongoing support during training that includes faculty advisement and supervision and that they apply specific published criteria, both objective and qualitative, that address academic and professional competencies, for the assessment and admission of candidates to the program at each level and for retention and progress monitoring.

Remediation

One way to assure that candidates receive the above provisions when they are identified as having a competency problem is to provide the student with an opportunity to remediate the problem. Research has shown that along with informing trainees of expected competencies, programs should inform trainees of their approaches for remediation (Forrest, Elman, Gizara, & Vacha-Haase, 1999; Kaslow et al., 2007). Yet, Olkin & Gaughen (1991) found that most of the programs reported that less than half of problem students were placed on remediation plans. Remediation, as a tool for addressing student competency problems, has been researched by different fields that are similar to school psychology, such as clinical and counseling psychology (Forrest et al., 1999;

Gilfoyle, 2008; Procidano, Busch-Rossnagel, Reznikoff, & Geisinger, 1995; Schwartz-Mette, 2009) and counseling (Foster & McAdams, 2009; McAdams & Foster, 2007; McAdams, Foster, & Ward, 2007). Even with this research there has been criticism of no specificity regarding procedural guidelines of remediation in counseling, psychology, and social work (Wilkerson, 2006). One study that included the field of school psychology was done by Huprich and Rudd (2004). They examined the frequency, type, and management of trainee impairment across clinical, counseling and school psychology doctoral programs and internships. Their results indicated that even though doctoral programs reported a greater frequency of trainee impairment, a greater percentage of internships had a policy and program in place for managing impairments than did doctoral programs.

Not only has there been little research with regards to school psychology but there is also limited empirical and conceptual literature addressing the options used by programs (Forrest et. al., 1999). Forrest & colleagues found through their research of the literature that “studies do not yet exist that examine the relationship between the type of impairment and the type of remediation plan, nor has anyone studied the efficacy of different types of remediation or the factors that correlate with positive or negative remediation outcomes”. However, Forrest et al. did find three studies that examined remediation options used by training programs: Kaczmarek & Connor, 1998; Olkin & Gaughen, 1991; Vacha-Haase, 1995. These three studies identified nine remediation options, which were: counseled out; extra coursework; increased supervision; leave of absence; leave program; personal therapy; repeat practicum; growth group; and tutoring. A few of these options warrant caution when implementing. If a student is asked to leave

the program it should only be after the student had received appropriate chances to remediate his or her problem or if the problem was severe enough to warrant immediate dismissal (Gilfoyle, 2008; NASP Standards of Training and Field Placement Programs in School Psychology Section 5.4, 2000). Another option that has been cautioned against is personal therapy. This option has warranted caution for several reasons such as there are no studies about the effectiveness in remediating competency problems (Kaslow et al., 2007); the therapist might identify a disability, which brings ADA protections (Gilfoyle, 2008); the reason for psychotherapy needs to be linked to professional standards (Kaslow et al., 2007); and informed consent, avoidance of dual relationships, attention to cultural background, clarification related to confidentiality, and financial concerns (Cruise & Swerdlik, 2010). Repeating practicum could also warrant caution because the program is exposing children, youth, families and other consumers to a potentially detrimental environment (Cruise & Swerdlik, 2010; NASP Standards of Training and Field Placement Programs in School Psychology, 2000).

According to Forrest et al. (1999), “We have fallen short of our commitments to scientist-practitioner or scholar-practitioner training models because we have not gathered data on how we design, implement, and evaluate remediation plans established to address trainee deficiencies” (p. 650-651). As can be seen there is not only a need for a study that examines exactly how training programs remediate students with competency problems but there is also a need for specific research as it pertains to school psychology because of the field’s unique relationship with schools and the populations they serve.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the current study was to gather data from National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) approved training programs in order to explore how they have handled competency problems in the past. It explored how common competency problems are; how NASP training programs notify students once a competency problem has been identified; what (if any) remediation methods are most often used; which remediation methods are most effective; and how often competency problems result in dismissal.

Research Questions

- What percentage of NASP approved programs have an operationalized definition of competence?
- How do NASP approved programs inform their trainees of the competencies expected of them?
- How are students notified once they have been identified as having a competency problem?
- What is the most common procedure training programs use once a student is identified as having a competency problem?
- Do educational specialist training programs use remediation plans at a different level than doctoral programs?
- Do programs handle competency problems identified during internship differently?
- What academic problem most often leads to remediation?

- What academic problem is most difficult to remediate?
- Who is involved in the development and monitoring of the remediation plan?
- What information should be included in the development of the remediation plan?
- What is the most often used timeframe for remediation plans?
- What remediation interventions are most used?
- Which interventions are most successful?
- What alternative methods are used to remediate students with competency problems?
- Are there interventions that work well with particular problems?
- How successful are remediation plans?
- Do schools with remediation plans have lower dismissals rates than schools that do not use remediation plans?
- How common are contested decisions?

Chapter II

Method

Participants

All program representatives of NASP approved programs were sent an e-mail that explained the purpose of the survey and how they could access the survey on Survey Monkey. However there were four faulty e-mail addresses; therefore, four programs did not receive an opportunity to participate in the study. Thirty five surveys were collected on-line via Survey Monkey. Thirty two program representatives were given hard copies at the 2010 Annual NASP Conference held in Chicago. A total of 67 surveys were collected out of the possible 182. Out of these 67 surveys, 61 were fully completed. The 67 respondents represented 27 different states; 11 states located in the East, 8 in the Midwest, and 8 in the West.

