|  |
| --- |
| Table 1A: Practicum Field Supervisor Ratings |
|  |
| **Candidate** | **II** | **III** | **IV****4.1** | **IV****4.2** | **V****5.1** | **V****5.2** | **VI** | **VII** | **VIII****8.1** | **VIII****8.2** | **Candidate Average** |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.14 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.29 | **3.04** |
| 2 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3 | 3 | 3.88 | 3.33 | 3 | 3.5 | 3.125 | 3.17 | **3.28** |
| 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.54 | 4 | 4.5 | 4.25 | 5 | **4.13** |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2.67 | N/O | N/O | 2.63 | 2.33 | 3 | **2.70** |
| 5 | 3.63 | 3.28 | 3.62 | 3.77 | 4 | N/O | 3.66 | 3.37 | 3.71 | 3.7 | **3.64** |
| 6 | 3.9 | 3.57 | 3.66 | 4 | 3.66 | 3.36 | 3.57 | 4 | 4 | 3.94 | **3.77** |
| 7 | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | **.** |
| 8 | 3.125 | 3 | 3.11 | 3 | 3 | 3.2 | 3.14 | 3 | 3.125 | 3.35 | **3.11** |
| 9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | **3** |
| 10 | 3.63 | 4.14 | 3.125 | 3.3 | 3.44 | 3.41 | 3.45 | 3.5 | 3.66 | 3.7 | **3.54** |
| **Cohort Average** | **3.41** | **3.27** | **3.28** | **3.34** | **3.42** | **3.26** | **3.35** | **3.39** | **3.36** | **3.57** | **3.36** |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 1B: Internship Field Supervisor Ratings |
|  |
| **Candidate** | **II** | **III** | **IV****4.1** | **IV****4.2** | **V****5.1** | **V****5.2** | **VI** | **VII** | **VIII****8.1** | **VIII****8.2** | **Candidate Average** |
| 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4.53 | **4.05** |
| 2 | 3.4 | 3.17 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.18 | **3.08** |
| 3 | 3.64 | 3.86 | 3.67 | 3.6 | 4 | 3.42 | 3.91 | 3.38 | 3.43 | 4 | **3.69** |
| 4 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 4.78 | 4.8 | 4.44 | 4.17 | 4.64 | 5 | 4.56 | 4.82 | **4.56** |
| 5 | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | **.** |
| 6 | 4.09 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | **4.01** |
| 7 | 4.45 | 4.57 | 5 | 5 | 4.89 | 4.75 | 4 | 5 | 4.33 | 5 | **4.70** |
| **Cohort Average** | **3.98** | **3.96** | **4.08** | **4.07** | **4.06** | **3.89** | **3.93** | **4.06** | **3.89** | **4.26** | **4.02** |

Table 2A: Faculty FRF Ratings by Case Evaluated

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2A-1. 2013 FRF and Overall Faculty Rating****Portfolio Evaluation: *Academic Intervention Case*** |
| Candidate | FRFRating 1 | FRF Rating 2 | **Ave****FRF Ratinga** | Comp Met (Y/N) | Overall Rating 1 | OverallRating2 | **Ave Overall Ratingb** | CompMet (Y/N) |
| Candidate 1 | 100 | 92 | **96** | Y | . | 4 | **4** | Y |
| Candidate 2 | 92 | 100 | **96** | Y | 4 | 5 | **4.5** | Y |
| Candidate 3 | 92 | . | **92** | Y | 4 | . | **4** | Y |
| Candidate 4 | 100 | 100 | **100** | Y | 4 | 5 | **4.5** | Y |
| Candidate 5 | 92 | 92 | **92** | Y | 4 | . | **4** | Y |
| Candidate 6 | 100 | 100 | **100** | Y | 5 | 4 | **4.5** | Y |
| Candidate 7 | 88 | . | **88** | Y | 4 | . | **4** | Y |
| Candidate 8 | 92 | . | **92** | Y | 5 | . | **5** | Y |
| Candidate 9 | 100 | 100 | **100** | Y | 5 | 4 | **4.5** | Y |
| Candidate 10 | 100 | 96 | **98** | Y | 3 | 4 | **3.5** | Y |
| Candidate 11 | Aug | Grad |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cohort** **Data** | **--** | **--** | **95.4** | **10/10;****100%** | **--** | **--** | **4.25** | **10/10;****100%** |

