ACADEMIC AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO AND OPERATIONS REVIEW

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM PHASE 1 TEMPLATE

Name of school/college: College of Education
Name of department/program: Educational Administration
Date: 5-3-16

Introduction

As the school/college reviews and builds out data sets provided by the university, it will also solicit, in a manner appropriate to the organization and culture of that school/college, the information needed from departments or programs for well-informed analysis and recommendations. Such material falls into two categories:

1. Workload and operations information that is held (or largely held) within the department/program rather than the school/college or central university data sources, such as faculty service performed within the department/program.
2. Information, perspectives, and concerns that the department/program believes should be considered as part of the broader review, such as challenges inherent to teaching within a particular discipline.

The questions below reflect the baseline information that meets the criteria above. Schools and colleges should feel free to add to these questions as appropriate. Please note that this template is part of the Workload and Operations phase; each department/program will have another opportunity to provide information relevant to the Portfolio Review.

Department/Program Review

Please address the questions below and add whatever information deemed relevant to this process.

To the extent that this information is not already available in the template for your school or college, advise regarding the parts of the workload for your faculty not captured by course load and credit generation measures. In particular, if there is any research/scholarship/creative work or service that distinguishes the contributions of the faculty in this department or program from others in the school/college and university, please describe it.

Response:
The School Psychology program (SPSY) faculty in the College of Education (COE) has *significant responsibilities that are not accounted for* by the course load and credit generation measures. These additional responsibilities are dictated by WA state credentialing requirements for School Psychologists and an external accrediting association, the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). These additional responsibilities include these:

1. A Professional Education Advisory Board (PEAB) is required. This is a committee of ten school professionals and SPSY representatives who evaluate the program curriculum and provide recommendations for program improvement. Faculty coordinate the PEAB's meetings (three

three-hour meetings, three times a year), plan the agenda, write minutes, discuss recommendations and create action plans to address them, and complete annual reporting requirements.

2. Coordinating field placements of students in practicum and internship. Graduates of our program work in schools as state-certified school psychologists. A significant part of their graduate training, therefore, is in schools practicing under a certified school psychologist (practicum in year 2 and internship in year 3 of the program). Faculty need to manage student placements in practicum and internship requiring constant communication with students and school practitioners throughout the year and the management of contracts with school districts. This requires approximately 4 hours a week.
3. Cultivating and maintaining external partnerships with schools. Strong relationships with practicing school psychologists and school districts are critical, as they need to agree to supervise our students and work with us for practicum and internship (described above). Faculty cultivate these relationships through meetings, offering professional development, and consultation.
4. The SPSY program is writing an accreditation report by the NASP this year. This is an extensive amount of work (approximately 200+ pages) for which faculty manage and write with the support of staff.

In addition to requirements imposed by accrediting bodies, there are other factors to be considered as well:

1. Scholarship standards also add to the workload in the COE. The current criteria are two publications a year for a rating of "meets expectations."
2. We have proposed a new program (PsyD in School Psychology) that is being approved by the university at this time. Once it is approved, program faculty will need to develop the courses and associated operations for this new program to begin Summer 2017.

Is there information that needs to be considered as a part of an analysis of the "teaching productivity" of the department or program? Are there differentiators in the kinds of instruction taking place or the population of students being educated that impact the ability of faculty to generate credit hours?

Response:

There are several factors to be considered in the teaching productivity of the SPSY faculty, all of which are related to WA state credentialing requirements for School Psychologists and our external accrediting association, NASP. These additional responsibilities include these:

1. Smaller student to instructor teaching ratios for clinical courses. NASP requires that there is no more than 12 students per instructor for courses that teach professional skills in school psychology. This affects a number of courses in our program.
2. Management of instructional supplies for professional practice. The clinical courses that we teach require the use of highly-technical and confidential professional psychology materials (e.g., standardized tests that are individually administered, computer software). The

management and protection of these materials is cumbersome and takes up much faculty time when teaching such a course.

In addition, there are certain courses that the program offers that are required by other programs in the college. Instruction in these instances must be differentiated for varying student professions, which also requires remediation of pre-requisite knowledge and skills that these students do not possess, thus adding to teaching workload. Finally, we advise 25 students each.

What unrealized opportunities do you see? Are there ways that the contributions of the department/program to the mission and financial health of the university could be improved?

Response:
As discussed above, we have proposed a new PsyD program, which would contribute to the mission and financial health of the university. As part of that program, a clinic offering professional psychology services on a sliding fee scale would be a great benefit to the SU community.

What particular constraints or challenges does the department/program face?

Response:

There are several challenges that the SPSY program faces:

1. Dual accreditation. With the approval of the new PsyD program, we will need to be accredited by a new organization, the American Psychological Association (APA) in addition to maintaining accreditation with NASP. Therefore, there would be two accreditation standards to which to adhere.
2. SPSY has a need for additional faculty, especially with the new PsyD program.
3. There is an ever-changing market for assessment systems and keeping up to date with them is critical for the program (i.e., continual need to purchase new supplies)
4. With the increased university emphasis on research, the institutional support for such research seems to be lacking.
5. There is competition in WA among SPSY programs, as new programs are being developed.

Is there anything else you would like to put on the record?

Response:

The SPSY faculty believe strongly that there is a need for special consideration in assessing credit generation in clinically-focused graduate programs.