Instrument

A survey was created to gather information pertaining to the notification of a problem, details related to remediation plans, and dismissals. It was composed of 37 varying types of questions. The composition of questions is as follows: 6-dichotomous, 17-multiple choice, 6-ranking, and 8-open-ended. The survey was made available on Survey Monkey and given to 32 program representatives at the 2010 Annual NASP Conference.

Design and Procedure

All program representatives of NASP approved training programs (educational specialist or equivalent and doctorate programs) were sent an e-mail explaining the survey and its purpose. A link to Survey Monkey was embedded in the e-mail from

which the program representatives were able to access the survey. Approximately a week after the e-mail was sent a follow-up e-mail was sent out. Then after approximately another week a second follow-up e-mail was sent out to all program representatives. There were four faulty e-mail addresses; therefore, these program representatives did not receive an opportunity to participate in the study. Surveys were also completed by 32 program representatives at the 2010 Annual NASP Conference.

Chapter III

Results

The data collected from the surveys were analyzed using Chi Square and a frequency analysis. The initial goal of using Chi Square was to determine if educational specialist or equivalent degree programs used remediation plans at a different rate than doctoral degree programs. However, all respondents used remediation plans; therefore, there was no difference between doctoral or specialist programs. As a result the goal of the Chi Square analysis was adjusted to determine if there were significant differences between educational specialist or equivalent programs and doctoral degree programs with regards to seven questions from the survey. The seven questions were chosen for two reasons; they provided the necessary data to calculate Chi Square and addressed more salient issues. The results of this analysis yielded no significant differences at $p < 0.05$ between the two types of degrees on any of the seven questions (See Table 1).

Most programs (96.9%) use student handbooks to familiarize trainees of professional competencies expected of them (See Table 4). Programs also review the expectancies in an introductory class (87.5%), use the program website (54.7%), and distribute information on NASP program requirements (37.5%) (See Table 4). Programs usually identify a competency problem during the first practicum (43.5%), while 29% identified them in the first semester, 21% in the second semester, 21% in the second practicum, and 6.5% during the internship (See Table 5). For students identified during their internship the most commonly used procedure of programs was a combination of additional supervision and remedial coursework selected by 58.6%; while additional supervision alone was selected by 56.9%, repetition of internship was selected by 48.3%,

removal of student from internship placement was selected by 41.4%, remedial coursework was selected by 32.8% and nothing (or no action) was selected by 3.4% of the respondents (See Table 6). The most commonly used next step once a student has been identified as having a professional competency problem was the development of a remediation plan (90.5%), followed by probation (12.7%), then inform the student but not taking action (9.5%), then not notifying the student but monitoring him or her for a period of time (7.9%), and lastly immediate dismissal (1.6%) (See Table 7). Sixty four of the 67 answered whether their program utilized remediation plans, of which all 64 selected yes (See Table 8).

The most commonly used approach to developing a remediation plan was a team approach that included the faculty and student working together (68.3%) (See Table 9). This approach was followed by the faculty making the plan without the student (28.6%) and only 3.2% have the program director make the plan alone (See Table 9). The source of information that is most used in the development of a remediation plan was formal faculty reviews of student's progress (95.2%), followed by course work (85.7%), student's self-assessment (57.1%), and review by mentor (47.6%) (See Table 10). The most used timeframe for a remediation plan was less than or equal to one semester (70%), followed by 2 semesters (28.3%), and least used was more than 2 semesters (1.7%) (See Table 11). The faculty advisor was found to be the person most often responsible for monitoring the remediation plan (52.5%) (See Table 12). Whenever a student does not make adequate progress within the timeframe 47.6% of the respondents adjust the remediation plan, while 41.3% dismiss the student, and 41.3% also use probation (See

Table 13). Of the programs that do make adjustments, only 37.7% adjust the plan one time, while 11.3% adjust it two times, and 1.9% adjust it three times (See Table 14).

The most often occurring professional competency issue is intrapersonal issues 63.3%, followed by academic issues (36.7%), then interpersonal communication or boundary issues (31.7%), next was no prominence of one particular problem (25%), and last was practicing outside of competency (3.3%) (See Table 15). Response to supervision averaged the highest ranking for the type of nonacademic problem that most often leads to remediation, next was interpersonal communication, followed by intrapersonal issues, then professionalism, and lastly was the student's lack of self-awareness with regards to weaknesses (See Table 16). Most of the programs (43.9%) selected intrapersonal issues as the most difficult to remediate, while 42.1% selected a student's lack of self-awareness with regards to weaknesses, this was followed by interpersonal communication (21.1%), then response to supervision (19.3%), and last was professionalism (3.5%) (See Table 17). Increased supervision averaged the highest ranking for most used interventions for nonacademic problems (See Table 18). It was followed by personal therapy, then counseled out, next was repeating courses or practicum, then additional coursework, then tutoring, and last was the use of growth groups (See Table 18). Increased supervision also averaged the highest ranking for most successful intervention used for nonacademic problems (See Table 19). It was followed by counseled out, then personal therapy, next repeated courses or practicum, then additional coursework, tutoring, and last was growth groups (See Table 19).

