|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1A: Practicum Field Supervisor Ratings | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Candidate** | **Domain 1** | **Domain 2** | **Domain 3** | **Domain 4** | **Domain 5** | **Domain 6** | **Domain 7** | **Domain 8** | **Domain 9** | **Domain 10** | **Domain 11** | **Candidate Average** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.25 | 2 | 2 | 2 | . | 2 | 3 | **2.13** |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1.5 | 2 | 2 | 1.5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | **2.0** |
| 3 | 2.33 | 2.4 | 2 | 2.5 | 2.25 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | **2.32** |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2.67 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **2.15** |
| 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.25 | 2.5 | . | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **2.08** |
| 6 | 3 | 2.67 | 2 | 2.5 | 2.75 | 2.25 | 2.5 | 3 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 3 | **2.62** |
| 7 | 3 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | **2.89** |
| **Cohort Average** | **2.33** | **2.27** | **2.07** | **2.14** | **2.36** | **2.46** | **2.25** | **2.38** | **2.25** | **2.23** | **2.71** | **2.31** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1B: Internship Field Supervisor Ratings | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Candidate** | **Domain 1** | **Domain 2** | **Domain 3** | **Domain 4** | **Domain 5** | **Domain 6** | **Domain 7** | **Domain 8** | **Domain 9** | **Domain 10** | **Domain 11** | **Candidate Average** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.29 | 2 | **2.13** |
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | **3.0** |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | **3.0** |
| 4 | 3 | 2.8 | 2.71 | 2.67 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2.83 | 2.75 | 3 | 3 | **2.89** |
| 5 | 2.67 | 2.6 | 2.57 | 2.33 | 3 | 2.4 | 2.67 | 2.8 | 3 | 2.71 | 2.67 | **2.67** |
| 6 | 2.92 | 2.86 | 2.93 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2.25 | 3 | 2.86 | 3 | **2.89** |
| 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | **3.0** |
| 8 | 2.6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2.57 | 3 | **2.92** |
| 9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2.67 | **2.97** |
| 10 | 2.33 | 2.2 | 2 | 2 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2 | 2.17 | 2 | 2.29 | 3 | **2.26** |
| 11 | Sally | Boyles | Aug | Grad |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **--** |
| **Cohort Average** | **2.75** | **2.75** | **2.72** | **2.7** | **2.9** | **2.84** | **2.77** | **2.71** | **2.76** | **2.77** | **2.83** | **2.77** |

Table 2A: Faculty FRF Ratings by Case Evaluated

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2A-1. 2013 FRF and Overall Faculty Rating**  **Portfolio Evaluation: *Academic Intervention Case*** | | | | | | | | |
| Candidate | FRF  Rating  1 | FRF  Rating  2 | **Ave**  **FRF Ratinga** | Comp  Met  (Y/N) | Overall  Rating  1 | Overall  Rating  2 | **Ave Overall Ratingb** | Comp  Met  (Y/N) |
| Candidate 1 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 2 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 3 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 4 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 5 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 6 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 7 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 8 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Candidate 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Candidate 11 | Aug | Grad |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cohort**  **Data** | **--** | **--** |  | **/10;**  **%** | **--** | **--** |  | **/10;**  **%** |

a Candidates are expected to achieve an average FRF rating of 85% or greater for competency.

b Candidates are expected to achieve an average overall faculty rating of ‘3’ or greater for competency.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2A-2. 2013 FRF and Overall Faculty Rating**  **Portfolio Evaluation: *Behavioral Consultation Case*** | | | | | | | | |
| Candidate | FRF  Rating  1 | FRF  Rating  2 | **Ave**  **FRF Ratinga** | Comp  Met  (Y/N) | Overall  Rating  1 | Overall  Rating  2 | **Ave Overall Ratingb** | Comp  Met  (Y/N) |
| Candidate 1 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 2 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 3 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 4 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 5 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 6 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 7 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 8 |  |  |  | Y |  |  |  | Y |
| Candidate 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Candidate 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Candidate 11 | Aug | Grad |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cohort**  **Data** | **--** | **--** |  | **/10;**  **%** | **--** | **--** |  | **/10;**  **%** |

a Candidates are expected to achieve an average FRF rating of 85% or greater for competency.

b Candidates are expected to achieve an average overall faculty rating of ‘3’ or greater for competency.

