

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	2	2	2	2	2.2	2.5	<b>2.06</b>
2	2.5	2.2	2.25	2	2.5	2.25	2.5	2.33	2	2.6	2.5	<b>2.33</b>
3	2.33	2	2	2	2.25	2.5	2	2	2	2.2	3	<b>2.21</b>
4	2	2.6	2.33	2.5	2.5	2.25	2	2	3	3	3	<b>2.47</b>
5	2	2	2	1.5	2.25	2.5	2	1.67	2	2	2	<b>1.99</b>
6	3	3	3	3	3	2.5	3	2.67	3	3	3	<b>2.92</b>
7	2.33	2.4	2.5	2.5	3	3	2.5	2.67	3	3	3	<b>2.72</b>
8	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	.	.	2	2	<b>2.0</b>
9	2	2	2	2	2	2.25	2	2	2	2	2	<b>2.02</b>
10	2	2	3	2	2	2.25	2	2	2	2	2	<b>2.11</b>
11	2.33	2.2	2	2.5	2.75	2.5	2.5	3	3	2.2	3	<b>2.54</b>
<b>Cohort Average</b>	<b>2.23</b>	<b>2.22</b>	<b>2.28</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>2.39</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>2.23</b>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>2.31</b>

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	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	<b>3</b>
2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.67	<b>2.97</b>
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2.43	3	<b>2.95</b>
4	2.83	2.6	2.8	2.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	<b>2.88</b>
5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	<b>3</b>
6	2	2	2	2	2	1.75	2	1.75	2	2	2.33	<b>1.98</b>
7	3	3	3	3	3	2.83	3	3	3	3	3	<b>2.98</b>
8	3	3	3	3	3	2.75	3	2.8	3	3	2.33	<b>2.90</b>
<b>Cohort Average</b>	<b>2.85375</b>	<b>2.825</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>2.8125</b>	<b>2.875</b>	<b>2.79125</b>	<b>2.875</b>	<b>2.81875</b>	<b>2.875</b>	<b>2.80375</b>	<b>2.79125</b>	<b>2.83</b>

**Table 2A: Faculty FRF Ratings by Case Evaluated**

<b>Table 2A-1. 2012 FRF and Overall Faculty Rating Portfolio Evaluation: <i>Academic Intervention Case</i></b>								
Candidate	FRF Rating 1	FRF Rating 2	Ave FRF Rating <sup>a</sup>	Comp Met (Y/N)	Overall Rating 1	Overall Rating 2	Ave Overall Rating <sup>b</sup>	Comp Met (Y/N)
Candidate 1	96	100	<b>98</b>	Y	3	4	<b>3.5</b>	Y
Candidate 2	96	96	<b>96</b>	Y	4	4	<b>4</b>	Y
Candidate 3	100	96	<b>98</b>	Y	4	3	<b>3.5</b>	Y
Candidate 4	85	100	<b>92</b>	Y	3	3	<b>3</b>	Y
Candidate 5	100	100	<b>100</b>	Y	4	5	<b>4.5</b>	Y
Candidate 6	92.3	100	<b>96</b>	Y	4	4	<b>4</b>	Y
Candidate 7	96	100	<b>98</b>	Y	4	4	<b>4</b>	Y
Candidate 8	96	100	<b>98</b>	Y	3	3	<b>3</b>	Y
<b>Cohort Data</b>	--	--	<b>97</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>	--	--	<b>3.69</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>

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

<sup>b</sup> Candidates are expected to achieve an average overall faculty rating of '3' or greater for competency.