A lack of assessment proficiency averaged the highest ranking for academic problem that most often leads to remediation (See Table 20). It was followed by

inadequate consultation/collaboration, then failure to use data-based decision making, insufficient knowledge of ethics and law, inadequate counseling, lack of knowledge pertaining to school systems, and last was lack of knowledge pertaining to behavior modification (See Table 20). The academic problem that is most difficult to remediate was failure to utilize data-based decision making (34.7%), which was followed by lack of assessment proficiency (22.4%), inadequate counseling (18.4%), inadequate consultation/collaboration (16.3%), lack of knowledge pertaining to school systems (16.3%), insufficient knowledge of ethics and law (2%), and lack of knowledge pertaining to behavior modification (0%) (See Table 21). Additional coursework averaged the highest ranking for intervention most used for academic problems, followed by increased supervision, repeat course/practicum, tutoring, counseled out, personal therapy, and lastly growth group (See Table 22). Additional coursework also averaged the highest ranking for the intervention that was most successful (See Table 23). Next was increased supervision, then repeat course/practicum, counseled out, tutoring, personal therapy, and last was growth group (See Table 23). When comparing academic to nonacademic problems 98.7% of respondents chose nonacademic problems as the most difficult to remediate (See Table 24). The usual outcome of remediation was a resumption of program activities, which was selected by 69.9% (See Table 25). It was followed by revisions and remediation to continue (14.3%), and then dismissal (8.9%) (See Table 25).

As for dismissal, 68.3% said they have formally dismissed a student from their program (See Table 26). Most of the respondents (70.2%) notify students of due process during the formal meeting when the student is made aware of his or her problem (See Table 27). An action letter was used by 59.6%, while 40.4% notified the student during

the development of the remediation plan, and 24.6% notified the student before they were dismissed (See Table 27). Thirty seven of the programs have criteria for automatic dismissal, while 23 do not (See Table 28). Twenty three respondents said they have utilized the automatic dismissal, while 38 have not (See Table 29). Thirty five percent of 20 respondents used the automatic dismissal because a trainee was unprofessional in their actions with parents, teachers, and/or school administrators (See Table 30). Of these 20 respondents, 25% used automatic dismissal because of plagiarism and another 25% used it because of a student's failure to respond feedback from faculty (See Table 30). Conversely 20% of the 20 respondents used automatic dismissal because of inappropriate conduct with a student being served and another 20% used it because the trainee did not make specific progress (See Table 30).

Chapter IV

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to gather data from National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) approved training programs in order to explore how they have handled competency problems in their programs. A survey consisting of 37 questions was distributed via two modes, online and at the 2010 Annual NASP Conference. The finding that was most unexpected was that all respondents used remediation plans and a large portion (90.5%) used remediation plans as the next step once a student was identified as having a competency problem. This is in contrast to the literature. For instance Olkin & Gaughen (1991) found most of the programs reported that less than half of problem students were placed on remediation plans. A recent chapter in *The Handbook of Education, Training, and Supervisions of School Psychologist in School and Community Volume II* by Cruise and Swerdlik (2010) discusses the best practices of handling problematic school psychology candidates. This chapter provides a model for assessing and intervening with trainees who have competency problems.

With Cruise and Swerdlik's (2010) chapter just recently being published, it brings up an interesting question. Have programs been practicing what they outline as best practices? Cruise and Swerdlik's 2010 chapter suggests clearly defining tasks and level of skill trainees must meet to be deemed competent and reviewing these throughout their training. This study found that 77.8% of the programs surveyed have a written operationalized definition of professional competence. It also found that most programs use student handbooks (96.7%) and their introductory class into the program (87.5%) to familiarize their students with the competencies that are required of them. Other methods

used were the program website (54.7%) and distribution of information pertaining to NASP program requirements (37.5%). Cruise and Swerdlik (2010) also suggest using multiple informants, beyond one supervisor, from diverse environments. This study found that 68.3% of the programs surveyed use a team approach that includes faculty and the student, 28.6% use only faculty without the student, and 3.2% of the programs use only the program director to make the plan. This leads to another important aspect that Cruise and Swerdlik (2010) address: involvement of the student. Cruise and Swerdlik (2010) suggest that self-assessment is an important skill school psychology trainees need to develop. This survey found that 57.1% of respondents used self-assessment as part of the information used in the development of a remediation plan. Other sources of information included faculty reviews of student progress (95.2%), coursework (85.7%), and review by mentor (47.6%). Lastly, Cruise and Swerdlik (2010) suggest that once a problematic behavior is identified, the concerns should be communicated to the trainee both orally and in writing. This study found that 90.5% develop remediation plan, 12.7% put the trainee on probation, 9.5% inform the trainee but no remediation plan is developed, 7.6% do not notify the trainee but continue to monitor the trainee's progress, and 1.6% immediately dismiss the trainee.

Cruise & Swerdlik (2010) also discuss what should be included in a remediation plan; however they do not discuss what methods of remediation are most used, successful, or if one method is best for a specific problem. The data collected through this study also begins to explore the answers to these questions. According to the 67 surveys collected the most often used and successful intervention for academic problems is additional coursework with increased supervision slightly behind it. The most often used

and successful intervention for nonacademic problems was increased supervision with counseling out slightly behind it. These findings are in contrast to the studies of Kaczmarek & Connor (1998), Olkin & Gaughen (1991), Vacha-Haase (1995) who all found that personal therapy was the most commonly used strategy. As for the question, are there methods that are particularly effective with specific problems? The following responses were given: personal therapy for mental health problems; combination of therapy and increased supervision for mental health problems; group therapy for substance abuse; individual therapy for anxiety; increased supervision for interns; reviewing course, retaking course, and tutoring for academic problems; and APA continuing education on-line for ethics issues.