Table 2B: Faculty PIR Ratings by Case Evaluated

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2B-1. 2013 PIR Scores**  **Portfolio Evaluation: *Academic Intervention Case*** | | | | | | |
| Candidate | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | **Ave PIR Scorea** | Competency Met  (Yes/No) | **Total Ratings of ‘0’b** | Competency Met  (Yes/No) |
| Candidate 1 | 26 | 26 | **26** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 2 | 26 | 26 | **26** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 3 | 25 | 26 | **25.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 4 | 25 | 25 | **25** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 5 | 29 | 28 | **28.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 6 | 26 | 26 | **26** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 7 | 27 | 26 | **26.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 8 | 26 | 26 | **26** | Y | **0** | Y |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cohort**  **Data** |  |  | **26.19** | **8/8;**  **100%** | **0** | **8/8;**  **100%** |

a Candidates are expected to achieve an average PIR score equal or greater to the Cut Score of ‘24’ for competency.

b Candidates are expected to achieve zero total ratings of ‘0’ on the PIR for competency.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2B-2. 2013 PIR Scores**  **Portfolio Evaluation: *Assessment Case*** | | | | | | |
| Candidate | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | **Ave PIR Scorea** | Competency Met  (Yes/No) | **Total Ratings of ‘0’b** | Competency Met  (Yes/No) |
| Candidate 1 | 40 | 44 | **42** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 2 | 46 | 41 | **43.5** | Y | **1** | N |
| Candidate 3 | 42 | 42 | **42** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 4 | 40 | 42 | **41** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 5 | 45 | 42 | **43.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 6 | 42 | 42 | **42** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 7 | 42 | 42 | **42** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 8 | 42 | 42 | **42** | Y | **0** | Y |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cohort**  **Data** |  |  | **42.25** | **8/8;**  **100%** | **1** | **7/8;**  **87.5%** |

a Candidates are expected to achieve an average PIR score equal or greater to the Cut Score of ‘39’ for competency.

b Candidates are expected to achieve zero total ratings of ‘0’ on the PIR for competency.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2B-3. 2013 PIR Scores**  **Portfolio Evaluation: *Behavioral Consultation Case*** | | | | | | |
| Candidate | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | **Ave PIR Scorea** | Competency Met  (Yes/No) | **Total Ratings of ‘0’b** | Competency Met  (Yes/No) |
| Candidate 1 | 21 | 22 | **21.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 2 | 22 | 22 | **22** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 3 | 24 | 22 | **23** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 4 | 21 | 22 | **21.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 5 | 22 | 22 | **22** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 6 | 23 | 22 | **22.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 7 | 23 | 22 | **22.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 8 | 23 | 22 | **22.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cohort**  **Data** |  |  | **22.19** | **8/8;**  **100%** | **0** | **8/8;**  **100%** |

a Candidates are expected to achieve an average PIR score equal or greater to the Cut Score of ‘21’ for competency.

b Candidates are expected to achieve zero total ratings of ‘0’ on the PIR for competency.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2B-4. 2013 PIR Scores**  **Portfolio Evaluation: *Counseling Case*** | | | | | | |
| Candidate | PIR 1 | PIR 2 | **Ave PIR Scorea** | Competency Met  (Yes/No) | **Total Ratings of ‘0’b** | Competency Met  (Yes/No) |
| Candidate 1 | 23 | 21 | **22** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 2 | 22 | 22 | **22** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 3 | 24 | 21 | **22.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 4 | 24 | 22 | **23** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 5 | 24 | 22 | **23** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 6 | 24 | 22 | **23** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 7 | 22 | 22 | **22** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 8 | 22 | 22 | **22** | Y | **0** | Y |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cohort**  **Data** |  |  |  | **/10;**  **%** | **0** | **/10;**  **100%** |

a Candidates are expected to achieve an average PIR score equal or greater to the Cut Score of ‘21’ for competency.

b Candidates are expected to achieve zero total ratings of ‘0’ on the PIR for competency.

Table 3AB: Positive Impact Data for Quantitative Intervention Cases

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3AB-1. Positive Impact Statistics,**  **Academic Intervention Case** | | |
| Candidate | Effect  Size | PND |
| 1 | 4.88 | -- |
| 2 | -- | 75% |
| 3 | -- | 100% |
| 4 | -- | 100% |
| 5 | 1.99 | -- |
| 6 | 2.5 | 100% |
| 7 | 3.13 | 80% |
| 8 | -- | 100% |
| **Cohort Average** | **3.13** | **92.5%** |

\* = Average

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3AB-2. Positive Impact Statistics,**  **Behavioral Consultation Case** | | |
| Candidate | Effect  Size | PND |
| 1 | .48 | 100% |
| 2 | 25.13 | -- |
| 3 | 2.86 | -- |
| 4 | 1.39\* | -- |
| 5 | 7.11 | -- |
| 6 | 2.8 | 100% |
| 7 | .51\* | 77.3%\* |
| 8 | 1.44 | -- |
| **Cohort Average** | **5.22** | **92.4%** |

\* = Average