<b>Table 2A-2. 2012 FRF and Overall Faculty Rating Portfolio Evaluation: Assessment Case</b>								
Candidate	FRF Rating 1	FRF Rating 2	Ave FRF Rating <sup>a</sup>	Comp Met (Y/N)	Overall Rating 1	Overall Rating 2	Ave Overall Rating <sup>b</sup>	Comp Met (Y/N)
Candidate 1	97	100	<b>98.5</b>	Y	3.5	4	<b>3.75</b>	Y
Candidate 2	100	91	<b>95.5</b>	Y	5	3	<b>4</b>	Y
Candidate 3	91	100	<b>96</b>	Y	4	4	<b>4</b>	Y
Candidate 4	100	100	<b>100</b>	Y	3	4	<b>3.5</b>	Y
Candidate 5	100	100	<b>100</b>	Y	5	5	<b>5</b>	Y
Candidate 6	100	100	<b>100</b>	Y	4	4	<b>4</b>	Y
Candidate 7	100	100	<b>100</b>	Y	5	5	<b>5</b>	Y
Candidate 8	100	100	<b>100</b>	Y	5	3	<b>4</b>	Y
<b>Cohort Data</b>	--	--	<b>98.75</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>	--	--	<b>4.16</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>

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

<sup>b</sup> Candidates are expected to achieve an average overall faculty rating of '3' or greater for competency.

<b>Table 2A-3. 2012 FRF and Overall Faculty Rating Portfolio Evaluation: Behavioral Consultation Case</b>								
Candidate	FRF Rating 1	FRF Rating 2	Ave FRF Rating <sup>a</sup>	Comp Met (Y/N)	Overall Rating 1	Overall Rating 2	Ave Overall Rating <sup>b</sup>	Comp Met (Y/N)
Candidate 1	96	86	<b>91</b>	<b>Y</b>	3	3	<b>3</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 2	97	96	<b>97</b>	<b>Y</b>	4	4	<b>4</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 3	96.5	79	<b>88</b>	<b>Y</b>	5	3	<b>4</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 4	86	100	<b>93</b>	<b>Y</b>	3	3	<b>3</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 5	100	89	<b>95</b>	<b>Y</b>	4	4	<b>4</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 6	100	86.2	<b>93</b>	<b>Y</b>	4	3	<b>3.5</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 7	93	100	<b>97</b>	<b>Y</b>	4	4	<b>4</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 8	96.5	79	<b>88</b>	<b>Y</b>	4	3	<b>3.5</b>	<b>Y</b>
<b>Cohort Data</b>	--	--	<b>92.75</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>	--	--	<b>3.63</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>

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

<sup>b</sup> Candidates are expected to achieve an average overall faculty rating of '3' or greater for competency.

<b>Table 2A-4. 2012 FRF and Overall Faculty Rating Portfolio Evaluation: <i>Counseling Case</i></b>								
Candidate	FRF Rating 1	FRF Rating 2	Ave FRF Rating <sup>a</sup>	Comp Met (Y/N)	Overall Rating 1	Overall Rating 2	Ave Overall Rating <sup>b</sup>	Comp Met (Y/N)
Candidate 1	93	96	<b>95</b>	<b>Y</b>	4	3	<b>3.5</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 2	93	100	<b>96</b>	<b>Y</b>	4	4	<b>4</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 3	96	100	<b>98</b>	<b>Y</b>	5	4	<b>4.5</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 4	96	100	<b>98</b>	<b>Y</b>	4	3	<b>3.5</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 5	100	93	<b>96</b>	<b>Y</b>	5	4	<b>4.5</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 6	96	100	<b>98</b>	<b>Y</b>	4	4	<b>4</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 7	93	93	<b>93</b>	<b>Y</b>	3	4	<b>3.5</b>	<b>Y</b>
Candidate 8	96	96	<b>96</b>	<b>Y</b>	5	3	<b>4</b>	<b>Y</b>
<b>Cohort Data</b>	--	--	<b>96.25</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>	--	--	<b>3.94</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>

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

<sup>b</sup> 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. 2012 PIR Scores Portfolio Evaluation: <i>Academic Intervention Case</i>						
Candidate	PIR 1	PIR 2	Ave PIR Score <sup>a</sup>	Competency Met (Yes/No)	Total Ratings of '0' <sup>b</sup>	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
<b>Cohort Data</b>			26.19	8/8; 100%	0	8/8; 100%

<sup>a</sup> Candidates are expected to achieve an average PIR score equal or greater to the Cut Score of '24' for competency.