Research also suggests a need for data on how we design, implement, and evaluate remediation plans established to address trainee deficiencies (Forrest et al., 1999). Again this study strived to initiate the data collection in order to explore the answers to these questions. According to the data collected for this study remediation plans were most often developed by a team approach that includes the faculty and student working together to formulate a plan. The second most used strategy was the faculty without the student. The information that is most frequently used in the development of a remediation plan is faculty reviews of the student's progress, with course work slightly behind it. The most frequently used timeline for remediation plans was found to be less than or equal to a semester. The person who is most often responsible for the monitoring of the remediation plan was the student's faculty advisor. If the student does not make adequate progress within the remediation time frame the most common result is an adjustment to the remediation plan. However student dismissal and probation were close

behind. The most common number of adjustments made to a remediation plan is one. However several respondents specified that it depended on the situation.

Arguably the most important question is how effective are remediation plans? Forrest et al. (1999) report that through their meta-analysis of research they were unable to find any studies that assessed how common certain outcomes of remediation were. According to the data collected 69.6% of 56 respondents indicated that the usual outcome of the remediation plan was that the student was back on track and resumed the typical program; however, the question did not specify whether the student graduated. Other outcomes were revising the remediation plan because it was not effective the first time (14.3%), and dismissal (7.1%). Five respondents also selected the Other choice. Their responses were “student chooses to leave the program after consultation with faculty and director”, “50/50 for me so far”, “the first and third choices above”, “both the first two choices above”, and “wait for the student to disappear”.

Limitations and Future Considerations

The following study is not without limitations. There were several learning opportunities provided throughout the process of this study. The first and foremost was the instrument that was used to gather data, the survey. This survey had 37 questions with eight of the questions being open ended. Two of these open ended questions were asking the respondent to indicate ratios. This resulted in several types of answers from percentages to whole numbers. Therefore it is suggested for future consideration that any ratio question be written in a multiple choice format with ranges of specific ratios. This approach will enable more precise data analysis. These questions were not the only poorly defined questions. The question asking how many trainees the program had should

have been defined more precisely. As a result of the broadly defined question responses included amounts representing a single cohort; a whole program, total over five campuses, total over a certain amount of years, total over the two types of degrees, and numbers that were not specifically defined. This leads to the next limitation, terminology confusion. In the future all terms used should be more explicitly defined. Another limitation of the survey was the length and breadth. Although the survey addressed a lot of important information, there might have been more respondents if it were shorter and more specific. In the future it might be beneficial to break such a survey into sections (e.g. remediation plan development, remediation interventions, dismissal, etc.) and then have separate, yet associated, researchers send out the surveys.

It should also be considered that not all respondents were program directors. Several of the respondents that completed the survey at the 2010 Annual NASP Conference were not program directors of their particular program. It is possible that respondents to the online survey may not have been the program directors. Allowing these other respondents was necessary in order to build upon the number of surveys collected. However, the respondents' knowledge of their program may be limited if they were not the program director. Although this study did have its limitations it began the basis of data that will enable school psychology trainee programs to remediate students more effectively and efficiently.

References

- Cruise, T.K. & Swerdlik, M.E. (2010). Problematic behaviors: Mediating differences and negotiating change. In J. Kaufman, T.L.Hughes, & C.A. Riccio, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Education, Training, and Supervisions of School Psychologist in School and Community Volume II* (129-152). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Elman, N.S., & Forrest, L. (2007). From trainee impairment to professional competence problems: Seeking new terminology that facilitates effective action. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 38, 501-509.
- Forrest, L., Elman, N., Gizara, S., & Vacha-Haase, T. (1999). Trainee impairments: Identifying, remediating, and terminating impaired trainees in psychology. *The Clinical Psychologist*, 27, 627-686.
- Foster, V.A. & McAdams, C.R. (2009). A framework for creating a climate of transparency for professional performance assessment: Fostering student investment in gatekeeping. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 48, 271-284.
- Gilfoyle, N. (2008, November). The legal exosystem: Risk management in addressing student competence problems in professional psychology training. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 2(4), 202-209.
- Huprich, S.K., & Rudd, M.D. (2004). A national survey of trainee in clinical, counseling, and school psychology doctoral programs and internships. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 60(1), 43-52.
- Kaczmarek, M., & Connor, C. (1998, February). A survey of doctoral programs: Remediation. In N. Elman (Chair), *Trainee impairment*. Symposium presented at

the annual meeting of the Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs, Scottsdale, AZ.

Kaslow, N.J., Rubin, N.J., Forrest, L., Elman, N.S., Van Horne, B.A., Jacobs, S.C., & Thorn, B.E. (2007). Recognizing, assessing, and intervening with problems of professional competence. *Psychology: Research and Practice, 38*, 479-492.

McAdams, C. R., III, & Foster, V.A. (2007). A guide to just and fair remediation of counseling students with professional performance deficiencies. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 47*, 2-13.

McAdams, C.R., III, Foster, V.A., & Ward, T.J. (2007). Remediation and dismissal policies in counselor education: Lessons learned from a challenge in federal court. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 46*, 212-229.

National Association of School Psychologists. (2000a). *Standards for training and field placement programs in school psychology*. Bethesda, MD: Author.

National Association of School Psychologists. (2000b). *Professional conduct manual: Principles of professional ethics and standards for the provision of school psychological services*. Bethesda, MD: Author.

Olkin, R., & Gaughen, S. (1991, June). Evaluation of dismissal of students in master's level. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 30*(4), 276.

Procidano, M.E., Busch-Rossnagel, N., Reznikoff, M., & Geisinger, K.F. (1995). Responding to graduate students' professional deficiencies: A national survey. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 51*(3), 426-433.

Schwartz-Mette, R.A. (2009). Challenges in addressing graduate student impairment in academic professional psychology programs. *Ethics & Behavior, 19*(2), 91-102.