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 | FRFRating 1 | FRF Rating 2 | **Ave****FRF Ratinga** | Comp Met (Y/N) | Overall Rating 1 | OverallRating2 | **Ave Overall Ratingb** | CompMet (Y/N) |
| Candidate 1 | 100 | 97 | **98.5** | Y | 4 | 5 | **4.5** | Y |
| Candidate 2 | 100 | 97 | **98.5** | Y | . | 5 | **5** | Y |
| Candidate 3 | 100 | 93 | **96.5** | Y | 4 | 5 | **4.5** | Y |
| Candidate 4 | 100 | 100 | **100** | Y | 5 | 4 | **4.5** | Y |
| Candidate 5 | 86 | 93 | **90** | Y | 4 | 4 | **4** | Y |
| Candidate 6 | 100 | 100 | **100** | Y | 4 | 4 | **4** | Y |
| Candidate 7 | . | . | **.** |  | . | . | **.** |  |
| Candidate 8 | . | . | **.** |  | . | . | **.** |  |
| Candidate 9 | 97 | . | **97** | Y | 4 | . | **4** | Y |
| Candidate 10 | 100 | . | **100** | Y | 5 | . | **5** | Y |
| Candidate 11 | Aug | Grad |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Cohort** **Data** | **--** | **--** | **97.6** | **8/8;****100%** | **--** | **--** | **4.44** | **8/8;****100%** |

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 | 26 | . | **26** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 4 | 26 | 26 | **26** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 5 | 26 | 26 | **26** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 6 | 27 | 26 | **26.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 7 | 26 | . | **26** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 8 | 26 | . | **26** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 9 | 27 | 26 | **26.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 10 | 25 | 24 | **24.5** | Y | **1** | N |
| Candidate 11 | Aug | Grad |  |  |  |  |
| **Cohort****Data** |  |  | **25.95** | **10/10;****100%** | **1** | **9/10;****90%** |

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 | 42 | 43 | **42.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 2 | 42 | 42 | **42** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 3 | 42 | . | **42** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 4 | 42 | 40 | **41** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 5 | 41 | 42 | **41.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 6 | 42 | 42 | **42** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 7 | 40 | . | **40** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 8 | 44 | . | **44** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 9 | 40 | . | **40** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 10 | 40 | 42 | **41** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 11 | Aug | Grad |  |  |  |  |
| **Cohort****Data** |  |  | **41.6** | **10/10;****100%** | **0** | **10/10;****100%** |

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 | 22 | 23 | **22.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 2 | 22 | 24 | **23** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 3 | 22 | 23 | **22.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 4 | 24 | 22 | **23** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 5 | 21 | 22 | **21.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 6 | 21 | 22 | **21.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 7 | . | . | **.** |  |  |  |
| Candidate 8 | . | . | **.** |  |  |  |
| Candidate 9 | 22 | . | **22** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 10 | 23 | . | **23** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 11 | Aug | Grad |  |  |  |  |
| **Cohort****Data** |  |  | **22.4** | **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 | 22 | 23 | **22.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 2 | 18 | 24 | **21** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 3 | 22 | 23 | **22.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 4 | 22 | 22 | **22** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 5 | 21 | 22 | **21.5** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 6 | 22 | 22 | **22** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 7 | . | . | **.** |  |  |  |
| Candidate 8 | . | . | **.** |  |  |  |
| Candidate 9 | 22 | . | **22** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 10 | 21 | . | **21** | Y | **0** | Y |
| Candidate 11 | Aug | Grad |  |  |  |  |
| **Cohort****Data** |  |  | **21.8** | **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 3AB: Positive Impact Data for Quantitative Intervention Cases

|  |
| --- |
| **3AB-1. Positive Impact Statistics,****Academic Intervention Case** |
| Candidate | EffectSize | PND |
| 1 | 1.38\* |  |
| 2 |  | 50% |
| 3 |  | 93.75% |
| 4 | 1.85 |  |
| 5 | 3.08\* |  |
| 6 |  | 57% |
| 7 | Unknowna |  |
| 8 | 2.81\* | 100%\* |
| 9 | 4.7 |  |
| 10 | .77\* |  |
| 11 | - | - |
| **Cohort Average** |  |  |

\* = Average

a = Positive impact data was not calculated by the student and could not be determined.