<sup>b</sup> Candidates are expected to achieve zero total ratings of '0' on the PIR for competency.

**Table 2B-2. 2012 PIR Scores**  
**Portfolio Evaluation: Assessment Case**

Candidate	PIR 1	PIR 2	Ave PIR Score <sup>a</sup>	Competency Met (Yes/No)	Total Ratings of '0' <sup>b</sup>	Competency Met (Yes/No)
Candidate 1	40	44	<b>42</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 2	46	41	<b>43.5</b>	Y	<b>1</b>	N
Candidate 3	42	42	<b>42</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 4	40	42	<b>41</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 5	45	42	<b>43.5</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 6	42	42	<b>42</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 7	42	42	<b>42</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 8	42	42	<b>42</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
<b>Cohort Data</b>			<b>42.25</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7/8; 87.5%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Candidates are expected to achieve an average PIR score equal or greater to the Cut Score of '39' for competency.

<sup>b</sup> Candidates are expected to achieve zero total ratings of '0' on the PIR for competency.



**Table 2B-3. 2012 PIR Scores**  
**Portfolio Evaluation: Behavioral Consultation Case**

Candidate	PIR 1	PIR 2	Ave PIR Score <sup>a</sup>	Competency Met (Yes/No)	Total Ratings of '0' <sup>b</sup>	Competency Met (Yes/No)
Candidate 1	21	22	<b>21.5</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 2	22	22	<b>22</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 3	24	22	<b>23</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 4	21	22	<b>21.5</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 5	22	22	<b>22</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 6	23	22	<b>22.5</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 7	23	22	<b>22.5</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 8	23	22	<b>22.5</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
<b>Cohort Data</b>			<b>22.19</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Candidates are expected to achieve an average PIR score equal or greater to the Cut Score of '21' for competency.

<sup>b</sup> Candidates are expected to achieve zero total ratings of '0' on the PIR for competency.

**Table 2B-4. 2012 PIR Scores**  
**Portfolio Evaluation: *Counseling Case***

Candidate	PIR 1	PIR 2	Ave PIR Score <sup>a</sup>	Competency Met (Yes/No)	Total Ratings of '0' <sup>b</sup>	Competency Met (Yes/No)
Candidate 1	23	21	<b>22</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 2	22	22	<b>22</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 3	24	21	<b>22.5</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 4	24	22	<b>23</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 5	24	22	<b>23</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 6	24	22	<b>23</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 7	22	22	<b>22</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
Candidate 8	22	22	<b>22</b>	Y	<b>0</b>	Y
<b>Cohort Data</b>			<b>22.44</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8/8; 100%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Candidates are expected to achieve an average PIR score equal or greater to the Cut Score of '21' for competency.

<sup>b</sup> Candidates are expected to achieve zero total ratings of '0' on the PIR for competency.

**Table 3AB: Positive Impact Data for Quantitative Intervention Cases**

<b>3AB-1. Positive Impact Statistics, Academic Intervention Case</b>		
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%
<b>Cohort Average</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>92.5%</b>

\* = Average

<b>3AB-2. Positive Impact Statistics, Behavioral Consultation Case</b>		
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	--
<b>Cohort Average</b>	<b>5.22</b>	<b>92.4%</b>

\* = Average

<b>3AB-3. Positive Impact Statistics, Counseling Case</b>		
Candidate	Effect Size	PND
1	6.84*	--
2	2.62*	--
3	1.44	--
4	3.59	--
5	2.72*	--
6	2.51*	--
7	.67*	87.5%*
8	2.67*	100%*
<b>Cohort Average</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>93.8%</b>

\* = Average