Vacha-Haase, T. (1995, August). *Impaired graduate students in APA-approved clinical, counseling, and school psychology programs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas.

Wester, S., Christianson, H., Fouad, N., & Santiago-Rivera, A. (2008, November).

Information processing as problem solving: A collaborative approach to dealing with students exhibiting insufficient competence. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 2(4), 193-201.

Wilkerson, K. (2006). Impaired students: Applying the therapeutic process model to graduate training programs. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 45, 207-217.

Tables

TABLE 1

Chi Square Value and Significance Level for Ed.S or equivalent vs. Ed.D or equivalent

Question	df=	Significance Level
What is the usual outcome of remediation?	2	No
What type of nonacademic problem is most difficult to remediate?	4	No
What type of academic problem is most difficult to remediate?	4	No
What information is used in the development of a remediation plan?	3	No
What is the most commonly used next step for a student identified as having a professional competency problem?	4	No
When are problems usually identified?	4	No
What is your designated procedure if a professional competency issue is not identified until the student is already placed in internship?	4	No

TABLE 2

What degree(s) is awarded at your school? (If your school has both degrees answer survey as it pertains to the highest degree awarded)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Ed.S (or equivalent)	56.3%	36
Ph.D (or equivalent)	43.8%	28
	<i>answered question</i>	64
	<i>skipped question</i>	3

TABLE 3

Does your graduate program have a documented (written) operationalized definition of professional competence? (Please select one)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	77.8%	49
No	22.2%	14
	<i>answered question</i>	63
	<i>skipped question</i>	4

TABLE 4

How do students become aware and acquainted with the requirements expected of them associated with professional competence? (Select all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Student handbook	96.9%	62
Program website	54.7%	35
Reviewed in introductory class into the program	87.5%	56
Distributed information on NASP program requirements	37.5%	24
	<i>answered question</i>	64
	<i>skipped question</i>	3

TABLE 5
When are problems usually identified?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1st semester	29.0%	18
2nd semester	21.0%	13
1st practicum	43.5%	27
2nd practicum	21.0%	13
Internship	6.5%	4
Other (please specify)	32.3%	20
	<i>answered question</i>	62
	<i>skipped question</i>	5

TABLE 6
What is your designated procedure if a professional competency issue is not identified until the student is already placed in internship? (Select all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Repeat internship	48.3%	28
Remedial coursework is completed during internship	32.8%	19
The student is removed from internship placement	41.4%	24
Additional supervision is provided	56.9%	33
Combination of additional supervision and remedial coursework	58.6%	34
Nothing	3.4%	2
	<i>answered question</i>	58
	<i>skipped question</i>	9

TABLE 7

What is the most commonly used next step once a student is identified as having problems with professional competence?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Immediate dismissal	1.6%	1
Probation	12.7%	8
Remediation plan is developed.	90.5%	57
The student is informed of the problem but no remediation plan is devised.	9.5%	6
The student is not notified but the faculty discuss the issue among themselves so the student can be further monitored for a period of time	7.9%	5
	<i>answered question</i>	63
	<i>skipped question</i>	4

TABLE 8

Does your program utilize remediation plans?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	100.0%	64
No	0.0%	0
	<i>answered question</i>	64
	<i>skipped question</i>	3

TABLE 9

How are remediation plans developed in your program?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Team approach (faculty and student work together to formulate plan)	68.3%	43
Program Director alone makes the plan	3.2%	2
The faculty together make the plan without the student present	28.6%	18
Other (please specify)	14.3%	9
	<i>answered question</i>	63
	<i>skipped question</i>	4

TABLE 10

**What information is used in the development of a remediation plan?
(Select all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Student's self-assessments	57.1%	36
Faculty reviews of student progress (formal)	95.2%	60
Course work (grades on tests, papers, and assignments; quality of work submitted)	85.7%	54
Review by mentor	47.6%	30
Other (please specify)	25.4%	16
	<i>answered question</i>	63
	<i>skipped question</i>	4

TABLE 11

What timeframe (goal date) is generally put in place for remediation plans for students in your program? (summer terms are considered semesters)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
≤ 1 semester (or equivalent)	70.0%	42
2 semesters (or equivalent)	28.3%	17
More than 2 semesters	1.7%	1
	<i>answered question</i>	60
	<i>skipped question</i>	7

TABLE 12

Who monitors the remediation plan once it is put in place?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
• The student is responsible for making regular reports or submitting information on a regular basis to show data towards progress	14.8%	9
• The program director monitors the student's work by consulting with faculty and following up with regular meetings with the student	36.1%	22
• The internship supervisor	13.1%	8
• Faculty Advisor	52.5%	32
• The student's mentor	8.2%	5
• A team approach including the student with multiple members listed above (professors, director, mentor, etc)	31.1%	19
	<i>answered question</i>	61
	<i>skipped question</i>	6

TABLE 13

What occurs if the student does not make adequate progress during the remediation time frame?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Remediation plan is adjusted	47.6%	30
The student is dismissed	41.3%	26
Probation is used (i.e., utilizing university's policy for academic probation)	41.3%	26
Other (please specify)	31.7%	20
	<i>answered question</i>	63
	<i>skipped question</i>	4

TABLE 14

If adjustments were made to the remediation plan, how many times can the plan be altered before it is determined that the plan did not work?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
1	37.7%	20
2	11.3%	6
3	1.9%	1
Other (please specify)	49.1%	26
	<i>answered question</i>	53
	<i>skipped question</i>	14

TABLE 15
Which of the following types of professional competency issues occur most often in your experience?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
• Academic issues (e.g., knowledge of assessments, consultation, therapy, interventions, etc.)	36.7%	22
• Students have interpersonal communication problems or boundary issues with the professionals with whom they interact in their field experiences.	31.7%	19
• Students have intrapersonal issues (problems with mental health, personal factors, high stress, etc.) that contribute to their identified competency issues.	63.3%	38
• Student practices outside of his/her qualifications and/or competency.	3.3%	2
• They often co-occur; there does not seem to be a pattern where one is more prominent than the other.	25.0%	15
	<i>answered question</i>	60
	<i>skipped question</i>	7

TABLE 16

What type of nonacademic problem most often leads to remediation? (Rank as many as have been encountered; with 1 being the most often)

Answer Options	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
• Response to Supervision (e.g., student does not respond well to constructive criticism or passively accepts it but then no change in behavior is observed)	2.13	100	47
• Difficulty with interpersonal communication (e.g., consultation/communication with parents, colleagues, or teachers)	2.42	104	43
• Complaints from student's mentor about professionalism (i.e., mentor witnesses an act of incompetence meriting significant concern)	2.86	120	42
• Intrapersonal issues (e.g., problems with hygiene, high stress, mental health, personal factors)	2.60	117	45
• The student seems to lack self-awareness with regard to weaknesses	3.33	133	40
		<i>answered question</i>	59
		<i>skipped question</i>	8

TABLE 17**What type of nonacademic problem is most difficult to remediate?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
• Response to Supervision (e.g., student does not respond well to constructive criticism or passively accepts it but then no change in behavior is observed)	19.3%	11
• Difficulty with interpersonal communication (e.g., consultation/communication with parents, colleagues, or teachers)	21.1%	12
• Complaints from student's mentor about professionalism (i.e., mentor witnesses an act of incompetence meriting significant concern)	3.5%	2
• Intrapersonal issues (e.g., problems with hygiene, high stress, mental health, personal factors)	43.9%	25
• The student seems to lack self-awareness with regard to weaknesses	42.1%	24
	<i>answered question</i>	57
	<i>skipped question</i>	10

TABLE 18**Which interventions are most used for nonacademic problems? (Rank as many as have been used; with 1 being the most used)**

Answer Options	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
Counseled Out (i.e. counseling a student out of the program, perhaps into another field that fits their skills and attributes)	2.36	118	50
Additional coursework	3.28	82	25
Increase supervision	1.91	84	44
Personal therapy	2.20	66	30
Repeat courses (practicum)	2.56	82	32
Growth group	5.67	68	12
Tutoring	4.80	72	15
	<i>answered question</i>		58
	<i>skipped question</i>		9

TABLE 19

Rank the following interventions according to their successfulness for remediation of nonacademic problems (1 being the most successful).

Answer Options	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
• Counseled Out (i.e. counseling a student out of the program, perhaps into another field that fits their skills and attributes)	1.98	81	41
• Additional coursework	3.50	70	20
• Increase supervision	1.83	73	40
• Personal therapy	2.09	48	23
• Repeat courses (practicum)	2.63	71	27
• Growth group	5.70	57	10
• Tutoring	4.58	55	12
		<i>answered question</i>	56
		<i>skipped question</i>	11

TABLE 20

What type of academic problem most often leads to remediation? (Rank as many as have been encountered; with 1 being the most often)

Answer Options	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
• Lack of assessment proficiency	1.73	69	40
• Inadequate consultation/collaboration	2.24	47	21
• Lack of knowledge pertaining to school systems	3.60	54	15
• Failure to correctly utilize data to make decisions or develop plans (data-based decision making)	2.45	76	31
• Inadequate counseling	3.41	58	17
• Lack of sufficient knowledge of Ethics and law	2.63	50	19
• Lack of knowledge pertaining to Behavior Modification	5.20	52	10
		<i>answered question</i>	51
		<i>skipped question</i>	16

TABLE 21
What type of academic problem do you find is most difficult to remediate?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
• Lack of assessment proficiency	22.4%	11
• Inadequate consultation/collaboration	16.3%	8
• Lack of knowledge pertaining to school systems	16.3%	8
• Failure to correctly utilize data to make decisions or develop plans (data-based decision making)	34.7%	17
• Inadequate counseling	18.4%	9
• Lack of sufficient knowledge of Ethics and law	2.0%	1
• Lack of knowledge pertaining to Behavior Modification	0.0%	0
	<i>answered question</i>	49
	<i>skipped question</i>	18

TABLE 22
What interventions are most used for academic problems? (Rank as many as have been used; with 1 being the most used)

Answer Options	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
• Counseled Out (i.e. counseling a student out of the program, perhaps into another field that fits their skills and attributes)	2.72	79	29
• Additional coursework	1.61	53	33
• Increase supervision	1.85	63	34
• Personal therapy	4.25	17	4
• Repeat courses (practicum)	2.06	64	31
• Growth group	5.50	22	4
• Tutoring	2.63	42	16
	<i>answered question</i>		55
	<i>skipped question</i>		12

TABLE 23

Rank the following interventions according to their successfulness for remediation of academic problems (1 being the most successful).

Answer Options	Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
Counseled Out (i.e. counseling a student out of the program, perhaps into another field that fits their skills and attributes)	2.69	78	29
Additional coursework	1.85	61	33
Increase supervision	1.97	61	31
Personal therapy	4.50	27	6
Repeat courses (practicum)	2.03	65	32
Growth group	6.40	32	5
Tutoring	2.73	41	15
		<i>answered question</i>	53
		<i>skipped question</i>	14

TABLE 24

In your opinion, are nonacademic or academic problems more difficult to remediate? (please select one)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Nonacademic	98.3%	57
Academic	1.7%	1
	<i>answered question</i>	58
	<i>skipped question</i>	9

TABLE 25

What is the usual outcome of remediation?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
• Resume program activities as set forth in student plan (student is back on track)	69.6%	39
• The remediation plan often does not work the first time around and must be revised for the remediation process to continue	14.3%	8
• The student is dismissed	7.1%	4
• Other (please specify)	8.9%	5
	<i>answered question</i>	56
	<i>skipped question</i>	11

TABLE 26**Have you ever formally dismissed a student from your program?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	68.3%	41
No	31.7%	19
	<i>answered question</i>	60
	<i>skipped question</i>	7

TABLE 27**How do you notify students of Due Process procedures when they are at risk?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
In the action letter	59.6%	34
Formal meeting when student is made aware of problem	70.2%	40
During the development of the remediation plan	40.4%	23
Before they are dismissed	24.6%	14
Other (please specify)	12.3%	7
	<i>answered question</i>	57
	<i>skipped question</i>	10

TABLE 28**Does your program have criteria for certain issues of professional competence that lead to automatic dismissal?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	61.7%	37
No	38.3%	23
	<i>answered question</i>	60
	<i>skipped question</i>	7

TABLE 29**Have you ever had to utilize the criteria for automatic dismissal to actually dismiss a student from your program?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	26.9%	14
No	73.1%	38
	<i>answered question</i>	52
	<i>skipped question</i>	15

TABLE 30

If you answered “yes” to the above question, which issues have led to automatic dismissal? (Select all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
• Trainee’s Inappropriate conduct with a student being served	20.0%	4
• Student/Trainee is unprofessional in his or her interactions with parents, teachers, and/or school administrators (Boundary violation)	35.0%	7
• Failure to respond to feedback from faculty	25.0%	5
• Student/Trainee does not show continuous growth or make specific progress	20.0%	4
• Plagiarism	25.0%	5
• Other (please specify)	35.0%	7
	<i>answered question</i>	20
	<i>skipped question</i>	47

Survey

1. State:
2. What degree is awarded at your school? (If your school has both degrees answer survey as it pertains to the highest degree awarded)
 - a. Ed.S (or equivalent)
 - b. Ph.D (or equivalent)
3. Number of school psychology trainees in program:
4. Does your graduate program have a document (written) operationalized definition of professional competence? (Please select one)
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
5. How do students become aware and acquainted with the requirements expected of them associated with professional competence? (Select all that apply)
 - a. Student Handbook
 - b. Program website
 - c. Reviewed in introductory class into the program
 - d. Distributed information on NASP program requirements
6. How do you notify a student once a professional competence problem is identified? (Select all that apply)
 - a. An action letter
 - b. An informal meeting (i.e., discussion after class)
 - c. Faculty Advisor informs the student
 - d. Formal meeting (with multiple faculty by appointment)

- e. Other (please specify)
7. When are problems usually identified?
- a. 1st semester
 - b. 2nd semester
 - c. 1st practicum
 - d. 2nd practicum
 - e. Internship
 - f. Other (please specify)
8. What is your designated procedure if a professional competency issue is not identified until the student is already placed in internship? (Select all that apply)
- a. Repeat internship
 - b. Remedial coursework is completed during internship
 - c. The student is removed from internship placement
 - d. Additional supervision is provided
 - e. Combination of additional supervision and remedial coursework
 - f. Nothing
9. What is the most commonly used next step once a student is identified as having problems with professional competence?
- a. Immediate dismissal
 - b. Probation
 - c. Remediation plan is developed
 - d. The student is informed of the problem but no remediation plan is developed

- e. The student is not notified but the faculty discuss the issue among themselves so the student can be further monitored for a period of time
10. Does your program utilize remediation plans?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
11. Approximately what is the ratio of problematic students who receive remediation plans per graduating class?
12. How are remediation plans developed in your program?
- a. Team approach (faculty and student work together to formulate plan)
 - b. Program Director alone makes the plan
 - c. The faculty together make the plan without the student present
 - d. Other (please specify)
13. What information is used in the development of a remediation plan? (Select all that apply)
- a. Student's self-assessments
 - b. Faculty reviews of student progress (formal)
 - c. Course work (grades on tests, papers, and assignments; quality of work submitted)
 - d. Review by mentor
 - e. Other (please specify)
14. What timeframe (goal date) is generally put in place for remediation plans for students in you program? (summer terms are considered semesters)
- a. ≤ 1 semester (or equivalent)

- b. 2 semesters (or equivalent)
- c. More than 2 semesters

15. Who monitors the remediation plan once it is put in place?

- a. The student is responsible for making regular reports or submitting information on a regular basis to show data toward progress
- b. The program director monitors the student's work by consulting with the faculty and following up with regular meetings with the student
- c. The internship supervisor
- d. Faculty Advisor
- e. The student's mentor
- f. A team approach including the student with multiple members listed above (professors, director, mentor, etc.)

16. What occurs if the student does not make adequate progress during the remediation time frame?

- a. Remediation plan is adjusted
- b. The student is dismissed
- c. Probation is used (i.e., utilizing university's policy for academic probation)
- d. Other (please specify)

17. If adjustments were made to the remediation plan, how many times can the plan be altered before it is determined that the plan did not work?

- a. 1
- b. 2

- c. 3
- d. Other (please specify)

18. Which of the following types of professional competency issues occur most often in your experience?

- a. Academic issues (e.g., knowledge of assessments, consultation, therapy, interventions, etc.)
- b. Students have interpersonal communication problems or boundary issues with the professional with whom they interact in their field experiences.
- c. Students have intrapersonal issues (problems with mental health, personal factors, high stress, etc.) that contribute to their identified competency issues.
- d. Student practices outside of his/her qualifications and/or competency
- e. They often co-occur; there does not seem to be a pattern where one is more prominent than the other.

19. What type of nonacademic problem most often leads to remediation? (Rank as many as have been encountered; with 1 being the most often)

- a. Response to Supervision (e.g., student does not respond well to constructive criticism or passively accepts it but then no changes in behavior is observed)
- b. Difficulty with interpersonal communication (e.g., consultation/communication with parents, colleagues, or teachers)
- c. Complaints from student's mentor about professionalism (i.e., mentor witnesses an act of incompetence meriting significant concern)

- d. Intrapersonal issues (e.g., problems with hygiene, high stress, mental health, personal factors)
- e. The student seems to lack self-awareness with regard to weaknesses

20. What type of nonacademic problem is most difficult to remediate?

- a. Response to Supervision (e.g., student does not respond well to constructive criticism or passively accepts it but then no changes in behavior is observed)
- b. Difficulty with interpersonal communication (e.g., consultation/communication with parents, colleagues, or teachers)
- c. Complaints from student's mentor about professionalism (i.e., mentor witnesses an act of incompetence meriting significant concern)
- d. Intrapersonal issues (e.g., problems with hygiene, high stress, mental health, personal factors)
- e. The student seems to lack self-awareness with regard to weaknesses

21. Which interventions are most used for nonacademic problems? (Rank as many as have been used; with 1 being the most used)

- a. Counseled out (i.e., counseling a student out of the program, perhaps into another field that fits their skills and attributes)
- b. Additional coursework
- c. Increase supervision
- d. Personal therapy
- e. Repeat courses (practicum)
- f. Growth group

g. Tutoring

22. Rank the following interventions according to their successfulness for remediation of nonacademic problems (1 being the most successful)

a. Counseled out (i.e., counseling a student out of the program, perhaps into another field that fits their skills and attributes)

b. Additional coursework

c. Increase supervision

d. Personal therapy

e. Repeat courses (practicum)

f. Growth group

g. Tutoring

23. What type of academic problem most often leads to remediation? (Rank as many as have been encountered; 1 being the most often)

a. Lack of assessment proficiency

b. Inadequate consultation/collaboration

c. Lack of knowledge pertaining to school systems

d. Failure to correctly utilize data to make decisions or develop plans (data-based decision making)

e. Inadequate counseling

f. Lack of sufficient knowledge of ethics and law

g. Lack of knowledge pertaining to Behavior Modification

24. What type of academic problem do you find is most difficult to remediate?

a. Lack of assessment proficiency

- b. Inadequate consultation/collaboration
- c. Lack of knowledge pertaining to school systems
- d. Failure to correctly utilize data to make decisions or develop plans (data-based decision making)
- e. Inadequate counseling
- f. Lack of sufficient knowledge o ethics and law
- g. Lack of knowledge pertaining to Behavior Modification

25. What interventions are most used for academic problems? (Rank as many as have been used; with 1 being the most used)

- a. Counseled out (i.e., counseling a student out of the program, perhaps into another field that fits their skills and attributes)
- b. Additional coursework
- c. Increase supervision
- d. Personal therapy
- e. Repeat courses (practicum)
- f. Growth group
- g. Tutoring

26. Rank the following interventions according to their successfulness for remediation of academic problems (1 being the most successful)

- a. Counseled out (i.e., counseling a student out of the program, perhaps into another field that fits their skills and attributes)
- b. Additional coursework
- c. Increase supervision

- d. Personal therapy
- e. Repeat courses (practicum)
- f. Growth group
- g. Tutoring

27. In your opinion, are personal or academic problems more difficult to remediate?

(please select one)

- a. Nonacademic
- b. Academic

28. What is the usual outcome of remediation?

- a. Resume program activities as set forth in student plan (student is back on track)
- b. The remediation plan often does not work the first time around and must be revised for the remediation process to continue
- c. The student is dismissed
- d. Other (please specify)

29. Have you ever formally dismissed a student from your program?

- a. Yes
- b. No

30. What is the ratio of students that are dismissed per graduation class?

31. How do you notify students of Due Process procedure when they are at risk?

- a. In the action letter
- b. Formal meeting when student is made aware of problem
- c. During the development of the remediation plan

- d. Before they are dismissed
 - e. Other (please specify)
32. Does your program have criteria for certain issues of professional competence that lead to automatic dismissal?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
33. Have you ever had to utilize the criteria for automatic dismissal to actually dismiss a student from your program?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
34. If you answered “yes” to the above question , which issues have led to automatic dismissal? (Select all that apply)
- a. Trainee’s inappropriate conduct with a student being served
 - b. Student/Trainee is unprofessional in his or her interactions with parents, teachers, and/or school administrators (boundary violation)
 - c. Failure to respond to feedback from faculty
 - d. Student/Trainee does not show continuous growth or make specific
 - e. Plagiarism
 - f. Other (please specify)
35. How many times have you had a student contest a dismissal decision during your time as program director?
36. Have you identified interventions that work well with particular problems?
(please specify)

37. Have you identified problems that were not addressed in this survey?

38. Other Comments: