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Welcome to the School Psychology Program at the University of Minnesota! This is one of the oldest and most well established graduate programs in school psychology in the country, with a young, innovative faculty who are committed to maintaining and elevating the program’s legacy of shaping the future directions for school psychology research and practice. The program faculty are leaders in the field by conducting high quality research that addresses the enhancement of student competence and the capacity of systems to meet the needs of students and families. We seek to prepare graduate students who will emerge as local and national leaders in school psychology through innovative scholarship, research-based practice, and systems change. The program is accredited/approved by multiple governing bodies (i.e., APA, NASP, & CAEP). As of June 2018, the Program has graduated 301 PhDs and 259 Specialist Certificates.

This handbook provides a summary of key information about the School Psychology Program. **You should always refer to this handbook for your degree planning and required activities.** It specifies the course requirements for students entering the program in Fall 2018; students admitted earlier may opt to follow these course sequence requirements. **All students must comply with all program policies set forth in this document, and are expected to read the applicable sections of this document in its entirety.**

In addition to reading the policies set forth in this handbook, you will find policies applicable to program completion on the [University](#), [College](#), [Department](#), and [Graduate School](#) websites. All school psychology students are part of the Department of Educational Psychology, which dictates the nature of the foundational academic coursework, final examinations, and other policies regarding graduate status and candidacy for degrees. **Students should carefully refer to the requirements as listed in the Educational Psychology Handbook.**

We hope that this handbook will answer many of your questions about the program requirements and expectations for student success. Should you have additional questions not addressed in the program or department handbooks, please contact the Program Assistant at (612) 626-0367. Our warmest wishes to you as you complete your graduate studies at Minnesota. We look forward to a productive and rewarding year!

---

**Set yourself up for success:**

- **Read this handbook and the Department Handbook.**
- **Familiarize yourself with the Program Canvas Site.**

These resources are designed to help you navigate your graduate experience—consult them regularly.
Section I: Program Description

Mission

The mission of this School Psychology Program is to maintain and elevate its status as a flagship program in the field of school psychology. The Program faculty, students, and alumni are committed to serving as thought leaders and practice leaders instrumental in driving the evolution of school psychologists’ roles in educational systems and communities, shaping the science of school psychology, and bolstering innovation in the field. In particular, the Program emphasizes research-based practice, data-based decision making, integrative service delivery through a continuum of support to address the academic, social-emotional, and behavioral needs of all children and youth, and to support the educators and families in their lives. The Program prepares graduates who will be change agents in educational systems and who support evidence-based practice and organizational change to affect the greatest benefit in schools. We are dedicated to this work because we are deeply committed to dismantling opportunity gaps and ineffective, inequitable systems that do not serve students and families. Above all, we are committed to leveraging our comprehensive and collective expertise for the continuous improvement in research, practice, and education of future school psychologists.

Vision

The School Psychology Program will continue its national reputation for excellence by (a) directly responding to the needs of systems that serve children and youth and conducting research that informs practice, policy, and professional learning; (b) developing school psychologists who are leaders in scholarship and practice; (c) recruiting high-quality graduate students with diverse cultural backgrounds (e.g., ethnicity, gender, and experience); (d) providing a rich graduate education in which students participate in varied experiences both in and out of the university classroom; (e) promoting knowledge and scientifically-based practices that recognize classrooms, schools, homes, and communities as critically important settings that influence outcomes for children and youth; and (f) promoting knowledge and scientifically-based practices that incorporate an ecological perspective to improve academic, social, behavioral, and emotional competence of children and youth.

The culture of the program fosters student and faculty success implementing these goals. Faculty recruit students with diverse cultural backgrounds, infuse research into every aspect of graduate preparation, mentor future faculty, obtain external funding for research and training, collaborate with students and colleagues to disseminate research, engage with the community, provide continuing education for school psychologists, and continue to strengthen supervised fieldwork. Students actively seek opportunities to integrate and apply the knowledge and skills acquired through research and didactic training. They value, conduct, present, and publish research. Students and graduates aspire to be leaders in school psychology scholarship and practice.

Program Assumptions

There are nine assumptions that underlie the Program’s curriculum and applied experiences. These assumptions, which are reviewed annually by the faculty, are:
1. Psychology, as a behavioral science, makes important contributions to the educational success and wellbeing of children and youth. The range of school psychology’s impact includes, but is not limited to, the application of theory and research in the psychosocial development and learning of children and youth, social interaction processes, prevention and competence enhancement strategies, instructional intervention and program development, delivery of mental health services, and systems change, as well as contributions to the attainability of the national educational goals.

2. School psychologists fill a wide range of positions within the educational and psychological enterprises. We prepare practitioners, educators, and scholars who are committed to translating research and theory into practice. School psychologists are employed in various settings (e.g., schools, community and health care settings, universities) to promote optimal development, wellbeing, and educational success among children and youth.

3. School psychology is inherently interdisciplinary. School psychologists draw on a knowledge base including, but not limited to, educational, developmental, clinical, organizational, and community psychology in developing and applying theories, methods, and research to assess individual, group, and system needs. School psychologists also generate, implement, and evaluate prevention and intervention strategies; understand and respond to cultural diversity and individual difference; engage in collaborative consultation and interprofessional practice; and develop and evaluate policy.

4. Training and research are grounded in an ecological systems theory in which other psychological and educational theories are integrated to understand individual, group, and system functioning in a range of environmental contexts. The complex nature of behavior often cannot be accounted for by simple linear cause-effect relationships. The explanations are more likely dependent upon multiple causes that have multivariate linkages with observed behavior.

5. A school psychologist is responsible for integrating and explaining psychological theories and principles relevant to development and performance. School psychologists recognize that: (a) cognitive, social, and affective development are interrelated; (b) individuals bring the totality of their life experience to school; and (c) schools have a powerful influence on the lives of children and youth.

6. Schools, homes, and communities are critically important settings that influence development and academic, social, behavioral, and emotional competence of children and youth. Adults in these settings share responsibility in nurturing and socializing children and youth in an increasingly complex world. School psychologists must attend to the multiple contexts in which children develop, and work with other professionals to develop school-linked services to develop competencies and address risk factors.

7. Delivery of school psychological services is based on rigorous scientific methods of study and objective, reliable data collection. The scientific credibility of theories, measures, techniques, and intervention strategies should be established prior to their implementation. Science and practice are integrated.
8. The roles and functions of school psychologists are not to be conceived of as isolated, separate domains of expertise. The links among the major competencies (e.g., assessment-intervention, research-intervention) are emphasized in graduate preparation and other professional learning.

9. Training modalities include the formal curriculum, such as academic coursework, traditional research experiences, and field placements, as well as informal curriculum, including a wide variety of seminars and independent study projects. We assume students have different interests and personal goals, which we strive to foster and develop. A wide range of community resources is available to facilitate goals of the program.

Program Goals & Competencies

The School Psychology faculty accept two broad aims of school psychological practice: (1) improving student competence and (2) building the capacity of systems to address the needs of children and youth. To this end, the program draws on competencies outlined by the American Psychological Association (APA) and further informed by guiding principles in school psychology (Ysseldyke et al., 2006). Accordingly, all program graduates are expected to develop the following competencies as part of their training for practice of school psychology and health service psychology under APA’s Standards of Accreditation, delineated in 9 goal areas:

1. **Research**
   - Demonstrate the substantially independent ability to formulate research or other scholarly activities (e.g., critical literature reviews, dissertation, efficacy studies, clinical case studies, theoretical papers, program evaluation projects, program development projects) that are of sufficient quality and rigor to have the potential to contribute to the scientific, psychological, or professional knowledge base.
   - Conduct research or other scholarly activities.
   - Critically evaluate and disseminate research or other scholarly activity via professional publication and presentation at the local (including the host institution), regional, or national level.

2. **Ethical and Legal Standards**
   - Be knowledgeable of and act in accordance with each of the following:
     - the current version of the APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct;
     - relevant laws, regulations, rules, and policies governing health service psychology at the

Our curriculum is designed to develop critical thinkers versed in the broad theoretical and empirical foundations of psychology, and to instill the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective scientist-practitioners.

Students learn research methods and statistics to support future research-based practice or research and teaching. Firm understanding of the domains are critical to effective research consumerism, application, and production as scientist-practitioner school psychologists.
o organizational, local, state, regional, and federal levels; and relevant professional standards and guidelines.

- Recognize ethical dilemmas as they arise, and apply ethical decision-making processes in order to resolve the dilemmas.
- Conduct self in an ethical manner in all professional activities.

3. **Individual and Cultural Diversity**
- Demonstrate an understanding of how their own personal/cultural history, attitudes, and biases may affect how they understand and interact with people different from themselves;
- Demonstrate knowledge of the current theoretical and empirical knowledge base as it relates to addressing diversity in all professional activities including research, training, supervision/consultation, and service;
- Demonstrate the ability to integrate awareness and knowledge of individual and cultural differences in the conduct of professional roles (e.g., research, services, and other professional activities). This includes the ability to apply a framework for working effectively with areas of individual and cultural diversity not previously encountered over the course of their careers. Also included is the ability to work effectively with individuals whose group membership, demographic characteristics, or worldviews create conflict with their own.
- Demonstrate the requisite knowledge base, ability to articulate an approach to working effectively with diverse individuals and groups, and apply this approach effectively in their professional work.

4. **Professional Values and Attitudes**
- Behave in ways that reflect the values and attitudes of psychology, including integrity, deportment, professional identity, accountability, lifelong learning, and concern for the welfare of others.
- Engage in self-reflection regarding one’s personal and professional functioning; engage in activities to maintain and improve performance, well-being, and professional effectiveness.
- Actively seek and demonstrate openness and responsiveness to feedback and supervision.
- Respond professionally in increasingly complex situations with a greater degree of independence as they progress across levels of training.
- Demonstrate the ability to independently apply their knowledge and approach in working effectively with the range of diverse individuals and groups encountered during internship.

5. **Communication and Interpersonal Skills**
- Develop and maintain effective relationships with a wide range of individuals, including colleagues, communities, organizations, supervisors, supervisees, and those receiving professional services.
- Produce and comprehend oral, nonverbal, and written communications that are informative and well-integrated; demonstrate a thorough grasp of professional language and concepts.
- Demonstrate effective interpersonal skills and the ability to manage difficult communication well.

---

All students are expected to engage in rigorous scholarship—be it original empirical investigations or research syntheses—reflecting publishable quality design, analysis, and writing that can contribute to the school psychology knowledge base.
6. Assessment
- Select and apply assessment methods that draw from the best available empirical literature and that reflect the science of measurement and psychometrics; collect relevant data using multiple sources and methods appropriate to the identified goals and questions of the assessment as well as relevant diversity characteristics of the service recipient.
- Interpret assessment results, following current research and professional standards and guidelines, to inform case conceptualization, classification, and recommendations, while guarding against decision-making biases, distinguishing the aspects of assessment that are subjective from those that are objective.
- Communicate orally and in written documents the findings and implications of the assessment in an accurate and effective manner sensitive to a range of audiences.

7. Intervention
- Establish and maintain effective relationships with the recipients of psychological services.
- Develop evidence-based intervention plans specific to the service delivery goals.
- Implement interventions informed by the current scientific literature, assessment findings, diversity characteristics, and contextual variables.
- Demonstrate the ability to apply the relevant research literature to clinical decision making.
- Modify and adapt evidence-based approaches effectively when a clear evidence-base is lacking.
- Evaluate intervention effectiveness, and adapt intervention goals and methods consistent with ongoing evaluation.

8. Supervision
- Demonstrate knowledge of supervision models and practices.
- Apply this knowledge in direct or simulated practice with psychology trainees, or other health professionals. Examples of direct or simulated practice examples of supervision include, but are not limited to, role-played supervision with others, and peer supervision with other trainees.
- Apply effective supervision strategies to direct and indirect services in accordance with their own developmental level to promote supervisees’ effective practices.

9. Consultation and Interprofessional Skills
- Demonstrate knowledge and respect for the roles and perspectives of other professions.
- Demonstrates knowledge of consultation models and practices.
- Apply appropriate consultation models and strategies to facilitate direct and indirect services and professional development.
- Apply this knowledge in direct or simulated consultation with individuals and their families, other health care professionals, interprofessional groups, or systems related to health and behavior.

Program Curriculum

The Program is designed to provide students with broad training in educational psychology, along with specialized training in school psychology. As such, the Program’s coursework reflects foundational psychology and educational psychology courses, methods and statistics courses, and school psychology courses.

The Program emphasizes scholarship and service delivery to improve provision of multitier systems of support (MTSS) facilitating students’ academic, behavioral, and
social-emotional development. The Program utilizes the World Health Organization's definition of mental health, which defines it as a state of well-being in which a child realizes their own potential, copes with the normal stresses of life, learns and works productively, and connects with and makes positive contributions to their community. In this way, students develop optimal mental health when they are supported by compassionate and nurturing adults, are socially connected and competent, are emotionally resilient in the face of adversity, and are engaged in and succeeding in school. This definition emphasizes a whole child perspective in which social, emotional, and academic well-being all interact and combine to impact a child’s mental health status.

During their training, graduate students acquire knowledge and proficiency with assessment, intervention, and consultation practices that focus on preventing and responding effectively to academic, social, emotional, and behavioral difficulties that impair students’ performance within and outside of school, as well as cultivating positive environments and promoting individual assets, including academic skills and mindsets, that help students flourish and optimize their wellbeing.

**Degree Tracks and Coursework**

The School Psychology Program offers two tracks for graduate study within the Department of Educational Psychology: the Specialist Certificate (SC) and the Doctorate (PhD). A terminal master’s degree is not offered, nor is there a respecialization track for individuals with prior doctorates in other areas of psychology. Graduates of the Program (SC and PhD) will receive institutional documentation (i.e., a diploma) of completion of the Program. All students will complete a Master’s degree in route to the SC or PhD if they did not previously complete an MA elsewhere.

The Program curriculum serves as the foundation for student evaluation activities described in Section VI. The sequencing of courses is intended to facilitate assessment-to-intervention linkages, opportunities to develop knowledge and skills needed to contribute to research-based MTSS and other school psychological services, and increasingly independent scholarship. Students develop knowledge and competencies through these courses. Other literature foundational to the program are provided in the Program-wide Required Readings. As of Fall 2017, written and oral exams address knowledge acquired in both the Program-wide Required Readings and track-wide required courses.

Our curriculum emphasizes research-based practice; thus, research and theory are the foundation for all didactic and applied experiences and all students in the school psychology program are trained to be scientist-practitioners. Original research factors heavily in all course materials. All students will learn to be active, lifelong research consumers; to conduct practice-based research; and to evaluate the effectiveness of their practices; and engage in synthesis and evaluation of research during their training. PhD students will also develop skills to design, implement, and disseminate original research.
**Program Goals and Required Coursework**  
(* = Required for PhD only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goals</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research</td>
<td>☐ EPsy 8251: Methods of Data Analysis for Ed'l Research (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ *EPsy 8252: Methods of Data Analysis for Ed Research (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ EPsy 8822: Research in School Psychology (3 or *3x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethical &amp; Legal Standards</td>
<td>☐ EPsy 8821: Issues in School Psychology (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ EPsy 8823: Ethics and Professional Standards (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Individual &amp; Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>☐ EPsy 5851: Engaging Diverse Students and Families (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>also EPsy 5221: Principles in Ed'l &amp; Psych Measurement (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional Values &amp; Attitudes</td>
<td>☐ EPsy 8813: Introductory Practicum (2x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ EPsy 8818: Intermediate Practicum (2x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication &amp; Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>☐ *EPsy 8831: Comprehensive School Practicum (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ *EPsy 8832: Advanced Practicum (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ EPsy 8842/8843: Internship – School Psychology (4/*2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ EPsy 8811: Assessment (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ EPsy 8812: Assessment II (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>also EPsy 8819: Emotion &amp; Psychopathology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ EPsy 8816: Academic Prevention &amp; Intervention (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ EPsy 8819: Emotion &amp; Psychopathology (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supervision</td>
<td>☐ *EPsy 8841: Instruction and Supervision (3x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Consultation &amp; Interprofessional Skills</td>
<td>☐ EPsy 8817: Problem Analysis &amp; Consultation (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>also: EPsy 8821: Issues in School Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ EPSY Core Course in Learning/Cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ *EPSY Core Course in Social Psychology or Learning/Cog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Program Canvas site contains helpful tools for tracking course requirements.
Section II: Program Organization and Policy

School Psychology is an interdepartmental track granting two graduate degrees (Specialist Certificate [SC], Doctor of Philosophy [PhD]); a Master’s Degree is required for each degree. School Psychology is housed administratively in the Department of Educational Psychology along with Special Education, Psychological Foundations of Education (PsyF), and Quantitative Methods in Education (QME). The Department of Educational Psychology is led by a Chair. The School Psychology Program is led by the Coordinator.

Program and Department Faculty & Staff

The School Psychology Program has several core faculty (* below). All hold doctorates school psychology. Email is the preferred mode of communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>ESB Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Christ, PhD*</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>624-7068</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tchrist@umn.edu">tchrist@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton Cook, PhD, LP*</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>626-7324</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ccrook@umn.edu">ccrook@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyse Farnsworth, PhD*</td>
<td>Lecturer, Fieldwork and Specialist Certificate Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:chri0802@umn.edu">chri0802@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Hansen-Burke, PhD, LP*</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Internship Consortium Director</td>
<td>624-5547</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hans1498@umn.edu">hans1498@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>350B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Miller, PhD, LP*</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Internship Consortium Director</td>
<td>625-0615</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fgmiller@umn.edu">fgmiller@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie Kember, PhD*</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kembe007@umn.edu">kembe007@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Sullivan, PhD, LP*</td>
<td>Professor, Program Coordinator</td>
<td>626-7221</td>
<td><a href="mailto:asulliva@umn.edu">asulliva@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisha Wackerle-Hollman, PhD</td>
<td>Senior Research Associate</td>
<td>624-3943</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wacke020@umn.edu">wacke020@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Psychology Administrators & Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>ESB Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alicia Vegell</td>
<td>Program Assistant</td>
<td>626-0367</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acvegell@umn.edu">acvegell@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panayiota Kendeou, PhD</td>
<td>Director of Graduate Studies (DGS), Professor</td>
<td>626-7814</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kend0040@umn.edu">kend0040@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Boucher</td>
<td>Assistant to the DGS, Graduate Program Coordinator (GPC)</td>
<td>624-4540</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bouch004@umn.edu">bouch004@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen McMaster, PhD</td>
<td>Department Chair, Professor</td>
<td>625-5861</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcmas004@umn.edu">mcmas004@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Matti</td>
<td>Licensing Specialist</td>
<td>625-8042</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ote@umn.edu">ote@umn.edu</a></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Governance

Policies and decisions for School Psychology are made at regularly scheduled faculty meetings chaired by the Program Coordinator. Emergency meetings are occasionally called by the Coordinator. Agenda items are due to the Program Assistant one week in advance of scheduled meetings. Students may request topics be added to the agenda and attend the open portion of meetings, typically the first 30-60 minutes. A representative from School Psychology Student
Association (SPSA), generally one or more of the co-Presidents, attends the open portion of the meeting, but all faculty and student personnel decisions such as fellowship nominations, admissions, hiring, and discussion of individual student issues are made in closed session to protect individual privacy.

Mandatory Program Time

Throughout the academic year, Fridays from 9:30-11:30 AM are designated as program time. During this time, all-program Roundtable, group advising (a.k.a., research lab/group), and SPSA programming are held. All students not yet on internship or finished with their dissertations (whichever comes first) should plan to attend program time for the duration of the academic year, excluding university holidays, religious holidays, and winter and spring breaks. Program time is held in ESB 325 unless otherwise indicated.

Roundtable Meetings

Faculty and students meet monthly during the academic year for Roundtable. Roundtable is co-facilitated by program faculty and student representatives. Topic ideas and student issues should be presented to appropriate SPSA representatives or the Program Coordinator. The meetings are designed to be informal yet structured conversations about relevant topics that could include professional development, program policies, procedures, student activities, etc. The standing agenda for the meeting is (a) celebrations and announcements, (b) questions/discussions, and (c) topical discussion. Although the meetings serve an important role in program communication, they are primarily viewed as a chance for faculty and students to regularly join as a community and engage in shared professional development.

Group Advising

In addition to the one-on-one mentorship provided by the student’s advisor, students will participate in Group Advising/Research Group until internship. Students are expected to engage in Research Group as an opportunity to learn about various research areas and subtopics, apply what they’ve learned elsewhere in their preparation, help others improve their work, and create accountability. Consistent engagement is strongly encouraged. Failure to consistently attend, actively participate, or complete tasks/assignments in a timely manner is generally associated with insufficient progress and professional development.

Advising

Each student is assigned an advisor upon entrance into the program based on their track and, in the case of PhD students, identified interests relative to faculty fit and availability. All PhD students are advised by one of the tenure-track core school psychology faculty, which allows students to benefit from professors’ research expertise as students design, conduct, and write up research projects. An advisor is the primary contact between the students and the program. The advisor, the DGS, and the DGS Administrative Assistant monitor student progress toward degree completion.

Some students may have research assistantships affiliated with their advisors; however, this is neither necessary nor guaranteed. Nonetheless, students are strongly encouraged to volunteer for collaborative research opportunities in order to gain research experience and deepen their scholarly development. In most cases, students will pursue required research projects that stem from this work.
The Advisor’s Role

- The advisor monitors the student’s progress towards their degree, supervises the student’s required research activities, evaluates overall professional development, and provides academic advising regarding degree requirements and course selection.
- The advisor will help students to identity self-study tasks to facilitate scholarly development and preparation to undertake their research activities.
- The advisor scaffolds the students’ research activities, provides ongoing feedback, and facilitates collaborative research opportunities.
- The advisor will monitor students’ professional development, recommend areas for improvement or supplemental learning, provide notice of foreseeable challenges, provide guidance throughout the degree planning and research processes, and provide constructive feedback on students’ written work.
- Advisors (and other faculty) may provide honest letters of recommendation when given sufficient notice. At least one month’s notice is recommended; late requests may not be feasible. Faculty are not obligated to provide letters of recommendation and may decline if not provided adequate notice or information, or when the requested recommendation is beyond the scope of their experience with a student.

Advisors are generally available via email and for in person meetings throughout the academic year. As a rule, advisors are minimally available during the summer and oral exams are not permitted during this time without program approval. Students should meet with the advisor before the end of the spring semester of each year to plan for their research activities during the summer months. Students are expected to engage ongoing independent reading and research productivity during the summer months in order to continue scholarly development and maintain timely progress toward degree completion. Summer activities may entail ongoing independent reading and exam preparation, project planning, IRB applications, and writing.

Where students have failed to maintain ongoing advisor contact and sufficient progress in research projects during the academic year, they should not assume advisor availability during the summer months to recoup progress. Instead, guidance should be sought before the end of the spring semester to develop a detailed plan to promote productive independent efforts that can be completed throughout the summer.

Expectations for Advisees

All Students

- Students will meet regularly with their advisors (at least once per semester), taking responsibility for scheduling meetings as needed. Students should query advisors about their preference for minimum meeting frequency. Failure to maintain regularly scheduled meetings with one’s advisor typically results in delayed completion of milestones and insufficient scholarly development. As such, ongoing, regular engagement with one’s advisor is considered essential to professional development.
- Students will come to meetings with an agenda and any documents for review/signing.
- Students will take notes during advising meetings and follow through with identified tasks in a timely manner.
- Students will cancel meetings in a timely manner when unprepared to meet (e.g., when failing to make progress on previously agreed upon tasks). Barring extenuating
circumstances (e.g., personal or family illness, accidents, transportation issues), students should notify regarding cancelations well in advance of the scheduled meeting time rather than waiting until the day of or after the meeting time.

- Students will engage in proactive problem solving, attempting to find answers and solutions. That said, students will ask questions and request assistance when needed.

- Students will let the advisor know when additional supports are needed (e.g., identification of social supports, disability accommodations, referral for mental health services, writing consultation, study skills training).

- Students will consult their advisors before deviating from the recommended course and milestone sequence for the SC or PhD tracks. Students are ultimately responsible for their own decisions and meeting all degree and program requirements, but advisors assist them in understanding alternatives.

- Students will complete several drafts of a manuscript before advancing to exam/defense, and often several drafts of each element of a project (i.e., section of MA manuscript, chapter of dissertation). We expect students to welcome and use feedback provided in a process of continuous improvement.

- Students will plan for advisor review time when preparing MA research project manuscripts. Unless otherwise noted, students should allow 2 weeks for each draft review, and should incorporate allowance for 8 to 15 iterations (or more) in timelines for completion of the research requirement.

- Students will obtain advisor approval for presentations, publications, and any extracurricular, volunteer, or paid activities that are psychological in nature while enrolled in the Program. For more information, see subsections below on Student Research and Professional Practice by Graduate Students.

**PhD Students**

- PhD students will familiarize themselves with faculty research, particularly their advisor’s, by reading fully advisor’s articles and other published works, and other readings as directed. Students will engage in intensive self-study of the empirical, theoretical, and conceptual literature, particularly peer-reviewed publications, related to their identified areas of interest before initiating a research project.

- PhD students will take primary intellectual leadership on required research projects. This means students should identify project topics, research questions, methods, and analyses. While advisors supervise and provide feedback, students will engage in the necessary self-study to plan and carryout research plans. Students should not rely on advisors to plan their studies.

- PhD students will plan for advisor review time when preparing thesis, oral preliminary paper, and dissertation documents. Unless otherwise noted, students should allow 2 weeks for each draft review, and should incorporate allowance for 8 to 15 iterations (or more) in timelines for completion of each research requirement.

- Students will obtain advisor approval before scheduling oral exams or prospectus meetings and before disseminating a document to their committee for these meetings.

- PhD students will actively engage in collaborative projects with their advisors throughout their time in the program to gain substantive and methodological experience in school psychological research. Student participation in their advisor’s research activities are
considered an essential element of scholarly development in our program.

**PhD Advisor Changes**

Advisor fit based on students’ identified research interest(s) is a primary determinant of doctoral students’ admission to the program; however, students may request a change in advisor using the [Advisor Change Request Form](#). Students must meet with both the current and proposed advisor and obtain approval for the change before submitting the form. Students should not assume requests to change advisors will be approved as faculty may decline the change request based on fit, availability, or other considerations. Students engaged in MA research projects are strongly discouraged from seeking an advisor change after initiating work on the research project. Doctoral students are strongly discouraged from seeking advising changes after the initiation of work toward the preliminary oral examination. Any advisor change is likely to result in delayed progress in research milestones as students often must engage in intensive self-study in the new research area that may delay initiation of projects by one to two semester or more. Only under the most extenuating circumstances will advisor changes be granted after an MA research project or preliminary oral paper is in progress.

Students may request co-advising by another member of the University with graduate advisory status when their area of interest is closely matched with expertise outside of the faculty in the program. It is preferred that students invite such individuals to serve on their examining committees and consult them while developing research projects. Co-advising arrangements are rare because students are admitted to the program based on fit with the program and program faculty research interests. The program faculty will serve as the primary advisor and will approve program requirements and forms.

**Student Conduct**

Students are expected to conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the standards and principles articulate in the ethics codes of the [American Psychological Association](#) (doctoral students) and the [National Association of School Psychologists](#) (all students). Ethical conduct is expected in all coursework, fieldwork, research, and other professional interactions, both within and outside of the Program. Students must also adhere to the [University Student Code of Conduct](#). Student conduct is considered as a component of the annual review process and is subject to corrective action. In cases of severe or unremitting misconduct or lack of professionalism, the faculty may dismiss a student from the program.

**General Expectations for Student Success**

In addition to the expectations set forth in the ethics codes, the Program has the following expectations for all students:

**Professional Attitudes and Approaches**

- Students will embrace the scientist-practitioner orientation of the Program. We expect students to be open-minded, inquisitive, critical, and skeptical. Students will immerse themselves in developing not just their practical knowledge and skills, but knowledge of theory, research methods, and statistics in order to prepare themselves for their future roles in consuming, applying, producing, and disseminating research. All students are trained to be scientist-practitioners. Some may go on to other career paths – research, faculty, practice in community settings – but all are trained to be school psychologists who engaged in scholarship and practice firmly grounded in scientific thinking and the science of school
psychology. Failure to demonstrate a scientist-practitioner orientation in coursework, fieldwork, and research activities is grounds for remediation or dismissal.

- Enrollment in the Program is a full-time commitment and should be treated as such. Consistent active engagement in Program requirements—courses, research, and fieldwork, program time—should take priority over assistantships and extracurricular activities. For students seeking to complete the specialist certificate in 3 years or the PhD in 5 years, timely completion of required activities, particularly the research requirements, will necessitate work outside of business hours and consistently throughout the calendar year. Students should expect to maintain ongoing effort on their research projects during breaks (winter, spring, summer) in order to complete the program in the recommended timeframes (3-4 years for a MA/SC, 5-6 years for the PhD).

- Students will engage in effective study strategies to facilitate learning. Students are strongly encouraged to take notes on readings and class sessions. Handwritten notes, in particular, are most conducive to encoding and retention. When necessary, students will seek assistance from faculty or the Student Academic Success Services (SASS) to develop effective critical reading, note taking, study, writing, exam, presentation, or concentration skills. SASS also provides self-help and online materials to facilitate improvements in active class participation, assignment/project planning, motivation, perfectionism, time management, stress management, and procrastination. Student should proactively seek such assistance to improve functioning and performance. Individual consultation and workshops are also available.

**Participation & Engagement**

- Students will demonstrate professionalism in all training and university affiliated activities.

- Students will familiarize themselves with University, Department, and Program policies and requirements. Students are expected to thoroughly read the Department and Program handbooks and to familiarize themselves with the Program Canvas site. Students are expected to review the appropriate handbooks before querying faculty or staff about procedure, paperwork, or requirements.

- Students will consistently attend all classes, fieldwork supervision, program meetings (e.g., Roundtable, Research Group), and program events (e.g., receptions). Barring extenuating circumstances (e.g., personal or family illness or emergencies), instructors should be notified in advance of any class or supervision absences. Excused absences and makeup work are only permitted for legitimate absences per university policy.

- Students will engage fully in all courses, completing all assigned readings, participating actively and respectfully in class, and maintaining appropriate on-task behavior. To facilitate engagement and learning, wifi and social media use are prohibited during class sessions unless explicitly directed by instructors. Inappropriate classroom behavior is grounds for loss of class points and, in cases of chronic infractions, corrective action by the Program.

- Students will arrive promptly to classes and meetings and will engage in appropriate on-task behavior, demonstrate respect for speakers and guests, and complete assigned tasks on time and in adherence with any verbal or written instructions provided by faculty and instructors.

- Class and supervision should be a priority and should not be missed for assistantship activities, fieldwork, research, or extracurricular activities. Absences for research, extracurricular activities, or professional development (e.g., workshops, conferences) should be approved in advance, but are not generally permitted. When a student is absent, it is
their responsibility to find out what makeup work is required and to submit it in a timely manner.

- Students will engage not only with required course and Program readings, but the broader school psychology literature and the profession (e.g., reading journals and new research articles, membership in professional associations, participation in professional conferences). Such activities cultivate commitment to lifelong learning.

**Research**

- Before engaging in research subject to oversight by the university’s Institutional Review Board, including as a collaborator, students will complete necessary training as specified by the IRB. Students will submit and obtain IRB approval before initiating research projects involving human participants. All research activities will be conducted in a manner consistent with university policy and professional guidelines. See also, University Policy on Research Involving Human Subjects.

- Students will commit themselves to making timely progress in their required research activities. Students will schedule regular meetings with their advisor. When unavoidable obstacles are expected, the student will consult with the advisor to plan accordingly. Progress in required research activities (i.e., MA Plan B project, prelim oral, dissertation) should take priority over other research activities.

- Students will learn and master APA style. All required research manuscripts, and, unless otherwise specified, class papers, should be written in APA style. This applies to all manuscript elements, organization and headings, writing style, grammar and usage, nonbiased language, mechanics, tables and figures, and citations and references. We expect students will read thoroughly the current edition of the APA Publication Manual and refer to it regularly when preparing papers.

- All students will produce high-quality research. Whether engaged in the synthesis and evaluation of existing research or the conduct of novel research studies, all students are expected to engage in publication-worthy scholarship.

- Students will obtain advisor approval for all research activities, including presentations and publications, even when the advisor is not a coauthor since the student completes such professional efforts as an affiliate of the University and the Program.

**Communication and Interactions**

- Students will check their UMN email regularly, as faculty, staff and the University use email for general and official communications. Students can generally expect responses to inquiries during normal business hours, allowing 1-3 business days for response. Faculty and staff are not generally available evenings and weekends.

- Students’ verbal and written communication (e.g., emails) will reflect appropriate academic etiquette, consistent with semi-

---

**Hint:** Colloquial v. Official Terms for Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colloquial</th>
<th>Official</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's thesis</td>
<td>Plan B Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>Oral Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Exam</td>
<td>Comprehensive Written Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelim, Prelim oral,</td>
<td>Oral Preliminary Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prac</td>
<td>Fieldwork, Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>Doctoral Thesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students and faculty often refer to various requirements by their colloquial or common terms, rather than the official terms used in university and department policy.
formal behavior in a professional work environment. When in doubt, err on the side of formality. Students should be mindful of the tone of email communications, as these as professional exchanges that should convey your professionalism. As such, students should be appropriately courteous and solicitous of staff and faculty (e.g., politely request, rather than demanding), and use complete sentences with correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation. All emails should contain a brief descriptive subject line; greeting (e.g., Hi Dr...., Dear..., Good morning, Hi, Dr....); a clear, concise body; and closing. Several illustrative examples are provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hi – I need to meet. I’ll stop by at 2 tomorrow? ~M | Hi Dr. Smith,  
I have been drafting the method for my MA project and am having difficulty isolating an appropriate measure of Q. Based on my readings of X, Y, and Z, I am trying to decide between A and B. I have class during your office hours and appointment slots for the rest of the month are taken. Are you available to chat any other times this week or next?

Thanks,
Marley |
| I need a permission number for EPSY 8000 ASAP. Thx. | Dear Alicia,  
I am in the process of registering for next spring. My degree plan indicates that I should be taking EPSY 8000. I’m forwarding below Dr. Smith’s email approval to take the course. Can you please provide the necessary permission number at your earliest convenience?

Thanks,
Marley  
(Note: It is critical that you forward the instructor’s approval email in order to receive a permission number; do not email without it) |
| John,  
I don’t understand your comments. What does “XXXXXX” mean? | Dear John,  
Thank you for the helpful feedback on the last draft of my results section. I’m in the process of addressing all of the comments and suggestions, but there are a few I am unsure about regarding the presentation of effect sizes. Would you prefer I comment within the next draft or meet to discuss at your next availability?

Best,
Marley |
| Dear Dr. Smith,  
I’m not ready to defend next month. Can I get an extension? I’d like to defend by June 1. | Dear Dr. Smith,  
I’ve not made expected progress on my MA project so I am not going to meet the spring deadline for the full draft. I’d like to meet to discuss next steps so that I can get back on track by early fall. I’ve signed up for two appointment slots next Thursday. Is there anything you’d like me to bring to the meeting or send in advance to facilitate the conversation?

My apologies,
Marley |
| When is the next assignment due? | Check the syllabus and Canvas site – no direct communication is necessary unless due dates are not provided in the syllabus or Canvas site. |
| I’d like a redo or make-up | Check the syllabus – no direct communication is appropriate unless allowance for re-doing assignments or make-up work is explicitly invited in |
In addition, students should not send unnecessary emails to faculty or staff, such as requesting or confirming information provided in syllabi, assignment rubrics/guidelines, handbooks, Canvas sites/gradebooks, or university websites, or otherwise requesting information they can access themselves if applying appropriate problem-solving (via reading, web or library searches, etc.).

- Students will not make unreasonable requests of faculty, instructors, or staff, such as requesting modifications to assignments or requirements, or requesting exceptions if not related to legitimate absences or disability. For exceptions to timelines for research requirements, the student must experience protracted legitimate absences or delays attributable to unavoidable and unpredictable external factors (e.g., delays in site approval for research, participant attrition, faculty absences/travel).

**University Policy on Research Involving Human Subjects**

The university requires that all research involving human subjects be cleared through proper channels. The student and student’s advisor must submit research proposals to the University Institutional Review Board (IRB) which must approve all proposals for research, even those using existing data. Students must receive approval for any independent research, including Master’s papers and doctoral dissertations, barring systematic reviews. Students are responsible for ensuring sufficient time to process this paperwork (1 to 2 months depending on exempt, expedited, or full review). Students are strongly encouraged to review [IRB guidance materials](#).

**Background Checks**

Consistent with university policy, the Program requires all students to have background checks in place to complete fieldwork or do any research or other professional activities with minors. Students are required to submit proof when they begin the program and then every year with annual review.

*Side note:* Students may forfeit eligibility for GRAs or other awards funded by federal agencies—which is most of the funding available to students—if ticketed for texting or other device use while driving. Don’t text and drive.

**Professional Practice by Graduate Students**

No graduate student in the School Psychology Program shall engage in public activity, including presenting at seminars, conferences and workshops, course projects, and work as a volunteer within or outside of the university, in which they would represent the profession of psychology without the written permission of their advisor. The [Program Approval of Outside Activities Form](#) must be completed and submitted to the Program Assistant before beginning the activity. When considering any such activity, the student and advisor should ensure that the activity is commensurate with the APA and NASP code of ethics and with the student’s level of professional training. Activities must also be consistent with state rules and regulations governing the practice of psychology or school psychology as overseen by the MN Board of Psychology or MN Department of Education, respectively.
No unlicensed graduate student in the program shall engage in the *unsupervised* practice of psychology, including: counseling, psychotherapy, school consultation, or psychometric evaluation. Exceptions to this regulation can be made only by the advisor with the concurrence of the student’s advisor and only if the student by other training or experience has qualifications meeting existing professional standards in a specified domain of practice. Such standards would include holding the proper license or certificate if the student is working for a fee. Students should consult with the Coordinator regarding restrictions for provisional licensing in school psychology while pursuing graduate studies.

Students, even when engaged in permissible practices of consulting activity, are not to identify their affiliation with the Program or university by the use of university stationery, a university mention on a personal business card, email signature, etc., without the written approval of the advisor and the concurrence of the student’s advisor. When students engage in such approved activity, they may identify themselves only as a "graduate student in the School Psychology Program, University of Minnesota."

Students interested in engaging in volunteer activities that are psychological in nature should consult their advisor. Students may not make an oral or written commitment to provide services without prior approval from the advisor. Once students have committed to provide such services with the requisite approval, students are ethically obligated to follow through with their commitment barring extenuating circumstances, which should be discussed with the advisor.

**Nondiscrimination & Diversity**

The Program engages in nondiscriminatory practices in accordance with the University policy. Thus, all students are provided equal access to the Program, facilities, and employment without regard to any dimension of diversity. Diversity is an evolving concept that includes, but is not limited to, differences based on: ability (cognitive and physical), age, language, socioeconomic status, gender (expression, identity, and roles), sexual orientation, ethnicity, race, religion, political ideology, marital status, cultural values and beliefs, personal values, and cultural background. The Program endorses the following mission with respect to multiculturalism and diversity:

> Our mission concerns the fundamental rights, dignity, and worth of all people, and our goal is to achieve a climate that honors and respects all individuals. In order to create such a climate, the program promotes cultural mindfulness and self-reflection, and encourages students to seek knowledge on topics related to diversity. Within an ecological framework, the School Psychology program promotes multiculturalism at the individual, group, and systems-level. Our mission reiterates the University of Minnesota’s Graduate School commitment to promoting cultural diversity. In alignment with the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) Practice Model and the American Psychological Association’s (APA) core values, we strive to foster knowledge of diversity multicultural research, and evidence-based practice related to diversity. Our mission reiterates NASP’s nondiscrimination and equal opportunity policy and APA’s Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists.

For more information, see our [Diversity Mission Statement](#).
Grievance Procedures

The School Psychology Program strives to create an environment in which students feel respected and supported. However, should students have grievances with the Program, they have multiple avenues for resolution:

- Attempt to resolve your grievance informally by speaking directly with the faculty member whose actions are of concern. Concerns should be addressed promptly with the individual.
- Attempt to resolve the grievance informally by meeting with the Program Coordinator, Department Chair, or relevant CEHD administrator to discuss potential solutions.
- Consult the University’s Student Conflict Resolution Center’s website or staff to identify potential resources and informal solutions. SCRC services are free and confidential, and can be used in cases of informal or formal grievances (e.g., discrimination, grading disputes, academic incivility, scholastic misconduct) and disciplinary proceedings. SCRC has advocates and ombudsman services available to assist students. Graduate assistants may also consult with the University’s Office of Conflict Resolution, which provides resources and support to university employees.
- File a formal written grievance, either by email or hard copy, with the Program Coordinator to initiate formal resolution within the program. The written grievance should include the nature of the complaint and identification of the parties involved. When a grievance is filed, the Coordinator will set up a meeting with the student within 10 business days of receipt to discuss potential resolution. With the exception of minor situations resolved in the initial conversation, the Coordinator will discuss the issue at the next Program meeting. The student may request not to be identified in this discussion. Alternatively, the student may attend to share their perspective on the matter and participate in the discussion of potential solutions. Depending on the nature and severity of the grievance, the Coordinator may enlist the services of the Student Conflict Resolution Center or Office of Conflict Resolution, particularly when mediation, ombudsman services, or a due process hearing is warranted. In all cases, the Coordinator will attempt to resolve the matter efficiently and in keeping with University policies and professional ethical standards and guidelines for training.

At any point, students may informally consult or seek support from the Program Coordinator, their advisor, or other faculty about the issue at hand.

School Psychology Student Association (SPSA)

SPSA is a formal student group that was organized in 1992-93 school year to promote student involvement in the Program and in the field of school psychology. SPSA focuses on professional development in a fun and relaxed atmosphere. Additional information on and resources from SPSA are provided on the Program Canvas Site. All School Psychology students are strongly encouraged to participate in SPSA. Annual dues are collected each fall by the SPSA Treasurer or President. Dues provide funds to support the activities of the SPSA committees. The amount of dues will be announced each fall. SPSA officers represent students at Program Faculty Meetings and plan additional programming and social events.
Student Service to the Program

Students are asked to contribute to the overall functioning of the Program. This request is consistent with committee work or professional service required of a school psychologist who is employed in school and community settings. The following activities satisfy this requirement: officer or executive board in SPSA, SPSA committee member, ad hoc committee member, and participation in School Psychology Program events. However, this list is not exhaustive, and each student is encouraged to identify an area of service that will strengthen the School Psychology Program.

Program Resources

Program Canvas Site

Canvas is an online course management system used for online courses and content. The Program maintains a Canvas site for program materials, forms, and resources. Many instructors and professors also use Canvas for their courses, whether in person or online. Students can access Canvas through myu.umn.edu using their internet password and ID. To access the Canvas site for the first time, students may need to contact the School Psychology Program Assistant. Thereafter, the Canvas site will be listed as one of the courses in the My Courses window and will also be listed in ‘my Courses & Teaching’ on the MyU website. On the Canvas site, students can download important program forms and documents. Students should regularly revisit or opt to receive updates because the Announcements page is used to share news, opportunities, and other announcements (e.g., scheduling, policy updates).

School Psychology Resource Library

The Educational Psychology Resource Library, located in 350D ESB, is maintained for faculty and students to use both as a resource and a gathering location. This room contains books, some intervention materials, references, journals, research reports, Master’s theses, doctoral dissertations, coursework readings, and computers. Books and journals are not available for checkout, but may be temporarily removed for photocopying. All other resources are available for checkout using the posted procedures. There are testing materials stored in the Resource Library that are signed out for coursework. Please see the course instructor to access these materials. Although students may use these materials during their practicum experiences, no resources may go with students on their internships. Students are responsible for all materials they check out, and will be held accountable for missing or damaged materials. The Resource Library is maintained and new materials are purchased with fees collected from students. Purchases are made with input from the Student Resources Committee of the School Psychology Student Association and approval of the Coordinator.

Testing/Intervention Materials

All testing equipment and some intervention materials are kept in 350D ESB and may be checked out by students only with approval from a faculty member, generally instructors of assessment and intervention courses or Fieldwork Coordinator. Students need to plan well in advance when they may need the materials. The assessment materials will be checked out according to the following priority: (1) assessment coursework, (2) practica, (3) school psychology faculty, (4) other student needs, and (5) educational psychology faculty. Students are responsible for all materials they check out. Students will be held accountable for missing or damaged materials. Materials are to be used only for sanctioned training activities. Although students may use these materials during their practicum experiences, no resources may go with
students on their internships. Use of program materials in places of employment or other non-program related activities is not generally permitted.

**Loss of Property:** The Educational Psychology Department maintains a current inventory of assessment devices and intervention materials. In many cases, these are quite expensive to purchase. The materials are available for students to borrow. Students are responsible for the materials they borrow. Therefore, in the event of loss or theft, students are responsible for replacing the materials. Because of this policy, we encourage students to verify that their homeowner’s or renter’s insurance would cover the replacement costs of assessment devices and intervention materials. Should you have questions about the costs of materials, please see the instructor for the class.

**Kim M. & David Cooke Research Grants**

Students may apply for a Cooke Research Grant to offset research costs. Research projects must be consistent with the program orientation. Priority is given to students’ required research projects (i.e., dissertations and MA projects) and projects for which students do not have other sources of funding. Funding is limited to costs necessary to conduct a study (i.e., intervention materials, assessment materials, participant incentives, protocols). Travel expenses and payment for data collection, transcription, coding, etc. are not permitted. Applications are reviewed at each program faculty meeting throughout the year. Students are encouraged to submit applications early in the academic year since limited funds are available and once expended no more awards can be made until the following September. For information on the 1-page application and selection processes, see the program Canvas site.

**Program Listservs**

The program maintains multiple listservs for current and past members of the Program.

- [Schlpsych-all@lists.umn.edu](mailto:Schlpsych-all@lists.umn.edu) is a university listserv of all program faculty and students. School Psych Alumni is an optional university listserv of program graduates. This listserv is used to share program and department announcements, opportunities, and resources.
- [Schlpsychstudents@lists.umn.edu](mailto:Schlpsychstudents@lists.umn.edu) is a university listserv of all current students. All students may send messages to this listserv.
- [Schlpsych-guru@lists.umn.edu](mailto:Schlpsych-guru@lists.umn.edu) is a moderated university listserv for graduates of the program through which announcements (e.g., events) and solicitation of input are shared.
- [Schlpsych-opportunities@umn.edu](mailto:Schlpsych-opportunities@umn.edu) is a Google Group used to share announcements for positions, fellowships, and other professional opportunities and is primarily intended for alumni and soon-to-be graduates. Anyone is welcome to join.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After you’ve checked the handbook(s) and/or websites, who can you go to for answers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departmental requirements or paperwork</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program procedures or paperwork</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program/track requirements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practicum or internship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal degree planning or research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approval of outside activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accreditation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: Specialist Certificate

The Specialist Certificate requires a three-year program of study comprised of a minimum of 60 graduate semester credits, including the Master’s degree (See Section V) with a major in Educational Psychology. Per Graduate School policy, all courses counted toward the SC must be taken within five consecutive years, beginning with the earliest coursework on the Graduate Planning & Audit System (GPAS) planner.

Program Approval

The School Psychology Program is approved by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP/CAEP). As such, the Program requires that SC students have a minimum of three years of full-time study (typically, two years of coursework and one year of internship) at the graduate level with at least 60 semester credits. The SC-track has been designed to operationalize the skills and competencies articulated in the NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists.

Degree Planning

The Program curriculum and corresponding required courses are described in the previous section. The Program recommends students work from the suggested 3- or 4-year sequence in order to meet all department and program degree requirements in the necessary order (e.g., completing core courses before attempting the comprehensive written exam) in order to avoid unwanted delays in degree completion. Proposed deviations should be discussed with the student’s academic advisor and coordinator and may result in delays in progress towards degree. Students should also discuss potential enrollment beyond 14 credits with their advisor. SC students should plan for 1 course (3 credits) meeting departmental learning/cognitive core course requirements and 2 electives towards a self-identified specialty area (e.g., literacy/reading, mathematics, intensive intervention, mental health services).

SC students must take a total of 60 total credits during their three years of study. The recommended 3-year course sequence assumes students will enroll in 14 credits during each of their first 4 semesters in the program, and 4 total credits of internship. All students must take a minimum of 1 internship credit per semester of their internship year. If SC students enroll in more than the recommended 56 credits during their first two years in the program (i.e., by taking additional electives or summer credits), they may enroll in 1 credit per semester of internship, as long as the total number of credits accrued while in the program is at least 60.
### Sample Course Sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPSY 8821 (3 cr)</td>
<td>EPSY 8815 (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPSY 8821 (3 cr)</td>
<td>EPSY 8815 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8811 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY 8816 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8811 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY 8816 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8813 (2)</td>
<td>EPSY 8817 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8813 (2)</td>
<td>EPSY 8817 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 5221 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY 8813 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 5221 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY 8813 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8251 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY core/elect. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 11</td>
<td>Total credits: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 14</td>
<td>Total credits: 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA Plan B project initiated by September. MA Plan B written exam by May.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EPSY 8812 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY 5851 (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EPSY 8825 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY 5851 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8818 (2)</td>
<td>EPSY 8819 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8812 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY 8819 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8822 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY 8818 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8818 (2)</td>
<td>EPSY 8818 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8215 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY core/elect. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8823 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY core/elect (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8823 (3)</td>
<td>Elective (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 11</td>
<td>Total credits: 8-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 14</td>
<td>Total Credits: 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>MA Plan B project initiated by September. MA Plan B written exam by May.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EPSY 8842 (2)</td>
<td>EPSY 8842 (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EPSY 8822 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY core/elect. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 2</td>
<td>Total credits: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8825 (3)</td>
<td>Elective (3-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 6-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8831 (3)</td>
<td>Elective (3-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 6-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY core/elect. (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EPSY 8842 (2)</td>
<td>EPSY 8842 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8842 (2)</td>
<td>EPSY 8842 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 2</td>
<td>Total credits: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Praxis complete by May</td>
<td>Portfolio complete by May.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Praxis complete by May</td>
<td>Portfolio complete by May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fieldwork

SC students will complete 4 semesters of practica in one placement per year prior to internship. When completing practica, students are to comply with the policies and procedures set forth in the Fieldwork Handbook available on the Program Canvas site. Practica are coordinated by the Fieldwork Coordinator and supervised by program faculty for EPSY 8813, 8818, 8831, and 8832. Placements should be arranged through the Field Coordinator. Completion of specific fieldwork requirements for the Portfolio can be fulfilled during school practicum and/or internship and the completion of these requirements must be documented on the requisite forms.

### Internship

Successful completion of the internship and all internship requirements in the third year of the program is necessary to receive the specialist certificate, which is the basis for eligibility for credentialing as a school psychologist. When completing internship, students shall comply with the policies and procedures set forth in the Fieldwork Handbook. The internship requires a minimum of 1,200 hours (Note: At least 600 hours must be in a school setting where interns have access to general education students).
**Internship Eligibility**

Coursework and MA requirements, including the MA written exam for the Plan B project, must be completed before students begin internship. In order to be eligible to apply for internships, students must be on track to complete the MA Plan B written exam by the end of spring semester before they intend to begin internship. SC students must obtain approval from their advisor and fieldwork coordinator before applying for internships. The MA written exam requires the MA examining committee to pass the student’s MA Plan B manuscript as meeting program requirements and expectations for the MA Plan B project.

Students off-track in MA milestones should discuss progress towards completion before spring midterms/spring break. Any fieldwork hours completed before the MA exam and before the official start of internship are practicum hours only, must be unpaid, and must be completed while enrolled in appropriate practicum credits, not internship credits.

Students are strongly encouraged to attend the fall internship planning meeting if they plan to complete their internship requirement in the fall of the following year.

**Internship Enrollment**

Students register for internship credits while completing internship and will receive a grade of K until all internship requirements are complete. Registration implies liability protection by the University. School Psychology interns are employees of the internship site and, therefore, receive funding through the employing agency. Benefits (e.g., health insurance) may or may not be included. The prospective intern should inquire about the provision of benefits by the district during the application/interview process.

For students who apply for an internship in MN, an equivalent of one school year and reimbursable Limited Intern License is required. The application forms can be downloaded at Minnesota Department of Education website. Students completing internships outside of MN are responsible for determining any applicable credentialing requirements.

**Graduate Planning and Audit System (GPAS)**

By the beginning of the third semester, students must submit the Graduate Planning & Audit System (GPAS) planner for their Specialist Certificate. The GPAS is available online via the student MyU portal page under the Academics tab, on the Degree Progress sub-tab. The student lists all completed and planned coursework required for the degree, including those courses listed on the Master’s GPAS planner. Once you submit the plan, it will be automatically routed to the student’s advisor and department Graduate Program Coordinator (GPC). The plan is then routed to the Graduate Student Services and Progress Office for final approval. After filing, it is possible to make changes to the program by a petition approved by the student’s advisor and the DGS.

The Specialist Certificate Program consists of the coursework for Master’s plus additional credits to total 60 and must include 3 credits of research methods. Students must earn a minimum GPA of 2.80 for courses listed on the student’s official program. At least two-thirds of the credits completed in the UMN Graduate School, and all taken to fulfill department core requirements, which are included on the GPAS planner must be taken under the A-F system.

With approval of the student’s advisor, DGS, and Graduate School, students may be permitted to transfer up to 50% of the coursework listed on the GPAS planner. Please consult the Graduate Education Catalog and the Uwide Policy Library for policy details. To transfer courses to meet Educational Psychology core requirements, submit an internal petition form. For
courses outside the University, include a syllabus for review. If approved, requirements will appear as satisfied on the GPAS planner. To transfer courses to meet School Psychology requirements, submit course syllabi to advisor. The student’s advisor will send an email to the program assistant & DGS assistant with approval. If approved, requirements will appear as satisfied on the GPAS planner. Substitutions should also be listed on the Annual Review Progress Chart.

Note: If admitted prior to Spring 2013, your GDP will be loaded into GPAS. To make changes to existing Graduate Degree Plan students will need to contact the DGS assistant.

**Special Field Preliminary Examination**

The SC Special Field Exam requires students to demonstrate their knowledge and competencies across coursework, fieldwork, and other evaluation activities requiring the synthesis of information across the curriculum. The Special Field Exam requires the following:

1) **School Psychology Coursework:** B- or better on all required final exams and course grades for School Psychology courses; or demonstrated competence in that area as determined by the student and advisor (e.g., students may be asked to retake a comparable final exam devised by the course instructor and advisor or write a paper in the content area)

2) **Educational Psychology Coursework:** B- or better for course grades in all Core Courses that meet the Educational Psychology requirements; or demonstrated competence in that area as determined by the student and advisor (e.g., students may be asked to retake a comparable final exam devised by the course instructor and advisor or write a paper in the content area)

3) **Comprehensive Written Examination:** Passing designation on the Comprehensive Written Examination.

4) **School Psychology Praxis Examination:** Passing score on the School Psychology Praxis Examination, which would also make them eligible to apply to be a nationally certified school psychologist upon completion of the SC program.

5) **Portfolio:** Passing score on the Portfolio rubric by the completion of internship placement.

When students have fulfilled all these requirements listed above, they should complete the SC Special Field Prelim Requirements Form with their advisor, which documents that all special field requirements have been met, and submit to the Program Assistant. Then, students can request the Graduation Packet from the Graduate School, in which the Final Examination Form can be found and completed by the Examining Committee.

**Examining Committee**

For the SC Final Examination Form, an examining committee is comprised of three school psychology faculty members. Specialist committees will be comprised of the SC advisor, program coordinator, and one other school psychology faculty member. A form to propose examining committee members is submitted online via the Graduate School website. If students wish to make changes to their committee, they will need their advisor’s and the new committee member’s approval. As a courtesy, students should be sure to inform any committee members that they are dropping. Changes are submitted online.
Program Accreditation & Approval

The PhD program is accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA) and approved by NASP. Questions related to the program’s APA-accreditation status should be directed to the Commission on Accreditation:

Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation
American Psychological Association
750 1st Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002
Phone: (202) 336-5979 / E-mail: apaaccred@apa.org
Web: www.apa.org/ed/accreditation

Residency & Time to Completion

The doctoral program is designed as a minimum five-year program of full-time study that requires the completion of a minimum of 90 graduate semester credits. The first three years are devoted primarily to completion of coursework and must be fulltime. Per APA requirements, at least two years must be at the University of Minnesota; one year must be fulltime in residence. Per Graduate School policy, students have eight years from initial enrollment to complete all degree requirements. Students must maintain good academic standing and complete annual review requirements yearly (see Section VI).

Degree Planning

The Program curriculum and corresponding required courses are described in the Section I. The Program recommends students work from the suggested 5- or 6-year sequence in order to meet all department and program degree requirements in the necessary order (e.g., completing core courses before attempting the comprehensive written exam) in order to avoid unwanted delays in degree completion. Proposed deviations should be discussed with the student’s academic advisor and coordinator and may result in delays in progress towards degree. Students should also discuss potential enrollment beyond 14 credits with their advisor. PhD students should plan for 2 courses (6 credits) meeting departmental learning/cognitive and social/personality core course requirements and multiple electives towards a self-identified specialty area (e.g., research methods, prevention science, disability policy, literacy/reading, mathematics, intensive intervention, mental health services).

PhD students are strongly encouraged to use elective credits for supplemental coursework in research statistics and methods. In particular, PhD students are encouraged to complete additional stats and methods courses in their third year to bolster knowledge and skills for dissertation success and general scholarly development.
### Sample Course Sequence and Milestones – 5 year

(grey = optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Example A (diss defense before internship)</th>
<th>Example B (diss defense during internship)</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | EPSY 8821 (3 cr)  
EPSY 8811 (3)  
EPSY 8813 (2)  
EPSY 5221 (3)  
EPSY 8251 (3)  
Total credits: 14 | EPSY 8821 (3 cr)  
EPSY 8811 (3)  
EPSY 8813 (2)  
EPSY 5221 (3)  
EPSY 8251 (3)  
Total credits: 14 | 1 |
|      | EPSY 8815 (3)  
EPSY 8816 (3)  
EPSY 8817 (3)  
EPSY 8813 (3)  
EPSY 8252 (3)  
Total credits: 14 | EPSY 8815 (3)  
EPSY 8816 (3)  
EPSY 8817 (3)  
EPSY 8813 (3)  
EPSY 8252 (3)  
Total credits: 14 |      |
|      | MA Plan B project designed by May. | MA Plan B project designed by May. |
| 2    | EPSY 8812 (3)  
EPSY 8818 (2)  
EPSY 8822 (3)  
EPSY 8215 (3)  
EPSY 8823 (3)  
Total credits: 14 | EPSY 8812 (3)  
EPSY 8818 (2)  
EPSY 8822 (3)  
EPSY 8215 (3)  
EPSY 8823 (3)  
Total credits: 14 | 2 |
|      | EPSY 5851 (3)  
EPSY 8819 (3)  
EPSY 8818 (2)  
EPSY core/elect. (3)  
Elective (3)  
Total Credits: 14 | EPSY 8819 (3)  
EPSY 8818 (2)  
EPSY core/elect. (3)  
Elective (3)  |
|      | MA Plan B project initiated by September.  
MA Plan B written exam by May. | MA Plan B project initiated by September.  
MA Plan B written exam by May. |
| 3    | EPSY 8831 (3)  
EPSY 8841/elect (3)  
EPSY 8888 (2)  
EPSY 5802 (3)  
EPSY core/elect. (3)  
Comprehensive exam in August.  
Prelim oral exam passed by May. | EPSY 8831 (3)  
EPSY 8841/elect (3)  
EPSY 8888 (2)  
EPSY core/elect. (3)  
Other elective (3)  
Comprehensive exam in August.  
Prelim oral exam passed by May. | 3 |
|      | EPSY 8841/elect (3)  
EPSY 8888 (2)  
EPSY core/elect. (3)  
Other elective (3) |
| 4    | EPSY 8841/elect (3)  
EPSY 8888 (9)  
Prospectus approved by December.  
Dissertation defended by May. | EPSY 8841/elect (3)  
EPSY 8888 (11)  
Other electives (≤5)  
Total credits: 9-14 | 4 |
|      | EPSY 8841/elect (3)  
EPSY 8888 (3-6)  
Other electives (≤5)  
Total credits: 9-14 |
| 5    | EPSY 8843 (1)  
EPSY 8843 (1)  
Portfolio complete by May. | EPSY 8842 (1)  
EPSY 8888 (1-2)  
Dissertation defended by May.  
Portfolio complete by May. | 5 |
|      | EPSY 8842 (1)  
EPSY 8888 (5)* |

Note: EPSY 8843 is a full-time equivalent credit that can only be used if dissertation is defended.

* to be considered a full-time student (to maintain full financial aid eligibility and defer student loans), students must enroll in at least 6 credits/semester)
Sample Course Sequence and Milestones – 6 year

(grey = optional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Example C (comp exam after year 2)</th>
<th>Example D (comp exam after year 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EPSY 8821 (3 cr)</td>
<td>EPSY 8821 (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8811 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY 8811 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8813 (2)</td>
<td>EPSY 8813 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 5221 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY 5221 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 11</td>
<td>Total credits: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA project deferred to years 2-3.</td>
<td>MA project deferred to years 2-3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|      | Spring                            | Spring                            |
| 1    | EPSY 8815 (3)                     | EPSY 8815 (3)                     |
|      | EPSY 8816 (3)                     | EPSY 8816 (3)                     |
|      | EPSY 8817 (3)                     | EPSY 8817 (3)                     |
|      | EPSY 8813 (3)                     | EPSY 8813 (3)                     |
|      | Total credits: 11                 | Total credits: 11                 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EPSY 8251 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY 5851 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8812 (3)</td>
<td>EPSY 8819 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8818 (2)</td>
<td>EPSY 8818 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EPSY 8823 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits: 11</td>
<td>Total credits: 8-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA Plan B project designed by May.</td>
<td>MA Plan B project designed by May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comp written exam in August.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|      |            |            |
| 3    | EPSY 8822 (3) | EPSY core/elect. (3) |
|      | EPSY 8831 (3) | EPSY 8831 (3) |
|      | EPSY 5802 (3) | EPSY 8823 (3) |
|      | Other elective | Other elective |
|      | Total credits: 8-11 | Total credits: 9 |
|      | MA Plan B study initiated by December. | MA Plan B study initiated by December. |
|      | MA Plan B written exam by May.    | MA Plan B written exam by May. |

|      |            |            |
| 4    | EPSY 8832 (3) | EPSY 8841 (3) |
|      | EPSY 8841 (3) | EPSY 8888 (3) |
|      | Total credits: 6-14 | Total credits: 6-14 |
|      | Prelim oral exam passed by May.   | Prelim oral exam passed by May.   |

|      |            |            |
| 5    | EPSY 8888 (12) | EPSY 8888 (12) |
|      | Prospectus approved by December.  | Prospectus approved by December.  |
|      | Internship applications after prospectus. | Internship applications after prospectus. |

|      |            |            |
| 6    | EPSY 8843/42 (1) | EPSY 8843/42 (1) |
|      | EPSY 8843/42 (1) | EPSY 8843/42 (1) |
|      | Total credits: ≥1* | Total credits: ≥1* |
|      | Dissertation defended by May. | Portfolio complete by May. |
|      | Portfolio complete by May. | Dissertation defended by May. |

Note: EPSY 8843 is a full-time equivalent credit that can only be used if dissertation is defended before internship.

* to be considered a full-time student (to maintain full financial aid eligibility and defer student loans), students must enroll in at least 6 credits/semester)

Timelines & Scheduling of Oral Exams

- To maximize the efficiency of their study time, students are encouraged to take the Praxis exam near the written exam.

- Students are encouraged to complete their written and oral preliminary exams in the fall or spring of their third year. To facilitate timely completion of milestones, the oral preliminary exam may be scheduled as early as two weeks after the written examination administration.
• The dissertation prospectus meeting may be scheduled as early as one week after the oral preliminary exam. Accordingly, with advisor approval, students may prepare their oral preliminary paper and dissertation prospectus concurrently, and while preparing for written exams. In exceptional cases, with advisor and committee approval, the oral prelim and prospectus may be scheduled in the same day.

• PhD students will be required to have passed their dissertation prospectus before they can apply for internships.

Delay of required oral and written exams may result in delays in degree completion.

**Note:** Students will be eligible for more accredited internship sites and be more competitive applicants if they are on track to complete their dissertations before beginning internship.

**Students may schedule oral exams for the MA Plan B project, preliminary oral exam, thesis planning/prospectus, and dissertation only during the fall or spring semesters. Any exams/meetings must be held by the end of final exams, Monday-Friday, during regular business hours. In order to be considered for exam readiness, students must submit full drafts of the MA Plan B project, prelim oral paper, thesis planning/prospectus, or dissertation to the advisor no later than 1 month before the final allowable exam date.**

If the student has not submitted a fully developed manuscript to the advisor by this date, they should work with the advisor to plan for summer independent research activities to recoup progress and complete the oral exams in the fall semester.

The Program does not permit scheduling of oral exams outside of the official semester calendars (i.e., after the final Friday of final exams) except under extenuating circumstances (e.g., illness or welcoming a child during academic year; committee unable to schedule during semester). In such instances, a written petition for an exception in scheduling must be submitted in writing to the program assistant before November 1 for a winter exam or May 1 for a summer exam to be voted on by the program faculty. If approved, the student may, in consultation with their advisor, schedule with the committee.

**Timelines for Dissertation Completion**

Doctoral students must take a total of 24 credits of EPsy 8888. Students may petition to enroll in up to 6 credits of early doctoral thesis credits once they have passed the MA oral defense and written preliminary exam. Otherwise, 8888 credits are not to be taken until after the oral preliminary exam is passed. Students who will not complete the dissertation final oral exam before internship may save dissertation credits until internship year in order to maintain full time status needed to maintain financial aid status and defer student loans (minimum 6 credits/semester required).

Students who are not on track to defend their dissertations during the spring before internship should delay taking the final two 8888 credits and enroll in one credit/semester of 8888 during the internship year. After internship completion, PhD students who have not completed their final oral exam are required to enroll in EPSY 8822 or EPSY 8993 each fall or spring as directed by the program coordinator.

Students should register at least one doctoral thesis credit (EPsy 8888) each semester until all
requirements for the PhD have been completed. Once the student has completed 24 dissertation credits, they should register for EPSY 8822 or 8993. Failure to comply with the mutually agreed upon deadlines will jeopardize the student’s status in the program or the Graduate School.

**Dissertation Completion and Internship Registration**

Doctoral students have two registration options for internship:

1. If the dissertation final exam is passed before beginning internship, students may enroll in one credit/semester of EPSY 8843, which is the equivalent of full time enrollment and maintains students’ financial aid eligibility and student loan deferment. The final exam should be completed by the end of the students’ spring semester in order to qualify.

2. If the dissertation final exam is not complete before beginning internship, students must enroll in one credit/semester each of EPSY 8842. Students may be required to register for additional credits of EPSY 8888, as well as 8822 in the fall as deemed appropriate by their advisor. 8842 does not count as the full time equivalent and does not confer financial aid eligibility (e.g., student loan repayment would be initiated). Students may enroll in additional credits of EPSY 8822 or directed study (8993) under their advisor while working on their dissertations in order to reach full time status and maintain financial aid eligibility during internship. Thus, the alternative course sequence for these students may be as follows:

   - Fall: 8842 (1), 8888 or 8993 (2 credits), and 8822 (3 credits) as needed
   - Spring: 8842 (1 credit), 8888 (1-5 credits), and/or additional 8993 as needed

**Predissertation Research Requirement for Students with Prior Master’s Degrees**

Students with Master’s degrees from other institutions or programs will complete a predoctoral research project under their advisor’s supervision before attempting preliminary exams. Per department policy, this project must an original research project that involves original data analysis. It must meet the Program’s general standards for rigor and preparation of a MA Plan B project, but final approval is determined by the advisor, rather than an examining committee.

**Fieldwork**

Doctoral students complete a sequence of four yearlong practica and a fulltime internship of a minimum of 1,500 hours. Introductory (EPsy 8813), intermediate (EPsy 8818), and comprehensive practica (EPsy 8831) must be in school settings; advanced practica (EPsy 8832) may be in a non-school setting approved by the program, but a school is encouraged. All placements must be approved by the Program’s Fieldwork Coordinator. When completing practica and internship, students must comply with the policies and procedures set forth in the Fieldwork Handbook. Practica are coordinated by the Fieldwork Coordinator and supervised by program faculty for EPsy 8813, 8818, 8831, and 8832. Completion of specific fieldwork requirements for the Special Field Prelim Requirements can be fulfilled during school practicum and/or internship and the completion of these requirements must be documented on the requisite form.

**Internship**
Successful completion of the internship is necessary for the PhD degree. Although a minimum of 1,500 internship hours is required by the program (≥600 in schools including general education), individual internship sites may require more hours (e.g., 2,000 hours). Further, students who may be interested in seeking licensure outside of Minnesota may need to complete more than 1,500 hours in order to be eligible for licensure. Students should discuss such plans with the Fieldwork Coordinator, advisor, and site supervisor(s) to ensure adequate preparation.

Coursework and preliminary exams must be completed before students go on internship. Students will complete their prospectus before applying for internship, and whenever possible, to complete their final oral defense before beginning internship. However, students may complete their internship before or after their final oral defense. This decision should be made in consultation with the student’s advisor. If the student elects to complete the final oral exam prior to internship, department policy states the student must complete internship within 18 months of the final oral examination. Students are strongly encouraged to attend the fall internship planning meeting if they are planning to complete their internship requirement in the fall of the following year.

Per APA Standards for Accreditation, the Program assumes (but does not require) that students will pursue accredited internships and licensure to practice professional psychology. Students interested in obtaining an APA- or APPIC-accredited internship or licensure as a professional psychologist in addition to or instead of state school psychology certification should seek supervision by licensed psychologists for all fieldwork. Plans for accredited internship or licensure should be discussed with the Fieldwork Coordinator as early in the program of study as possible.

For students who apply for an internship in MN, an equivalent of one school year and reimbursable Limited Intern License is required. The application forms can be downloaded at Minnesota Department of Education website. Students completing internships outside of MN are responsible for determining any applicable credentialing requirements.

School Psychology interns are employees of the internship site and, therefore, receive funding through the employing agency. Benefits (e.g., health insurance) may or may not be included. The prospective intern should inquire about the provision of benefits by the district during the application/interview process.

**Eligibility for Non-School-based Internship Placements**

Under our NASP approval, students are expected to complete school-based internships. For students interested in non-school-based internships (e.g., hospital or clinical settings), this requirement can be met via a minimum 600-hour fieldwork placement in which supervision requirements and learning outcomes (e.g., assignments, supervisor ratings) commensurate with internship placement are met. This could take place during students' third year or later, but is only necessary for students who intend to pursue internship placements outside of schools. Such plans should be discussed with the Fieldwork Coordinator as early in their degree plans as possible.

---

**Note:** Students generally complete EPsy 8841 during their fourth year in the program, but may request early enrollment if they are interested in gaining additional teaching experience during their last year in the program. Requests should be submitted with the annual review preceding enrollment.
Teaching & Supervision

Each PhD student is required to fulfill two semesters of teaching and supervisory experience in conjunction with enrollment in EPsy 8841. To complete this requirement, students must be a TA for at least one semester in the Assessment sequence, unless otherwise assigned by the Program faculty. The second semester may be fulfilled in Assessment or other settings and experiences designed with the instructor but such requests must be submitted with the annual review.

Wavier TA Requirement

One of the required TA experiences (but not 8841 enrollment and participation) may be waived on the basis of the student’s previous experience as a teaching assistant or instructor if it included grading, instruction, and supervision in a graduate-level course. Waivers and exceptions to the policy must be approved by the instructor and faculty, typically at the Student Review Meeting in May. Accordingly, students requesting a waiver should submit a written request with description of the proposed substitute experience in an attachment to the student’s Annual Review. In the request for a waiver of one-semester 8841 TA experience, students should describe the instruction and supervision provided in the TA or instructor position.

Graduate Planning and Audit System (GPAS)

Doctoral students must submit their doctoral Graduate Planning & Audit System (GPAS) planner no later than after successful completion of 4 semesters of coursework. The GPAS is available online via the student MyU portal page under the Academics tab, on the Degree Progress sub-tab. The doctoral GPAS planner must be submitted before taking the written preliminary exam and at least two semesters prior to the term in which the preliminary oral examination is scheduled. On this webpage students list all completed and planned coursework required for the degree by both the program and department. Once you submit the plan, it will be automatically routed to the student’s advisor and GPC. The plan is then routed to the Graduate Student Services and Progress Office for final approval. After filing, it is possible to make changes in the program by a petition approved by the student’s advisor and the DGS.

At least two-thirds of the credits completed (and all taken to fulfill EPsy core) included on the GPAS planner must be taken under the A-F system. Educational Psychology PhD programs must have at least 27 semester credits of didactic coursework (excludes human relations courses/workshops) in psychological foundations (or equivalent courses) as a central part of the major emphasis to obtain DGS approval.

With approval of the student’s advisor, DGS, and Graduate School, transfer work from other graduate schools may be included as appropriate. Please consult the Graduate Education Catalog and the Uwide Policy Library for policy details. To transfer courses to meet Educational Psychology core requirements, submit an internal petition form. For courses outside the University, include a syllabus for review. If approved, requirements will appear as satisfied on the GPAS planner. To transfer courses to meet School Psychology requirements, submit course syllabi to advisor. The student’s advisor will send an email to the program assistant &
DGS assistant with approval. If approved, requirements will appear as satisfied on the GPAS planner. Substitutions should also be listed on the Annual Progress Chart.

NOTE: If admitted prior to Spring 2013, your GDP will be loaded into GPAS. To make changes to existing Graduate Degree Plan students will need to contact the DGS assistant.

**Oral Preliminary Paper & Exam**

PhD students complete an oral preliminary paper and examination to demonstrate their knowledge of school psychology and scholarly development in a specialty area to their committee members. The oral preliminary paper serves as the guiding document for the oral examination in conjunction with their transcript of completed coursework. Basic guidelines for the paper can be found in the *Educational Psychology Handbook*; Program specific guidance is provided below.

**Topic**

The Oral Prelim paper synthesizes an area of theory, research, and/or practice closely related to the school psychology and the student's area of focus. The intent of the paper is to integrate the literature in a prescribed area of research, ideally related to the student's dissertation and a long-term professional interest. It should not include a specific plan for the student's dissertation. The topic for the paper should be developed by the student in consultation with the advisor. The topic must be accepted by the advisor on behalf of the Committee. The student must assume primary responsibility for selection of a topic, generation of scope and procedural plans for conducting the review, collection of relevant literature and research information, review synthesis, and preparation of the final paper.

**Preparation**

The oral preliminary examination process reflects cumulative preparation in that the student should engage in intensive, sustained independent reading of the conceptual, theoretical, empirical, and methodological literature in their area of specialty, as well as related areas and competing research and theory, so that they are develop in depth knowledge of the subject area and are conversant in all of the relevant dimensions. The exam itself can be regarded as the culmination of coursework and independent study around topical area since entrance to program. Successful completion assumes students have fully engaged in classes, studied effectively, and have undertaken sustained and substantial independent reading to develop a specialty area that will be explored in both their oral prelim paper and dissertation. The oral preliminary paper and examination will be an opportunity to develop in-depth knowledge of a student's specialty area and methodology of their intended dissertation.
prelim paper reflects a targeted effort to synthesize a specific area of scholarship related to the student’s identified specialty area and corresponding research agenda. The paper is merely a sampling, however, of a student’s knowledge of the research area. Students may consult their advisor and other committee members to map relevant areas of literature related to their specialty but are ultimately responsible for demonstrating depth and comprehensiveness of knowledge.

**Skills for the Oral Preliminary Examination.** The content for evaluation is the student’s (oral) performance during the examination period. The student must be able to (1) address the theoretical foundations of the field and their specialty area; (2) integrate the relevant literature; (3) critique the relevant literature; and (4) respond to questions relevant to their specialty area and the program curriculum. No specific criteria are provided for committee evaluations of student performance; however, there are skills and competencies that are necessary (but not sufficient) for successfully completing the exam. These skills represent accumulated knowledge and are fundamental not only to the preliminary oral examination but to other scholarly and professional endeavors, including the dissertation.

- Master foundational areas of content (i.e., school psychology and topic of paper) and related theory, research methods, and statistics. This includes course content as well as related scholarship (e.g., journal articles or scholarly texts). The student is expected to read broadly and deeply in preparation for the exam. This includes, but is not limited to course readings, program required readings, and seminal and contemporary literature related to the prelim paper topic.

- Provide a clear statement of themes, findings, or dilemmas that represent your interest in an existing body of literature. (e.g., describe the relation between identified theme(s), broader literature, and ongoing area of scholarly and/or professional activity) related to your specialty area, including, but not limited to, the content of the oral prelim paper.

- Demonstrate capacity clearly describe relevant constructs and methods; to ask and address complex conceptual questions (e.g., describe gaps of theory, implications of methods, or research findings; compare or integrate perspectives or findings from multiple areas or sources); develop clear, empirically supportable perspectives and opinions on a body of theory, research, and methods related to one’s specialty area, as well as basic topics from the program curriculum.

- Identify views within the literature that diverge from your own. When divergence can be accounted for by differences in factual knowledge, change your view to accommodate new facts. When divergence can be accounted for by differences in perspective or opinions, identify essential differences and provide rationale for your position on these differences.

- Be consistent, coherent, and respectful in responses to others’ questions and challenges.

**Structure and Format**

The paper’s approach, structure, and analytic style should be modeled on integrative reviews or systematic reviews found in the peer-reviewed journals such as *Review of Educational Research, Journal of School Psychology, School Psychology Review, Psychological Bulletin, or Psychological Review*. All papers are to be prepared in accordance with publications guidelines of the current APA Style Manual for all formatting, structure, and writing style. Example systematic reviews are provided on the Program Canvas site. For systematic reviews, format recommendations provided for the MA Plan B project systematic review option apply.
Note, the review and corresponding manuscript should represent an independent project developed in consultation with the advisor. Collaborative projects are not acceptable beyond coders enlisted to ensure adequate interobserver agreement. The general expectation is that students should work with the faculty to identify reviews that can reasonably be completed in one to two semesters and that will inform, and potentially become part of, their dissertation. Ideally, the prelim oral paper informs the research questions for a primary study in the dissertation. Students are generally encouraged to reserve meta-analyses, even as an extension of qualitative synthesis, for the dissertation given the intensity of these methods relative to prelim expectations.

Required Appendix Essay

In addition, all oral prelim papers should include as an appendix an essay of 3-5 pages that describes the relations of theory and research in at least two of the following areas: developmental, biological, affective, cognitive, and social psychology to the topic of the paper. The Appendix should be titled, Integrative Essay on the Scientific Bases of Psychology. Students should describe how theory and empirical findings, including seminal works, from these two areas have or can inform theory and research in their identified topic area.

The full paper, not including this appendix, should be no more than 40 pages. The full paper, including the Appendix, must be distributed to the committee at least 2 weeks before the exam.

Approach

Most oral prelim papers are systematic reviews related to the student’s anticipated dissertation topic. Regardless of the specific approach selected, the paper identifies major issues in the area chosen. It is guided by ideas and uses information selectively and critically with respect to those ideas. It reflects methodological sophistication in the description of search strategies and analyses. The paper is to be coherent, analytic, integrative, and topically constrained. It will typically range from 30-40 pages of double-spaced text, including front and back matter (i.e., title page, abstract, references, tables, and figures), but excluding the appendix. Given the scope and scholarly nature of this paper, it is possible that the product will subsequently be submitted for publication, but peer review does not replace advisement and examination at the University of Minnesota. If submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal or otherwise disseminated, APA guidelines should be used to determine authorship. The document submitted for the oral examination, however, should represent sole author, or at a very minimum, senior author, effort by the student.

Examining Committee

A form to propose PhD oral examining committee members is submitted online. The preliminary examining committee is comprised of four members: the advisor (who will be the committee chair), two examiners from Educational Psychology, and one examiner outside department. Students, in conjunction with their advisor, identify potential committee members, solicit their acceptance to serve, and make a recommendation of them to the DGS for

Reminder: Students should submit a final draft of the paper to the advisor at least 30 days before the anticipated exam date to allow sufficient time for review and revision.

The oral prelim paper must be submitted to the committee at least 2 weeks before the exam.
committee members. Students are expected to compose examining committees of 3 school psychology faculty and 1 faculty from outside the department. Students are strongly encouraged to consult committee members about the paper, as appropriate to individuals’ areas of expertise, in advance of the exam.

**Oral Examination**

The prelim oral exam is taken after passing the written exam and the majority of PhD coursework. The prelim oral cannot be scheduled until the Checklist for Showing Completion of Written Prelim is submitted. The examination covers the major field, and any work fundamental to these areas, including the topic of the oral preliminary paper. Students are evaluated on their knowledge in the Program’s curriculum, the topic area of the oral paper, and any additional knowledge related to coursework listed in their transcript.

This examination is conducted in a closed session by the examining committee. The oral preliminary paper must be distributed to committee members two weeks in advance of the oral exam. The oral must also be scheduled at least one week in advance with the Graduate School. Students should schedule exams in a 2 hour block. The examination will last at least 90 minutes but not more than two hours, and could include a review of the student’s program of study and questions or discussions from any member of the committee. Questions related to the relationship between student’s research and professional practice or other research are also appropriate. The committee will vote privately at the close of this examination with the results communicated immediately to the student.

**Organization of the Prelim Oral Examination.** The student should arrive at the exam with the requisite Grad School form, Program Oral Exam Rubric, and a copy of their unofficial transcript. The exam consists of the following elements.

1. The committee briefly confers in closed session (i.e., the student is excused).

2. Optional: Student may make brief introduction of approximately 10-15 minutes, which may include a presentation, on their general graduate studies (e.g., general interest in school psychology, research interests and/or plans) and the paper. It is not necessary, that the student deliver an extensive presentation on the paper unless requested by the advisor or committee members. Committee members will have read the paper before the exam. The purpose of the exam is for the student to field the committee’s questions. The time spent on the introduction should be minimal. (approx. 10-15 minutes)

3. Committee queries student’s grasp of (a) research methods and statistics, (b) school psychology research and practice, and (c) conceptual, theoretical, and empirical elements of paper topic. The questions may be based on, but not limited to the curriculum indicated in the student’s transcript and the prelim oral paper. (approx. 60 minutes)

4. Committee queries student’s knowledge specific to program goals. Questions are based on the competencies outlined in Section I and should be documented on the Program Oral Exam Rubric. (approx. 30 minutes)

5. Committee votes on the student’s performance in closed session and electronically submits the required graduate school form and Program Oral Exam Rubric. The vote is based on the student’s performance during the oral exam only, not the paper itself. A pass decision indicates that the student is prepared to advance to doctoral candidacy. A pass with reservation may require additional self-study, including revisions to the
paper or additional essays, before the committee decision is changed to a pass. A fail requires an exam retake.

6. Committee or advisor debriefs student to provide feedback on performance and next steps.

After the exam, the student submits the required forms to the appropriate offices. Copies of the form and ballots should be submitted to the Program Assistant to be included in the student’s file. PhD candidacy is established when the oral preliminary exam is passed.

Dissertation

The dissertation, or doctoral thesis, serves as the basis for a final oral examination of candidates for receipt of a Doctorate of Philosophy in Educational Psychology from the Graduate School.

Scope

The dissertation is a scholarly document reporting an empirical investigation, or line of research, involving primary data collection and analysis, secondary data analysis, or meta-analysis. It is assumed that the work will be of scope and quality to warrant publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Given the scope of theses, it is likely that many will subsequently be submitted for publication. Peer-review does not, however, replace advisement and examination at the University of Minnesota.

Topic

The topic for a dissertation is developed by the student with approval of the Dissertation Panel to reflect (a) an area of concern to school psychology or related discipline and (b) an area of interest to the student, ideally related to long-term professional interest. The dissertation research should represent original work and make a unique contribution to the field. For recent dissertations completed by school psychology students, see [link to recent dissertations].

The student should select the topic, generate research questions or a procedural plan, collect relevant literature and research information, analyze data, and interpret findings. Although the student should receive collegial support and feedback from the advisor and others associated to this project, the final product must reflect the individual effort and perspectives of the student.

Format

The dissertation topic should be focused and selected in collaboration with the student’s advisor. The investigation described fully in the manuscript and the document is to be written in current APA-style and in accordance with formatting requirements of the Graduate School. PhD students can select one of two format options for the dissertation format, pending approval from the Dissertation Panel. Regardless of the selected format option, the typical document length is between 75-100 pages, and should rarely exceed 100 pages.

Option 1 – Chapters consist of each of the following:

---

 Hint: Students should consult the APA Publication Manual and APA’s Journal Article Reporting Standards when preparing the dissertation.

---
• **Introduction** that includes a brief summary of relevant research, statement of the problem, study purpose, significance of the study, research questions, definitions, delimitations, and organization of the dissertation.

• **Review of Literature** that comprehensively reviews empirical reports and literature reviews with a conceptual framework to contextualize the study, adequately summarizes the state of current research (i.e., critically evaluates research methods and reports effect sizes), identifies the need for further work, and provides a convincing rationale for the study.

• **Method** detailing the methodology employed.

• **Results** detailing the findings of the investigation according to each research question.

• **Discussion** section including any interpretation of the findings, its relationship/contribution to the existing literature, implications for practice, implications for theory, limitations, and conclusion.

**Option 2** – Chapters consist of each of the following:

• **Introduction** that includes a brief summary of relevant research area, statement of the problem, study purpose, significance of the study, research questions, definitions, and delimitations.

• **Study 1**, prepared as a standalone APA-style research manuscript for an original study (abstract thru tables/figures). This may be a systematic review based on the prelim oral paper if a systematic review or meta-analysis was conducted, but should represent a further refined product that the paper submitted for the oral prelim exam.

• **Study 2** that provides a description of a second study that is conceptually related to Study 1, but represents a unique contribution to the literature. This chapter should be prepared as a standalone APA-style research manuscript.

• **Study 3** (optional)

• **Synthesis and General Discussion** that discusses the shared contributions of the studies, implications for research and practice, and future research directions.

Option 2 is designed to facilitate publication of the students’ dissertation research by allowing for preparation of studies as standalone manuscripts formatted following APA style guidelines and of typical publication length (i.e., each 25-40 pages inclusive of front and back matter). The dissertation document may contain more than 2 studies. They should be thematically related, but each representing a unique contribution to the literature.


Piecemeal, or fragmented, publication of research findings can be misleading if multiple reports appear to present independent instances of data collection or analyses; distortion of the scientific literature, especially in reviews or meta-analyses, may result...[it] is therefore undesirable unless there is a clear benefit to scientific communication. It may be difficult to determine whether such a benefit exists when multiple independent variable that are observed in the same sample and the same time are reported in separate manuscripts.

**Advisement**

The **Advisor** provides primary supervision and consultation as the student prepares their prospectus, conducts their dissertation research, and prepares the final document. Students may consult other faculty with relevant expertise.
The **Dissertation Planning/Prospectus Panel** is comprised of at least 4 members who help shape the initial plans of the dissertation and convene for the Prospectus Meeting. The members include the advisor and at least 2 additional members, 1 from the program and 1 from outside the department. Typically these faculty will become your doctoral thesis readers. All designated members must sign the **Thesis Planning Panel Form** to approve the dissertation prospectus.

The **Dissertation Final Oral Examination Committee** is comprised of 4 members who review the completed dissertation and participate in the final oral exam. The members include your advisor, two internal examiners (i.e., from your major), and 1 external examiner whose primary appointment is not with Educational Psychology. One member of the committee other than your advisor will chair the final defense. The chair may or may not be from Educational Psychology, but must have full approval from the Graduate School. Check the **Graduate Education Faculty Role List** to verify a member’s status. Assign/Update your Doctoral Final Committee with the Graduate School at least one month prior to your exam date.

**Prospectus**

Students must complete a prospectus meeting before beginning dissertation data collection or analyses (in the case of meta-analyses or secondary analyses). Prior to the prospectus meeting, students will prepare, in consultation with their advisor, an overview of their study, generally consisting, at a minimum, of Chapters 1 through 3 of the dissertation document for Option 1 format, or Chapter 1 and the introduction and methods for each of the studies for Option 2. All elements of the prospectus document should be fully developed before holding the prospectus meeting. As noted in the Department handbook, “The functions of the panel are two-fold. First, the panel reviews your prospectus and offers suggestions and feedback on its conceptualization, design, and feasibility. Second, panel members have the opportunity to clarify their expectations of the project and to define the criteria by which you will be judged during the final oral examination.”

The prospectus document must be disseminated to the thesis planning panel (committee) 2 **weeks** before the scheduled prospectus meeting. Students should consult committee members to determine whether a presentation on the study is expected, and if so, the content of that presentation. Some advisors/committees may request a detailed presentation on the prospectus.

The prospectus meetings generally proceeds as such:

1. The committee may briefly confer in closed session.

2. The student makes a brief presentation on the rationale, purpose, and proposed method of the dissertation study/ies.

3. The committee and student proceed through each element/section of the prospectus and discuss potential modifications to the study and documentation.

4. The committee approves the study/ies to be implemented and expectations for the research to be completed (i.e., hypotheses or research questions, method, and analyses) and written up for the final exam.

5. The committee may confer in closed session and signs the requisite department form if the project is approved. If significant issues remain unresolved, the committee may defer
approval pending provision of a revised prospectus document and, if desired, an additional meeting.

It is expected that students will seek study approval from the IRB and sites (if necessary) after approval of the prospectus. Students are required to complete the prospectus meeting before applying for internships.

**Final Oral Examination**

The student must complete a final oral examination (referred to as a defense) administered by the student’s doctoral examining committee made up of three members from Educational Psychology, including your advisor, and one member from an outside department. The final oral cannot be scheduled during the same semester that the preliminary oral is taken. The full and final dissertation document must be submitted to readers at least **30 days** before the scheduled date for the oral examination and to the full committee at least **2 weeks** before the scheduled exam.

The final oral exam is scheduled with the Graduate School after: (a) all coursework on the GPAS planner is complete, and (b) the reviewer's report form is signed by the three readers and filed with the Graduate School. (Note: Barring extenuating circumstances and program approval, students should not schedule oral examinations during the winter or summer breaks.) Both forms need to be filed with the Graduate School at least one week before the final oral. The time and place of the final oral is posted in the Department to permit the public to attend. Notify the DGS Assistant to do this. Students should announce their defense to faculty and students in the School Psychology Program using the program listserv. The Program Assistant can assist with this announcement.

Students should allocate 2 hours for the final oral exam. The first 45-60 minutes of the final oral is open to the public; the remainder is closed with only the doctoral candidate and the examining committee members present.

**Organization of the Final Oral Exam**

The dissertation final oral exam consists of two major portions: a public presentation and the closed exam. The process generally includes the following elements.

1. The chair introduces the student to the audience for the public portion. The student may invite questions during the presentation or ask the audience to hold questions until the presentation is complete.
2. The student delivers a 20 to 30 minute presentation on the dissertation. The chair of the committee may request that the student provide a more extensive presentation. It is the student's responsibility to query the chair regarding their expectations for the presentation.
3. The student fields questions from the audience. This portion does not generally include questions from the committee. After a maximum of 60 total minutes of presentation and questions, the chair concludes the public portion and briefly dismisses the student.

**Reminder:** Students should submit a final draft of the dissertation to the advisor at least **45 days** before the anticipated defense date to allow sufficient time for review and revision. The dissertation must be submitted to readers **30 days** before the defense.
4. The committee may confer in closed session, then invite back the student for the closed
    session.
5. During the closed exam, the student fields questions from the committee (45-60
    minutes).
6. The student is excused and the committee confers in closed session to determine
    whether the student has passed the exam. The committee electronically signs the
    requisite forms.
7. The student is invited back in and debriefs with the committee or advisor.

After the exam, the student confirms with the GPC or Program Assistant that all steps are
completed and reviews the final stages of the process.

**Binding the Dissertation**

After the dissertation committee has read and approved the dissertation and the student has
successfully passed the final oral examination for the degree, one electronic copy (pdf) is to be
submitted to the Program Assistant for the program archive. Follow the Graduate School
Checklist for final steps to submitting your dissertation electronically to the Digital Conservancy.

**Special Field Preliminary Examination**

The PhD Special Field Exam requires students to demonstrate their knowledge and
competencies across coursework, fieldwork, and other evaluation activities requiring the
synthesis of information across the curriculum. Students are eligible to complete the Special
Field Preliminary Exam only after: (a) submitting the PhD degree plan, (b) passing the MA final
oral exam, and (c) completing sufficient fieldwork, usually part or all of internship. No exceptions
to this rule will be granted. The Special Field Exam requires the following:

1. **School Psychology Coursework:** B- or better on all required final exams and course
    grades for School Psychology courses; or demonstrated competence in that area as
determined by the student and advisor (e.g., students may be asked to retake a
comparable final exam devised by the course instructor and advisor or write a paper in
the content area)

2. **Educational Psychology Coursework:** B- or better for course grades in all Core
Courses that meet the Educational Psychology requirements; or demonstrated
competence in that area as determined by the student and advisor (e.g., students may
be asked to retake a comparable final exam devised by the course instructor and advisor
or write a paper in the content area)

3. **Comprehensive Written Examination:** Passing score on the Comprehensive Written
Examination.

4. **School Psychology Praxis Examination:** Passing score on the School Psychology
Praxis Examination, which would also make them eligible to apply to be a nationally
certified school psychologist upon completion of the SC program.

5. **Portfolio:** Passing score on the Portfolio rubric by the completion of internship.

When students have fulfilled all these requirements listed above, they should complete the PhD
Special Field Prelim Requirements Form with their advisor, which documents that all special
field requirements have been met, and submit to the Program Assistant.
Section V: Master’s Degree

Unless an entering student has a Master’s degree in school psychology, psychology, or a related field or was admitted to a previous graduate program at the University, all students must complete a Master's degree during their course of study in the Program. Per university policy, Master’s degrees must be completed within five years of initiation.

Master’s Program

By the end of second semester of their first year, students must complete and submit the Graduate Planning & Audit System (GPAS) planner for their Master’s degree. On this webpage the student lists all coursework (completed and proposed) required for the Master’s degree. Once you submit the plan, it will be automatically routed to the student’s advisor and DGS. The plan is then routed to the Graduate Student Services and Progress Office. The GPAS is available online via the student MyU portal page under the Academics tab, on the Degree Progress sub-tab. The Student Guide to completing the GPAS Planner is available online.

This program lists 30 semester credits including these areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Course Area</th>
<th>Credits Required</th>
<th>Applicable Program-Required Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Learning/Cognition, (b) Social/Personality, and (c) History/Systems</td>
<td>6 credits from two content areas</td>
<td>EPsy 8819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
<td>EPsy 8251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement or Evaluation</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
<td>EPsy 5221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s thesis/Plan B paper + final exam</td>
<td>Plan B credits per program</td>
<td>EPsy 8822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students must earn a minimum GPA of 2.80 for courses listed on the student’s official program. At least two-thirds of the credits completed (and all taken to fulfill EPsy core) which are included on the GPAS planner must be taken under the A-F system. With approval of the student’s advisor, DGS, and Graduate School, students may be permitted to transfer up to 40% of the degree coursework listed on the GPAS planner. Credits earned more than 7 years ago cannot be applied to the MA. Please consult the Graduate Education Catalog and the Uwide Policy Library for policy details. To transfer courses to meet Educational Psychology core requirements, submit an internal petition form. For courses outside the University, include a syllabus for review. If approved, requirements will appear as satisfied on the GPAS planner. To transfer courses to meet School Psychology requirements, submit course syllabi to advisor. The student’s advisor will send an email to the program assistant & DGS assistant with approval. If approved, requirements will appear as satisfied on the GPAS planner. Substitutions should also be listed on the Annual Progress Chart.

NOTE: If admitted prior to Spring 2013, your GDP will be loaded into GPAS. To make changes to an existing Graduate Degree Plan students will need to contact the DGS assistant.
Master’s Plan B Project

All students complete a Master’s research project via the Plan B option. The Master’s Plan B project serves as the basis for an examination of candidates for degree leading to receipt of a Master’s of Arts in Educational Psychology from the Graduate School. All projects must be prepared under advisor supervision. Students will prepare a manuscript consistent with the APA Publication Manual and pass an oral or written examination on their research project in order to officially complete the Master’s project and MA degree. The Master’s Plan B project is a scholarly research project that will require approximately 150 hours of work for planning, implementation, analysis, and writing (this does not include preliminary reading to gain knowledge in school psychology and the topical area).

**Topic**

The project should represent an original idea entailing primary or secondary data analysis, a rigorous replication study, or, in the case of SC students, a systematic review. The topic should be focused and the investigation described fully in the manuscript. The topic for a Master’s Plan B project is developed by the student and advisor to reflect (a) an area of concern to school psychology or closely related discipline; and (b) an area of interest to the student. The topic must be acceptable to the advisor on behalf of the Committee.

**Method**

The methodology selected may be informed by the student’s degree track.

**SC.** SC students complete a systematic review of primary research for their MA Plan B project. Such projects should be novel within the school psychology literature and of comparable scope and quality to warrant publication in a peer-reviewed journal in school psychology or related fields, consistent with the program orientation, vision, and goals. Such reviews must include a detailed method and appropriate evaluation of the methodology and findings in any studies reviewed, consistent with professional guidelines for the conduct and reporting of systematic reviews in the social sciences generally, and school psychology or special education in particular. Acceptable topics include the range of psychoeducational practices addressed within the program, such as various aspects of school-based assessment, intervention, consultation, systems change or other processes or procedures within MTSS. Topics are selected in consultation with the SC advisor, and, if appropriate, program faculty. Students may self-identify topics, subject to advisor approval, or undertake a specific topic at the direction of the faculty as part of existing research programs. Projects will generally be completed within the context of EPsy 8822. Note, the review and corresponding manuscript should represent an independent project developed in consultation with the advisor and other faculty. Collaborative projects are not acceptable beyond coders enlisted to ensure adequate interobserver agreement. The general expectation is that students should work with the faculty to identify reviews that can reasonably be completed in one to two semesters.

When completing a systematic review, students must adhere to the research reporting guidelines provided in the APA Publication Manual and should read an instructive text on systematic reviews, such as Petticrew and Roberts (2006), *Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences: A Practical Guide* available in ebook format through the university library, to inform their methodology and analysis. For most analyses, students should also apply quality indicators in the evaluation of studies reviewed or some other approach to explicit evaluation of studies. Students may consult with the university librarians regarding search strategy, but this consultation is not required and does not replace advisement nor supersede expectations or
evaluation by the faculty. The student is ultimately responsible for the project. All SC students are required to pass written examination of the research manuscript prepared for MA Plan B research project.

**PhD.** PhD students must complete a study that entails original data collection/analysis in order to meet the department’s predissertation requirements. If a doctoral student completes a master’s Plan B project that does not involve original data analysis (i.e., application of quantitative or qualitative methods to answer research questions), an additional research project will be required to meet the department requirements before the student can proceed to the oral prelim exam or dissertation. Examples of approaches used in MA Plan B project primary research studies include single-case designs, group designs, secondary data analysis, and measurement projects, replications, etc. Preparation of Plan B project manuscripts should follow APA’s publication manual and Journal Article Reporting Standards. In conjunction with the MA Plan B project and preparation of corresponding manuscript, all doctoral students are required to pass an oral examination on the MA Plan B research project. Students may self-identify topics, subject to advisor approval, or undertake a specific topic at the direction of the faculty as part of existing research programs.

**Format**

The final product should be prepared as a research manuscript of 25-40 pages (inclusive of front and back matter), following the APA Style Manual. It is likely that many Master’s papers will be submitted for publication, however peer-review does not replace advisement and examination at the University of Minnesota. All MA papers should contain the following elements:

- **Title page**
- **Abstract with keywords** – The abstract should briefly (150-250 words) summarize the study.
  - Systematic review: Abstract includes problem, purpose, eligibility criteria, participants across studies, findings, conclusions, and implications.
  - Original data analysis: Abstract includes statements of the problem, purpose, method, findings, conclusions, and implications.
- **Introduction** – The introduction should identify a problem under study and the research strategy, articulating the relevance of the problem, relevant research and, if applicable, theory, research questions or hypotheses, and the value of the study.
- **Method** – The method describes how the study was conducted.
  - Systematic review: search strategy, including data bases and terms, inclusion criteria, coding and analytic procedures, computation of effect sizes (if applicable)
  - Original data analysis: Participants or data source, sampling procedures, power (if applicable), measures and covariates, design, intervention (if applicable), and analyses
- **Results** – The results describe the data collected and analyses.

**Hint:** Students should consult the APA Publication Manual and APA’s Journal Article Reporting Standards when preparing all manuscripts.
Original data analysis: as appropriate, recruitment and participant flow; preliminary analyses, missing data analysis and how addressed, implementation fidelity, baseline data, analyses to answer research questions, including ancillary analyses,

Systematic review: study and participant characteristics, description of variables/interventions; evaluations of study quality; syntheses across studies relative to research questions, including effect sizes and moderators as appropriate.

Discussion – The discussion should provide interpretation of the results relative to the research questions, comparison to previous research, limitations, and implications for theory, research, practice, and/or policy as appropriate to the topic.

References
Optional: Tables and/or Figures

MA Written Exam for SC Students
SC students are subject to a written exam for the MA; no defense/oral exam is required. This exam is based on the final MA Plan B project manuscript submitted to the committee. Students are required to present a poster on their project at the department's Graduate Student Research Day, held in March of each year. Most SC students choose to distribute their papers according to timelines for the MA Defense Day (see below)

Process for SC Students’ MA Written Exam

1. Submit the full paper to the advisor at least 1 month before the anticipated distribution of the paper and exam form to the committee, which should occur by the end of final week spring semester. Earlier completion is strongly advised.

2. Once approved for the written exam, work with the SC advisor to identify the committee. The SC advisor and faculty will confer to identify the external member. The committee should be submitted for approval online by the student at least month prior to the exam date.

3. Once students have scheduled the examination, they request the Graduation Packet online. This will provide the degree completion paperwork as well as the Final Examination form needed by the committee.

4. Submit the full paper to the committee for review at least 2 weeks before the end of finals. The MA exam form should be given to the advisor at this time. The advisor will facilitate collection of signatures and feedback from the committee members.

5. The committees will vote to determine if the student passes the exam. A pass decision indicates that the student has successfully completed the MA Plan B project, although minor revisions to the paper may be required before the MA degree can be awarded. If the student fails the exam, the committee may allow a second and final retake. The committee will recommend remediation to be completed before the retake (e.g., major revisions of the Plan B project manuscript; completion of a new study; directed independent study).

6. The student submits the signed exam form to Lori Boucher for scanning to GSSP.

7. The student completes any necessary revisions to the document, seeks approval from the advisor and committee as specified in the feedback provided with the exam form. Once all revisions are approved, the student submits the final version of the Plan B project to the Program Assistant for archiving.
For the Master's defense, an examining committee (MA Examining Committee) is comprised of three faculty members: your advisor, another school psychology faculty member, and one external faculty member, usually from the department. The committee should be submitted for approval online by the student at least one month prior to the exam date. The student may schedule the examination with advisor approval of readiness for examination. The final paper must be submitted to the committee at least two weeks prior to the exam date.

Masters exams may only occur during the fall or spring semesters; the Program only permits scheduling during breaks under extenuating circumstances. In such instances, a written petition for an exception in scheduling must be submitted in writing to the program assistant before November 1 or May 1 to be voted on by the program faculty. If approved, the student may, in consultation with their advisor, schedule with the committee.

Once students have scheduled the oral examination, they request the Graduation Packet online. This will provide the degree completion paperwork as well as the Final Examination form needed by the committee. If the student passes the oral examination, the student will submit the examination materials and degree request forms. After making any required modifications, students must submit a final PDF version of the MA Plan B project to their advisor and the Program Assistant.

If the examination is failed, and the committee permits a retake, the advisor will develop a remediation plan with the student. Only one retake of the final exam is permitted before the student is dismissed from the program.

MA Defense Days. To facilitate timely completion of MA theses by providing a firm deadline and avoiding end of semester scheduling conflicts, the program schedules MA Defense day during which students are encouraged to plan to defend their MA theses. Dates are selected to offset course and fieldwork demands. Students should consult their advisor to ensure timely completion of their MA Plan B project for one of these defense dates and notify the Program Assistant at least 6 weeks in advance. When students select a defense day, the student does not need to identify committee members; they will be assigned for them based on availability; generally, 1 or two external faculty participate in defense day. Specialized knowledge in the topic cannot be guaranteed in this case, but is not considered necessary since diverse committee composition provides the opportunity for the student to demonstrate their ability to explain their project to individuals of varying background knowledge. The Program Assistant will email students the assigned committee members to be submitted online by the student at least one month prior to the defense date.

Organization of the MA Oral Defense. The student should arrive at the exam with the requisite Grad School form. The defense consists of the following elements.

1. The committee briefly confers in closed session (i.e., the student is excused).
2. Optional: Student may make brief introduction, which may include a formal presentation (e.g., PowerPoint), on their general graduate studies (e.g., interest in school psychology and research interests) and the study conducted. It is not necessary, nor expected, that
the student deliver an in-depth presentation on the study. Committee members will have read the paper before the exam. The purpose of the exam is for the student to field the committee’s questions. The time spent on the introduction should be minimal. (approx. 10 minutes)

3. Committee queries student’s grasp of (a) conceptual, theoretical, and empirical elements of their study, (b) related issues of research methods and statistics; and (c) implications for school psychology research, practice, and/or policy. The questions may be based on, but not limited to, the content of the Plan B project manuscript. (35-50 minutes)

4. Committee votes on the student’s performance in closed session and electronically signs the required graduate school form. The vote is based on the prepared manuscript and the student’s performance during the oral exam.

5. Committee or advisor debriefs student to provide feedback on performance and next steps.

A pass decision indicates that the student has successfully completed the MA Plan B project, although minor revisions to the paper may be required before the MA degree can be awarded. If the student fails the exam, the committee may allow a second and final retake. The committee will recommend remediation to be completed before the retake (e.g., major revisions of the manuscript; completion of a new study; directed self-study).

After the exam, the student confirms with the GPC or Program Assistant that all steps are completed and reviews the final stages of the process. The student completes any necessary revisions to the document, seeks approval from the advisor and committee as specified in the feedback provided with the exam form.

Once all revisions are approved, the student submits the final version of the manuscript to the Program Assistant for archiving.
Section VI: Student Evaluation

The faculty provide ongoing mentoring and continual, timely appraisal to ensure students have the necessary skills to be competent scientist-practitioner school psychologists. Ongoing contact and positive working relationships between students and faculty are important to the student evaluation process.

Annual Review of Student Progress

Progress toward degree completion is a focal point of the student evaluation process. All students are required to complete the Annual Student Review form to record their accomplishments and progress toward their degrees within an academic year. In addition to providing evaluative feedback to the student, these data are used to fulfill reporting requirements set forth by the Graduate School, APA, and NASP. Therefore, it is critical for students to submit the Annual Student Review form. Students who fail to complete all requirements of the annual review will not be allowed to register for courses and may be discontinued from the program.

The Program Assistant will distribute the Annual Student Review form to students during spring semester. Students must submit reviews by the date specified in the distribution or will have holds placed on their accounts barring registration. The forms are then distributed to the academic advisors, who review the contents in preparation for the Student Review meeting at the end of May. While the annual review forms submitted by students serve as one basis for review of progress, data on student progress is collected from several sources: mentors, practicum supervisor, course instructors, advisors, student evaluation of assessment TA (when appropriate), and examining committee members. In this assessment, the program faculty attend to students’ academic, professional, and personal competencies, as all are essential for practice as school psychologists. Students’ advisors provide feedback to them about their progress toward degree completion. These evaluations are sent to the student and added to the student’s cumulative file in 250 ESB. Copies are available at the student’s request by contacting the Program Assistant.

Evaluation of Professionalism

In addition to progress in program coursework, research, and fieldwork requirements, students will be evaluated on their demonstrated professionalism. Professionalism refers to those behaviors, dispositions, and attitudes necessary for appropriate, effective professional conduct. As such, students are asked to self-evaluate, and will be evaluated by faculty in the following domains: (1) punctuality and attendance; (2) professional appearance and demeanor; (3) initiative, motivation, consistency, and perseverance; (4) flexibility, adaptability to novel/unexpected situations; (5) poise, tactfulness, and rapport with staff and others; (6) preparation and organization; (7) ability to handle professionally constructive criticism and positively use feedback; (8) ability to accurately self-evaluate areas of practice; (9) respect for cultural and individual diversity; (10) development of professional identity and integrity; (11) self-care; and (12) effective oral, written, and nonverbal communication skills. Each area is evaluated relative to observed behaviors in program contexts (e.g., classes, fieldwork, program events) and potential impediment of professional development and functioning. In the case of self-care, this dimension is related to essential professional values and attitudes necessary to “engage in activities to maintain and improve performance, well-being, and professional effectiveness” (APA Standards for Accreditation, C-8D). The Program encourages all students to engage in
ongoing self-care in order to maintain and enhance wellbeing and professional functioning, and will recommend university resources and other activities when deemed appropriate.

Professionalism and interpersonal effectiveness will be carefully monitored and students will be alerted to issues to allow for appropriate corrective action, including remedial plans as deemed necessary. In cases when a student’s issues cannot be satisfactorily resolved, the faculty may dismiss the student from the program following appropriate due process.

APA Style Test

Students are expected to know and apply APA style in all written work unless instructed otherwise. All students will pass the APA Style Test administered through the Program’s Evaluation site on Canvas during their first year in the Program. In preparation for the test, students should read the APA Publication Manual in its entirety.

Comprehensive Written Examination

Students in both the SC and PhD tracks complete a closed-book/note written examination assessing students’ acquired knowledge in the program’s training goals. Students will have 4 hours to complete the exam. The exams consist of multiple-choice items aligned with Program goals for Research, Ethical and Legal Standards, Individual & Cultural Diversity, Assessment, Intervention, and Consultation. Content is based on the curriculum specified in the first two years of each program, as well as the program-wide required reading list. Exam candidates must sign the Agreement of Exam Terms document (see the form provided on the School Psychology Resource Moodle) and return it to the Program Assistant before the exam begins. Although the examination is proctored, students are expected to adhere to an honor system and to display exemplary ethical behavior (see the Program Canvas site for the Proctor Agreement).

Scheduling

The comprehensive exam is administered in August and January of each year one-two week(s) before classes begin. Students must file their GPAS planner before they can take their written examination. Students should file the Written Prelim Registration form at least one month before the exam date. Students who need accommodation should submit their requests in writing to the Program Assistant at least four weeks before the examination date. Students who need an alternative exam date or location, such as out-of-state interns, are required to identify a proctor for the exam (e.g., their intern supervisor) who must be approved by the Program faculty. See the Program Canvas site for the Proctor Agreement.

Scoring

Each goal area generally contains 20-30 items at three levels: Essential (weighted the heaviest), Basic, and Advanced (weighted the lowest). Overall performance on the exam is categorized as follows:

- **Pass**: ≥ 80% in every goal area.
- **Pass with Reservations**: ≥ 80% in at least 4 goal areas and scores between 79-65% in the remaining goal areas. Students may retake up to 2 goal areas with scores between 79-65%. If scores of at least 80% are attained on the retake, the student’s exam score is
changed to pass. If a score of less than 80% is obtained, the score is changed to a fail and the student must retake the entire exam.

- **Fail**: <80% in ≥3 goal areas or ≤64% in any area on the first exam attempt or failure to pass goal retakes. The student must retake the entire exam. Only one reexamination is permitted. Students who fail the comprehensive examination twice will be dismissed from the program. Dismissal is considered final unless the program faculty approve a reexamination.

Students will be notified of their official score by the Program Assistant, generally within 4 weeks of the exam date. Once a student has received a passing score and completed all necessary requirements they should file the [Checklist for Showing Completion of Written Prelim](#) with the Graduate Program Assistant.

**Portfolio**

Students use the portfolio system to document their growth and development in each of the program training domains. The portfolio system is used to demonstrate the ways in which those areas of competence have been achieved through fieldwork and other training activities. The faculty view the portfolio system as both a formative and summative measure of progress and student performance in meeting program goals.

The portfolio is defined as a systematic and organized collection of a student’s work that documents one’s professional competencies in each of the Program’s goal areas. There is no prescribed set of materials, and it is expected that there will be much variation among individual student’s portfolios. The portfolio will contain a set of core content, and then be individualized for each student. Students are not expected to include every relevant document from their respective educational experiences, but should present multiple artifacts per domain that clearly demonstrates the basic competency. Any information that could identify specific individuals should be redacted or removed from any materials submitted. Failure to do so will result in failure to achieve a passing score on the competency under which the materials were submitted.

Portfolios are evaluated by the Fieldwork Coordinator using the [Portfolio Rubric](#). Students are required to submit their portfolio for review at three time points (exact deadline will be communicated by the Fieldwork Coordinator):

- **Before beginning internship**: The portfolio will be evaluated to determine progress in achieving necessary competencies through coursework and practica. Areas that should be specifically targeted for concentrated development during internship will be identified. The feedback gained at this stage should inform development of goals for the internship (i.e., the intern learning plan).

- **December of the internship year**: The portfolio will be evaluated to determine progress in achieving competencies in training and will provide further guidance for the structuring of activities during the remaining internship time for any areas in which competency is not fully demonstrated.

- **May of the internship year**: The portfolio will be used as a summative evaluation. Included components should demonstrate achievement of all required competencies. Any identified deficiencies may require revisions of submitted documentation or additional guided study and/or supervised fieldwork.

**Portfolio Evaluation**

Students are expected to demonstrate competency in Program goal areas before completing the program. Each domain will be scored separately using the Rubric and assigned one of the following grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>May provide evidence some knowledge in the domain but none of the required elements are addressed or the demonstrated knowledge and skills are far below what is expected of a novice scientist-practitioner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Provides evidence of knowledge or application in the domain. Where specific elements are delineated, only some of the required elements are documented. Submitted materials may fail to meet basic requirements (e.g., failure to safeguard client privacy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Provides evidence that the competency is fully met in knowledge and application. Where specific elements are delineated, all required elements are documented. Demonstrated knowledge and skills indicate competency expected of a novice scientist-practitioner at completion of graduate training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meritorious</td>
<td>Evidence is extraordinarily well-presented and clearly superb among interns. Demonstrates exceptional grasp of foundational knowledge and skills in the domain, and competency in practicing effectively beyond what is expected of a novice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students may pass, pass with reservations, or fail the final portfolio submission.

- **Pass.** A result of pass or better in all domains of the portfolio. Students must receive a final pass designation in order for the portfolio to be considered complete.

- **Pass with Reservations.** A result of pass with reservations will result when there is a pass or better on at least 5 out of 6 of the domains and no item with a score of 0. In this case, the student will be required to revise submitted materials or submit new materials in each domain in which a score of 2 or better was not obtained within 2 months. Materials will be graded using the same criteria as for the original responses and the knowledge that supplemental resources were accessible and likely used. The “preliminary pass” designation will be changed to “pass” when scores of 2 and 3 are obtained in all domains and to “fail” for any score of 0 or 1.

- **Fail.** A result of fail will result if the criteria are not met to either pass or pass with reservations. In the case of a fail, the student will meet with the Fieldwork Coordinator and their advisor to devise a remediation plan for guided self-study and/or additional course enrollment/auditing or fieldwork. A resubmission may be evaluated no later than one year from the date of the original final submission. Only one reevaluation is permitted. Students who fail the portfolio twice will be dismissed from the program. Dismissal is considered final unless the program faculty approve a reevaluation.

Students are expected to achieve passing scores in all domains by the final submission, but not necessarily on the initial or midterm submissions. Students will not receive a final designation at the initial or midyear submission unless all domain scores are ≥ 2 (i.e., a passing designation is earned). In such cases, that submission will be treated the final submission and the portfolio requirement is considered complete.
Concerns and Correction

The Program has been designed to help all students acquire professional and ethical behavior as well as specific competencies. Student competence and professional behavior are evaluated annually in the Student Reviews. Individuals may raise concerns about any student’s professional behavior at any time during the student’s enrollment. Procedures for addressing concerns about students’ professional behavior include:

- In accordance with APA and NASP professional and ethical standards, concerns about a student’s performance should be first discussed directly with the student by the individual who has the concern. If the concern persists, the student’s advisor or Program Coordinator should be contacted.

- The advisor and student develop an remediation action plan, using the Constructive Feedback Plan Form. The student is given a copy, and a copy is filed in the student’s file.

- If the concern is serious or if the advisor and student cannot remediate the concern using the Constructive Feedback Plan, the case is discussed by School Psychology faculty. Faculty can vote to implement additional remedial action or to terminate program enrollment.

- The student may grieve the situation to the DGS, Department of Educational Psychology in the College of Education and Human Development, 250 Educational Sciences Building.

In all instances, the student will be notified in advance of deliberation, will have an opportunity to respond, and will be encouraged to participate in the design of a tentative remediation plan. Regular feedback and an opportunity to correct the concern are seen as the main ways to protect student’s due process rights. Examples of possible remedial activities are to increase direct supervision of student performance, reduce workload by extending the time period for completing required coursework, require additional academic courses/practica, recommend individual or group counseling, redo course requirements, or complete additional training experiences. Satisfactory progress toward correcting the concern must be documented; additional rating forms may be used.
Section VII: General Information

Graduate Assistantships

Students may fund their education, at least in part, through graduate assistantships; these positions provide a stipend, tuition reduction, and health insurance. Most students hold one or two .25 FTE assistantships, each the equivalent of 10-hours work per week, during the academic year, or on .5 FTE position requiring 20-hours per week of work. **Students must have program approval to have more than .5 FTE in assistantships during the academic year.** The program strongly discourages employment above .5 FTE because additional employment generally undermines degree progress and completion. Only students in good standing and on track in research and exam requirements will be approved for employment above .5 FTE. Failure to obtain approval for assistantships over .5 FTE will affect standing in the program.

A .5 FTE (or 50%) assistantship, or the equivalent, generally provides full tuition remission and reduced cost individual insurance (but not other fees). This covers a maximum of 14 credits per semester. Graduate students may enroll in a maximum of 18 credits per semester, but each credit beyond 14 is the responsibility of the student. Students should also discuss potential enrollment beyond 14 credits with their advisor. Information about available positions can be obtained from the university’s Human Resources Graduate Assistant Employment website. Position announcements will also be shared via the program, department, and college listservs.

If a student does not qualify for resident tuition but had a graduate assistantship, they may qualify for resident tuition rates as an extended benefit of the assistantship. Generally, the rule is that if a student was a graduate assistant for a minimum of two semesters, they qualify for resident tuition for the same number of semesters that they were a graduate assistant. The maximum number of semesters this benefit can be used is four. There is a three-year time limit. Students who are interested in using this benefit should contact the Graduate Assistant Office (612-625-5001) for the specifics.

**A note on data use and ownership:** Data collected or analyzed as part of an assistantship are generally owned by the supervising faculty or principal investigators of a sponsored project (i.e., grant). Therefore, students must seek approval before using such data in any context beyond those directed by the faculty/PI. Before using any data obtained through an assistantship or other employment or volunteer research activities for personal use (e.g., degree program research requirements, publications, presentations), the student should clarify issues of ownership and acceptable use with the faculty/PI. Failure to do so may result in inappropriate use of data that conflict with professional standards (i.e., ethical guidelines) and could affect standing in the program, in addition to nullifying the project.

Registration

Links to course information can be found on-line at OneStop (http://onestop.umn.edu) and on flyers placed on area bulletin boards. Register on-line via the Academics tab on your MyU portal homepage. Most School Psychology core courses need permission numbers in order to register. Students can get the permission numbers for courses beginning with 88## from the program assistant in 250 ESB (currently acvegell@umn.edu or 612/626-0367); for other courses, students should contact the course instructor.

Students will need to get a University of Minnesota ID Card which identifies them as a member
of the University of Minnesota community. To get a U Card, bring a photo ID such as a driver’s license, state ID, or passport to the U Card Main Office, G22 Coffman Memorial Union, 300 Washington Ave. SE, (612) 626-9900. Students may initiate their U of M e-mail account at https://www.umn.edu/initiate

Students will need to know their student ID number. The number was assigned to their file when they applied to Graduate School. Students can call the Technology Help Line at 612-301-4357 for assistance in retrieving this number.

**Early Registration Deadline**

Students are required to register for classes before the first day of classes in order to avoid paying late registration fees. However, the Graduate School will allow students to register through the end of the second week of the semester if they pay late registration fees. This date is also the last day to add a course, change sections of a course, change grading options (including to or from audit status), and cancel a course without a "W" (withdrawal) appearing on the transcript. All changes in registration after the second week require instructor and Graduate School approval. Graduate students will be permitted to cancel courses through Friday of the sixth week of the semester with the advisor’s signature. Courses canceled after the eighth week will require the signature of both the advisor and instructor, and the approval of the graduate school. No registration changes will be permitted after the last day of instruction.

These registration deadlines will be strictly enforced. (Remember that registration changes are not effective until the student submits a completed Graduate Registration Exception Request). Exceptions will be considered only by written request to the Graduate School. Such requests are not routinely approved.

These deadlines will in no way change the University's refund policies, which are enforced by the Office of the Registrar. Further details on these policies, as well as on tuition and fees, are available via the One Stop website.

**Delayed Financial Support**

Students whose financial support is pending should not delay registration. They should register on time and contact Student Account Assistance [211 Bruininks Hall, 624-2873] for information on late payment fee policies. The University provides options for payment of fees that allow students to spread out payment amounts over the school term.

**Registration and Holds Status**

The Graduate School determines when and if students are eligible to register for classes. Holds on registration may be placed on students’ accounts for scholastic reasons (e.g., low grade point averages, more than 8 credits of incompletes, or failure to file required paperwork) or financial reasons (e.g., overdue library books/fines or unpaid fees). If students have a hold on their record, they may not register until that hold is cleared. Notice of any hold, including the name of the office where it may be cleared, will be listed on the student’s MyU portal homepage.

**Graduate School Policy on Incompletes**

When a student accumulates more than 8 credits of incompletes, they are issued a warning at registration indicating the need for lowering the number of incomplete credits to 8 or less before the next semester. If the student still has more than 8 credits of incompletes when the next registration period begins, a hold is placed on their account preventing him/her from registering.
In addition to the above policy, our program has instituted the following procedures:

- Instructors should specify at the beginning of the course their position on incompletes in consultation with students enrolled in that course. This procedure is necessary because of the immediate professional responsibilities which students have toward their clients in the assessment and intervention sequences, practica, and other courses.
- Advisors should be informed of impending incompletes as soon as possible.
- Please note that a grade of "K" is frequently given in a course involving an ongoing program of study or research. Upon completion of the course requirements, the "K" grade is then converted to the regular course grade, and credit is granted.

**Resource Fees**

Students are assessed a resource fee in conjunction with each year of practicum in order to offset the cost of materials used in classes and fieldwork. These fees are charged to your student account and will be reflected on your tuition bills.

**Department Facilities & Resources**

**Office Space**

The School Psychology offices are located primarily on the third floor of the Education Science Building (ESB). The Educational Psychology Department offices are located on the second floor of the Education Science Building. Students typically have office space (if they have an assistantship) in the building where their research projects are housed. Attempts are made to provide office space to School Psychology students in ESB, but due to space limitations, there are no guaranteed spaces. Students employed by program faculty should inquire to their supervisor about the availability of space in ESB. Communal office spaces are available in ESB 190 and 275 for use during business hours. Students may also use the open air study rooms on each floor.

**Office Equipment**

A data projector and video cameras can be checked out at the front desk in 250 ESB. Students have access to computers through research projects, University computer labs, throughout the Education Sciences Building and the Educational Psychology Student Resource Library (third floor of ESB). A computer lab fee will appear automatically on your fee statement regardless of your actual U of M computer use.

**Keys**

Office keys are issued to those students with assistantships in the program one semester at a time allowing them access to independently assigned room/space. Students may request keys at the front desk in room 250 ESB. After office hours access is available to give students

---

**Reminder:** Please be respectful of others in shared spaces, including office suites, conference rooms, and the atrium by maintaining low volume of conversation and media so as not to disturb others. Be mindful of potential confidentiality issues when sharing information or storing sensitive documents in shared work areas since lack of walls and ceilings means sounds transmits easily throughout each floor or suite.
access to the building on evenings and during weekends and needs to be requested through the Ed Psych main office in room 250 ESB. Students will be required to complete a request form and have it signed by their appointment supervisor. Students are responsible for returning their assigned keys at the end of the semester. Lost or unreturned keys will result in a key replacement fee. For safety reasons, do not prop open any doors. If you are found to have propped open a door your building access and keys can be revoked and the University can choose to prosecute.

**Security**

Do not leave any unattended office doors open or unlocked at any time. Valuable computers, data, money, radios, wallets/purses, and coats have been stolen during brief absences.

**Mailboxes**

Mailboxes located on first floor ESB are provided for current students. Students with offices outside of ESB may have additional mailboxes in those buildings. Check your mailboxes often. Do not leave valuable items in these mailboxes as they are not in a secured area.

**Student Files**

Personally identifying information and student files are located centrally in 250 ESB. If any of the material in these files is requested by someone outside the School Psychology Program, it will be given only with student consent. Under the Buckley Amendment, students have access to all information in their file excepting those items for which they waived right of access.

The Graduate School requires the School Psychology Program to provide it with information about student demographics and progress to degree completion. Also, as an APA-accredited and NASP-approved program, we are often asked to complete surveys about this information. Therefore, the program tracks the information on student demographics and progress on the Annual Student Review form. Students are responsible for providing the program assistant with this required information.

**Campus Resources**

**Conference Funding**

Students often present their research at professional conferences. The department generally provides some annual funding for a student’s travel; see the department office for information. The Program expects that students who receive department travel funds will present their research at the department’s Graduate Student Research Day, which typically occurs the first Friday in March. Funding is also available from the following university sources:

- Council of Graduate Students (COGS)
- Graduate Students in Education and Human Development (GradSEHD)
- Community of Scholars Program (COSP) for students from underrepresented backgrounds

Students may also pursue competitive funding through various professional associations (e.g., NASP, APA, AERA).

**Research Consultation Services**
Research Methodology Consulting Center (RMCC): RMCC provides consulting to graduate students working on a dissertation or master’s thesis. Per RMCC, all RMCC recommendations should be cleared by the student’s committee before being undertaken; provides general advice about methodology and statistical analysis. Four, 45-minute consultations are provided each academic year at no cost. Submit a request here.

CAREI Research Methods Consultation: Students may receive up to 4 no-cost consultations to support their thesis and dissertation work. Submit this form to request assistance. You are encouraged to discuss with your adviser beforehand to ensure appropriate usage of the services.

Center for Writing

The Center provides online and in-person consultation appointments and drop-in; annual dissertation retreat, and a graduate student writing support. See writing.umn.edu

Student Academic Success Services

SASS provides individual consultation and online resources regarding a variety of topics including life balance, study skills, time management, self-awareness, active learning at http://www.sass.umn.edu/

University Mental Health Resources

- U Counseling and Consulting Services - UCCS provides individual and group treatment, workshops, academic counseling, consultation, crisis resources at http://www.uccs.umn.edu/
- http://www.mentalhealth.umn.edu/
- https://counseling.umn.edu/counseling/personal
- https://counseling.umn.edu/lets-talk - free, confidential, not appointment necessary but only available through 5/15
- https://boynton.umn.edu/clinics/mental-health
- Learn to Live, no-cost online mental health support for UMN students (use code UMN) - Learn to Live is an online mental health resource available to Student Services Fee-paying students on all University of Minnesota campuses. Learn to Live’s methods are based on Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) principles and the self-paced, confidential programs are designed to help with social anxiety, depression, stress and insomnia. There is also an option to work with member coaches who offer support for students as they work through Learn to Live’s programs, which helps increase their likelihood of behavioral change. When used consistently, online CBT has been shown to be as effective as in-person therapy and is a good fit for students who are not interested in face-to-face therapy or students that need a more flexible option.

You can access Learn to Live at https://www.learntolive.com/partners using the code “UMN”. After entering the code, students will be asked participate in a short assessment
to give them personalized program recommendations. Once students start a program, they can return to it anytime as progress is saved as they go.

**Community of Scholars**

This program provides summer programs, workshops, and individual counseling for students from underrepresented groups. See [https://diversity.umn.edu/gradeducation/cosp](https://diversity.umn.edu/gradeducation/cosp)

**Library Resources**

The U library provides tutorials on a variety of research processes, peer research consultants, and other specialized services for graduate students.

- [https://www.lib.umn.edu/instruction/tutorials](https://www.lib.umn.edu/instruction/tutorials)
- [https://www.lib.umn.edu/services/prc](https://www.lib.umn.edu/services/prc)
- [https://www.lib.umn.edu/services/grads](https://www.lib.umn.edu/services/grads)

**Multicultural Center for Academic Excellence**

The Instructional center provides one-on-one assistance in writing, statistics, and library research. See [https://diversity.umn.edu/multicultural/instructionalcenter](https://diversity.umn.edu/multicultural/instructionalcenter)

**CEHD Funding Resources**

For college fellowships and scholarships, see [http://www.cehd.umn.edu/graduate/cehd-aid.html](http://www.cehd.umn.edu/graduate/cehd-aid.html)

**Graduate School**

- For a calendar of academic and professional development events see, [http://www.grad.umn.edu/current-students-academic-professional-development/apdcal](http://www.grad.umn.edu/current-students-academic-professional-development/apdcal)
- For university-wide fellowships and scholarships, as well as links to external funding, see [https://www.grad.umn.edu/fundingtuition](https://www.grad.umn.edu/fundingtuition)

**Other Campus Resources**

- **Student Cultural Centers**
  - [American Indian Student Cultural Center (AISCC)](#)
  - [Asian Student Union (ASU)](#)
  - [Black Student Union (BSU)](#)
  - [Disability Student Cultural Center (DSCC)](#)
  - [La Raza Student Cultural Center](#)
  - [Queer Student Cultural Center (QSCC)](#)
  - [Al-Madinah Student Cultural Center (AMCC)](#)
  - [Minnesota International Student Association (MISA)](#)
  - [Women's Student Collective Activist (WSAC)](#)
  - [University Indigenous Women and Women of Color](#)
- **Community of Scholars Program** for students from underrepresented backgrounds – provides workshops, writing support, travel grants, etc.
- [Graduate Students of Color Alliance](#)
- [Asian Pacific American Resource Center](#)
- **Immigration Response Team** – provides resources and supports to all members of U community (all immigrant statuses) re: local and national immigration policy, regulations,
etc.

- Gender and Sexuality Center
- Women's Center
- Grad Student Organizations
- Disability Resource Center: accommodations and services
- Teaching Assistant Professional Development
- Student Conflict Resolution Center

Other Resources

- The University now has an institutional membership with the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD). Basic NCFDD resources are available free of charge to faculty and instructors, graduate students, and post-docs at http://www.facultydiversity.org/
- American Psychological Association (APA). You can get information about APA at www.apa.org. Students may also be interested in the Division of School Psychology (Division 16).
  - Specialized resources for graduate students are available at http://www.apa.org/education/grad/index.aspx
  - Fellowships and research funding opportunities are searchable at http://www.apa.org/education/grad/funding.aspx
- National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). You can get information about NASP at: www.nasponline.org

Licensure and Certification

Minnesota Psychology Licensure

The PhD program in school psychology prepares graduates for entry-level doctoral practice, including the pursuit of licensure to practice psychology. Students who graduate from this program with a PhD are eligible for licensure in the state of Minnesota following the completion of supervised post-doctoral experience and passing the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) and the Minnesota Professional Responsibility Examination (PRE). Current information on the licensure process is available through the Minnesota Board of Psychology, http://www.psychologyboard.state.mn.us/, 612-548-2100, 2829 University Ave SE Suite 320 Minneapolis, MN 55414.

Information on the EPPP and a compendium of state and province regulations for psychology licensure is available from the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB), http://www.asppb.net/.

In addition, students may wish to seek board certification in psychology. Information on certification, including early entry for graduate students and interns, is available through the American Board of Professional Psychology, www.abpp.org.

Minnesota School Psychology Certification

Students who graduate from a NASP-certified program are eligible for certification as a school psychologist in the State of Minnesota. Students who will be practicing in schools will need to apply to the Minnesota Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board (First-Time Full Professional Minnesota License). Upon completion of requirements for certification, students
follow the steps required for Other School Professional Licensing at the Minnesota Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board. This generally entails submitting an application, license fee, and transcript. The Minnesota Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board (PELSB) can be contacted at 651-539-4200, 1500 Hwy. 36 W., Roseville, MN, 55113.

**Fingerprinting Requirements and Fee**

Minnesota State Law requires that all candidates applying for initial licensure be finger printed for national and state criminal background checks. If you completed your internship in Minnesota with the Limited Intern License, you already had a background check. According to PELSB, you do not need another fingerprinting. If you do need to submit a fingerprint card, please be sure to use the PELSB’s fingerprint card (available at 250 ESB). The U of M Police will provide fingerprinting for $10 and is done by appointment only. For detailed information, please call U of M Police at 612-626-5304. If you have the time, it may pay to check around. Washington County will fingerprint for free. Hennepin County will fingerprint during regular business hours, however, there is a charge. Most police stations will also fingerprint you for a small fee. You might want to check the county you are residing in to find out if they offer fingerprinting for free.

**National Certification for School Psychologists**

All program graduates are eligible to apply to become Nationally Certified School Psychologists, the professional credential of the National School Psychology Certification System of the National Association of School Psychologists. The program strongly recommends graduates for the NCSP. This professional credential is required by over 50% of states for certification as a school psychologist. For more information or an application, visit NASP website at [http://www.nasponline.org/certification/index.aspx](http://www.nasponline.org/certification/index.aspx). Students may request program approval of their NCSP applications after all degree requirements have been completed.
Appendix: Recent Student Research

Dissertations

**Julia A Baker** (PhD., 2018, Advisor: Theodore J Christ)
*Summer Learning Loss in Reading Achievement: Effects of Demographic Variables and Summer Activity*

The purpose of this dissertation was to determine if there was a statistically and practically significant effect of summer learning loss in reading in primary grades, and to determine whether or not that loss varied by demographic variables and/or summer activity. The first study examined if demographic variables such as free or reduced lunch status, special education status, eligibility for English Language Learner services, or race influenced summer learning loss. The second study controlled for significant demographic variables and determined if summer literacy activities at home, as measured by a survey, or summer program attendance were associated with differential summer learning loss. Based on recommendations in previous literature, intervening instructional time was minimized and students were tested within the last 10 days of school in the spring and the first 10 days in the fall. There was a significant effect of summer learning loss in reading in four of the six grades studied, and in those grades, the effect size of the loss was medium to large in magnitude (i.e., \( d = .52 – 1.37 \)). Demographic variables and summer activity, as measured by the present study, accounted for a small proportion of the variance in summer change. Keywords: summer learning loss, summer slide, summer regression

**Stephanie K Brunner** (PhD, 2019, Advisor: Amanda Sullivan)
*Influence of Head Start Lead Teacher Profiles on the Relation between Coaching and Intervention Fidelity*

Promoting social-emotional (S-E) competence among young children from low-income backgrounds (LIB) remains a national imperative, given that early S-E competence predicts later outcomes and that children from LIB are less likely to enter kindergarten with adequate S-E skills. From an ecological perspective, high-quality early childhood education (ECE) experiences can offer differential benefit to children from LIB, so it is worthwhile to devote efforts to improve ECE quality. Coaching-centered interventions that provide ECE teachers with ongoing support for implementation of new strategies, like the Incredible Years Teacher Classroom Management Program (IY TCM), predict positive changes in teacher behavior, classroom climate, and S-E competence. Additionally, teachers’ professional background, psychological load, perceptions, and classroom process quality can impact coaching and fidelity outcomes. Using data from the Head Start CARES national demonstration, this dissertation explored the degree to which Head Start lead teachers’ responses on indicators could be organized into profiles and, subsequently, the degree to which profile membership moderated the relation between coaching dosage and average IY TCM intervention fidelity. Latent profile analysis results supported three profiles, best distinguished by low, moderate, and high levels of initial classroom process quality. Despite a lack of relationship between coaching dosage and average fidelity, logistic regression identified main effects of profile membership, such that lead teachers in Profiles 1 and 2 were less likely than teachers in Profile 3 to be in the high mean fidelity group when provided with the average coaching dosage. Results offer implications about collections of teacher-level factors that impact fidelity, future directions for exploring CARES data, and Head Start technical assistance.

**Elizabeth Margaret Christian** (PhD, 2017, Advisors: Amanda Sullivan and Clayton Cook)
*The Effectiveness of the ACHIEVER Adult Resilience Curriculum in Promoting Teacher Wellbeing*
Kate Lindsey Clayton (PhD, 2015, Advisors: Theodore J Christ, Scott Rushton McConnell)
The Influence of Parenting Stress and Social Support on Parenting Behavior during a Preventative Parenting Education Program for Enhancing School Readiness.

The purpose of this study was to examine if parents with increased levels of risk (e.g. increased parenting stress and lower perceived social support) and less developed parenting behaviors prior to the intervention would show more change in key parenting behaviors (e.g. parent knowledge and parent-child language interactions) over the course of the intervention. Forty-seven parent-child dyads participated. Participants were recruited through a larger parent study investigating the overall efficacy of the intervention. All participants were English speaking. The majority of families were living below the poverty line. A quasi-experimental, pretest-posttest within-subjects intervention design was employed to evaluate the extent to which elevated parenting stress levels or low levels of social support moderated either a) increases in parenting knowledge or b) increases in CT for parents who participated in the College Bound Babies parenting education program. Dependent variables included change in frequency of parent-child conversational-turns and change in parenting knowledge. Data were collected using the Language ENvironmental Analysis (LENA) system in the participant’s natural home environment and parenting knowledge was measured using the Parenting Knowledge and Practices Questionnaire, a self-report measure. Moderator analyses indicated that elevated levels of parenting stress or lower levels of perceived social support did not moderate change in parent-child language interactions or change in parenting knowledge for participants regardless of baseline levels of parenting knowledge or baseline level of parent-child conversational turns. Directions for future research and implications of non-significant findings are discussed.

Maureen Margaret Cooper (PhD, 2015, Advisor: Sandra L. Christenson)
Examining the Effects of an Attribution Retraining Intervention on the Attributions and Engagement of Alternative School Students.

The purpose of the present study was to examine the effectiveness of an intervention designed to increase effortful attributions in high school students enrolled in an alternative high school at risk for failure to graduate. Pre-test and post-test self-report surveys on student attributions and engagement were collected and analyzed prior to and after the administration of an attribution retraining intervention for a treatment and control group. An additional 5-question survey on educational background was collected to better describe and understand the educational experience of the sample of students. The attribution and engagement surveys suggested that there were no significant effects of the attribution retraining intervention on student attributions or engagement. A significant relationship existed between perceived family support for learning, and students’ history of consistent attendance in school. Limitations and implications for future research are discussed.

Joseph Demers (PhD, 2016, Advisor: Theodore J Christ)
Student-Centered Analyses of Classroom Perceptions and their Prediction of Student Disengagement

The purpose of this project was to examine modifications to REACT—a student rating scale assessing the classroom environment—to better predict classroom aspects associated with student disengagement. Specifically, the studies examined psychometric properties of student rating items corresponding to unsupportive and unpleasant aspects of the classroom environment within the existing subscales on REACT, as well as items corresponding to perceptions of social interactions and teacher relational support. The studies then examined the extent to which new items and existing items on REACT associated with student reports of engagement and disengagement and student characteristics considered to place students at risk for disengagement. 1160 middle school students completed REACT, along with 36 new
items and a measure of engagement and disengagement. Teachers reported data about student characteristics, including gender, Special Education and Section 504 status, achievement in class, social behavior, and class participation for 744 of these students. Study one examined psychometric properties of the new items, including several confirmatory factor analyses to assess the extent to which new items fit with REACT. Results indicated a majority of items constituted a new instrument—CAIRS—corresponding to social aspects of the classroom environment, in contrast to instructional aspects. Regression analyses indicated new items accounted for additional variance in student engagement and disengagement, after controlling for responses on REACT. In Study two, correlation and regression analyses indicated REACT scores exhibited few significant differences relative to different student characteristics. CAIRS scores did exhibit such differences, but effect sizes were small. Implications and future research are discussed.

Lynn Marie Edwards (PhD, 2016, Advisors: Jim Ysseldyke and Matthew K Burns)
Investigating Why Phrase Drill Works: The Effects of Modeling and Sentence Repetition on Student Oral Reading Fluency Skills

The purpose of the current study was to use a conceptual model to identify possible causal mechanisms at play in the phrase drill (PD) intervention. The study was carried out by isolating and investigating modeling and sentence repetition, which are two specific instructional components that are typically used in PD, by creating instructional variations of PD that separated the two components into two levels (low and high conditions). The study used a two-by-two factorial, between-subjects experimental design with a control condition. Participants were 111 second grade students attending elementary school in the upper Midwestern United States. The participants were identified as being below benchmark on a grade level curriculum-based measure in reading. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four PD intervention conditions or the control condition. Each participant received one session of one of the intervention conditions or the control. Participants were assessed using a reading fluency measure looking at both accuracy and reading rate. Results indicated modeling functions as a potential causal mechanism of the PD intervention but sentence repetition does not function as a causal mechanism. Secondly, the results provide evidence for the effectiveness of the PD intervention in increasing struggling second grade readers’ ability read words accurately in connected text. Third, the results lend preliminary support for using the instructional hierarchy conceptual model to identify causal mechanisms of reading interventions specifically in the area of the acquisition stage of the hierarchy. The results of the study were contextualized within theory and previous research. Implications for practice, directions for future research, and limitations of the study were also addressed.

Victoria Erhardt (PhD, 2019, Advisors: Faith Miller and Amanda Sullivan)
Effectiveness and Key Components of School-Based Anxiety Interventions

Anxiety disorders and subclinical anxiety symptoms are prevalent in childhood and adolescence, highlighting the need for prevention and early intervention efforts. While research has demonstrated positive effects for some school-based anxiety interventions, additional research is warranted to ascertain program effectiveness, composition, and delivery to best meet student needs. This multi-study dissertation project comprised of two studies. Study 1 was a systematic literature review that examined anxiety interventions for youth in school settings and updated and expanded a previous systematic review (Neil & Christenson, 2009) to more fully understand the state of the science regarding school-based anxiety programs. Randomized controlled trials (RCT) from articles published between 2008 and June 2016 were reviewed and evaluated in areas including program effectiveness, program content, intervention intensity, and participant age. Twenty-two RCTs, representing 9,693 study participants, were coded and analyzed. Results indicated that 43% of trials reported statistically significant reductions in
anxiety (ES = -0.69 to -0.15) with the majority of programs based in cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT). Results from Study 1 were used to inform the development and implementation of an applied school-based anxiety intervention. In Study 2, Think Good Feel Good was implemented as a low-cost, 6-week, CBT-based modularized intervention to address student anxiety in an elementary school utilizing a multiple-baseline single case design. The main purpose was to analyze the effectiveness of the program as measured by formative and summative anxiety assessment measures following a multi-method, multi-source approach. Participants included 14 students across third, fourth, and fifth grades at a public elementary school. Results of the study indicated both responders and non-responders to the intervention. Self-report data on the Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children (MASC-2) pre/post assessments showed statistically significant anxiety reduction on the generalized anxiety disorder and the physical symptoms scales, whereas parent and teacher pre/post data and progress monitoring data revealed mixed findings. Social validity data from students indicated high acceptability and perceived utility. The implications of the results from this dissertation project for future research and practice are discussed.

Elyse McCollough Farnsworth (PhD, 2018, Advisor: Amanda Sullivan)

Influence of Child Find Referral Mechanisms on Early Childhood Special Education Participation

According to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004), state and local education agencies are obligated to locate, identify, and evaluate all individuals ages birth to 21 years who may be in need of special education services and supports. Past research suggested, however, that disparities exist between the percent of children who demonstrate needs and those who participate in special education (e.g., Boyle et al., 2011). This indicates that child find referral mechanisms may not be effectively functioning to locate all children in potential need and suggests that examining the influence of referral mechanisms on receipt of special education may provide important information for improving practices and upholding the law. During preschool, four common child find referral mechanisms exist to aide in the identification of young children with special needs. These include referrals that result from early childhood screening, well-care visits, early childhood education providers, and parent knowledge of development. The purpose of this study is twofold. First, I aimed to understand if the disparities between special need and special education participation are observed during preschool. Second, I examined the extent to which involvement with one of the common child find referral mechanisms predicted participation in early childhood special education among a nationally-representative sample of preschoolers with special needs born in the United States in 2001, using multivariate logistic regression of data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study – Birth Cohort. Findings indicated that 20.9% of preschoolers included in the sample demonstrated special needs, while only 5.9% of participants received special education services during preschool. Attendance at well-care visits and parent knowledge were not significant predictors of early childhood special education participation after controlling for ecological covariates; however, attending early childhood screening and any form of early childhood education significantly increased the likelihood that preschoolers with special needs participated in early childhood special education. The relationship between early childhood screening and receipt of early childhood special education was moderated by gender, with significant effects being most profound for girls. Likewise, birthweight influenced the relationship between early childhood education and early childhood special education participation. Results suggest that educational agencies should focus child find efforts on strengthening referral relationships with early care providers and ensuring all families of young children attend early childhood screening.

Elizabeth Mary Hagen (PhD, 2015, Advisor: Sandra L Christenson)
Determinants of school completion: Student perceptions of success at an experiential learning high school.

Although high schools in the United States use a wide range of interventions to increase school completion, a large number of students still drop out each year. Research has shown that, to be effective, interventions must facilitate engagement in learning and connectedness to school. The scale of the dropout crisis suggests that there is a significant population of students who may benefit from interventions that are more comprehensive than supplemental supports in a traditional school environment. The purpose of this phenomenological case study was to develop an understanding of the experience of successful students at an experiential high school in order to examine experiential education as a whole school approach to facilitating school completion. The fourteen participants were students who enrolled at an experiential high school after becoming disengaged at other schools. According to these students, the structures of an experiential high school—notably, projects, expeditions, advising, and a close-knit community—created a school experience of meaningful academic learning and strong relationships that made them feel valued as individuals. Projects and expeditions provided the context for relevant and meaningful learning experiences and created opportunities for relationships to emerge and strengthen. Students associated feelings of being accepted, challenged, and supported with the format of the school, including membership in a close-knit community and the centrality of the advisory relationship. For participants in this study, these experiences were part of a progression that began when students recognized they wanted to leave previous schools and ended when students reflected back on successes as they approached graduation.

Matthew Steven Hall (PhD, 2016, Advisors: Matthew K Burns and Jennifer McComas)

A Comparison of Targeted and Multicomponent Small-Group Reading Interventions in Early Elementary Grades.

Although there is a broad research base supporting effective components of reading interventions, less is known about how to implement reading interventions in small groups. The current study investigated the impact of implementing small group reading interventions targeted to student needs guided by the theoretical frameworks of the Instructional Hierarchy (Haring & Eaton, 1978) and Chall’s (1983) stage theory of reading development. A between-participants randomized block design was used to assign 50 second and third grade students to either a targeted or multicomponent small group reading intervention to ensure equal students with decoding and fluency needs were in each condition. Results revealed no differences between conditions on measures of decoding, fluency and comprehension following 4-weeks of intervention. However, students with a decoding need were found to significantly improve their decoding skills compared to students with a fluency need regardless of condition. Observations of the interventions being implemented indicated that all four interventionists modified the interventions or added additional components. Implications for theory and practice are discussed.

Amber Suzanne Hays (PhD, 2018, Advisor: Scott Rushton McConnell)

The Relation between Parent Involvement and the Development of Kindergarten Self-Regulation and Literacy Skills

Rebecca A Kanive (PhD, 2016, Advisor: Matthew K Burns)

Relationship between the Learning Hierarchy and Academic Achievement on Strategies Used by Third-Grade Students when Solving Multiplication Word Problems
Distinguishing between sources of variability in mathematics performance may contribute to a more comprehensive theory of mathematics skills. Research has examined student differences based upon scores on achievement tests, which provide overall proficiency, but may not provide the detailed information for identifying and remediating difficulties. The Learning Hierarchy (Haring & Eaton, 1978) considers how students learn different academic skills as they progress through a learning sequence and has previous support as an intervention heuristic (Daly & Ardon, 1997), but there is limited research for mathematics (Burns, Codding, Boice, & Lukito, 2010). The purpose of this study is to extend previous research by examining the Learning Hierarchy conceptual model as a framework based on performance on a fluency measure, as well as broaden the previous research base around the characteristics of problem solving for students by examining strategy use of students in specific phases in the Learning Hierarchy. Participants were 492 third grade students and were administered measures of computation fluency and application. Students were classified into four categorical phases based on accuracy and fluency scores (Burns, 2004; Burns, VanDerHeyden, & Jiban, 2006; VanDerHeyden & Burns, 2008). To examine strategy use, student responses were scored for overall accuracy and coded for strategy used to solve the problem (Zhang, Ding, Barrett, & Xin, 2014). The results support previous research findings in strategy development suggesting that mathematics achievement significantly predicts accuracy of strategy (Zhang et al., 2014). When student performance was compared based upon phases of the Learning Hierarchy, students in initial phases displayed more variation in strategy selection but, were less accurate and used lower quality strategies. The current findings are promising for consideration of the Learning Hierarchy as a potential conceptual heuristic model in mathematics. Current results were contextualized within previous research and potential implications for theory and future research supporting the validity of the Learning Hierarchy framework as well as the potential of understanding strategic development on intervention were discussed.

Abbey C Karich (PhD, 2016, Advisor: Matthew K Burns)

Intervening with the Interventionist: Matching Interventions for Treatment Integrity to Stages of the Transtheoretical Model of Behavior Change

Within the implementation science literature, there is a well-established gap between research-based interventions and effective implementation. Changing the behavior of those responsible for carrying out new innovations within schools is necessary in order for interventions to be implemented with fidelity (Durlak & DuPre, 2008; Wickstrom, Jones, LaFleur, & Witt, 1998). The current study applied an adapted transtheoretical model (TTM) of behavior change in an attempt to increase treatment integrity among resistant teachers. Interventionist level variables were situated within stages of TTM and possible strategies were identified to intervene with a teacher. Two multiple baseline designs were used to deliver matched interventions to three teachers, each working with three students. Treatment integrity on the intervention protocol and student outcomes on a mastery assessment were monitored each session. The study occurred over five weeks, resulting in 21 intervention days. Teachers were also interviewed after each phase of the study to identify common needs/barriers and aid in interpretation of single-case design data. Results were variable but offered promise for matching the adapted TTM stages to teachers in consultation. Consultation in general increased initial treatment integrity across all teachers and phases, although these effects did not seem to last. Implications for practice and theory, limitations, and future directions for research are discussed.

Jessie Marie Kember (PhD, 2017, Advisors: Theodore J Christ and Annie Hansen)

Sexual minority youth diversity and resilience

These studies were part of a research line to examine how the definitions of sexual minority youth influence how and what is learned about members and subgroups in this heterogeneous population. The first study was an examination of how membership in the sexual
minority population is influenced by the definition(s) of sexual orientation, as measured by the Minnesota Student Survey (MSS). The study examined the within-group variability in the populations of sexual minority youth, and discordance between reported sexual identity and sexual behavior. Results indicated that sexual orientation definitions yielded distinct prevalence rates for sexual minority youth, with some differences in prevalence of males and females across definition categories. Overall, sexual orientation definition and gender did not predict age. Evidence regarding the congruence of sexual identity and sexual behavior was inconclusive for males and females. The second study was an examination of protective factors and their interaction with alternate definitions of sexual minority youth. The second study used Latent Profile Analysis (LPA) to identify the profile structure of sexual minority MSS participants based on a combination of individual-level protective factors. Results indicated that heterosexual students scored higher on developmental skills and supports compared to non-heterosexual students. Across students, three resilience profiles existed: low, medium, and high. Finally, age and sexual minority status significantly predicted resilience profile membership.

Aleksis Paul Kincaid (PhD, 2017, Advisor: Amanda Sullivan)
Prevalence of Youth with Disabilities in the Juvenile Justice System

The U.S. juvenile justice system disproportionately incarcerates minority youth, youth from impoverished backgrounds, and youth with disabilities (YD). Youth who are involved with the juvenile justice system have a decreased chance of completing high school, lower work participation and earning rates, and are more likely to commit offenses as adults than peers who were not involved in juvenile justice. There is some evidence that these outcomes are magnified for YD. This project investigated whether YD were more likely to: end up in court, commit different offenses, and receive harsher sentences than youth without disabilities. In Study 1, extant datasets of administrative educational and court records were linked to investigate the prevalence of youth with disabilities in the juvenile court system, types of offenses committed, and county attorney’s choice of degree of referral. Study 1 found that YD were overrepresented in the juvenile court system, but that when disability was categorized as a dichotomous variable, the finding was not robust to sex, race/ethnicity, and free or reduced-priced lunch (FRL status). When disability categories were disaggregated, youth with EBD, OHI, and SLD were overrepresented in the juvenile courts, while youth with ASD, DCD, physical or sensory impairments, and SLI were underrepresented. In addition, save for drug law violations, YD were more likely to be referred for non-status offenses (e.g., crimes against persons, property, public order) than their peers. Lastly, youth with disabilities as a group were referred to court with a higher degree of severity than their peers, a trend that held across most disability categories, and though attenuated, remained when the type of offense was included. Study 2 investigated the likelihood that YD would be convicted delinquent and whether they were incarcerated for longer periods of time than youth without disabilities. YD received delinquency convictions at rates similar to their peers. In contrast to previous literature, YD were not incarcerated for greater lengths of time than their peers. These studies elucidate the relationship between youth with various disabilities and involvement in the juvenile justice system, an important first step in determining both risk and resiliency factors. Research implications are discussed.

Allyson J Kiss (PhD, 2018, Advisor: Theodore J Christ)
Investigating Young Children’s Attitudes toward Mathematics: Improved Measurement and the Relation to Achievement

Researchers in the field of school psychology have recently emphasized the influence of different academic enablers that may influence how students achieve and perform in school. In this literature, attitudes have not yet received much attention as an enabler. However, students as young as pre-kindergarten enter school with predisposed attitudes towards mathematics.
These attitudes may influence their engagement, persistence and performance in mathematics. Evidence also suggests that mathematics performance in kindergarten and first grade can predict performance later in life. Thus, it is important for school psychologists and educators to understand how students perceive their ability and perceive the task of mathematics to help students build their competence to become later successful learners. Understanding the earlier development of these attitudes may help foster more positive perceptions and mathematics learning environments for all students. The purpose of this two-study dissertation was to examine attitudes toward mathematics among young children in kindergarten and first grade. Specifically, the purpose of Study 1 was to develop an assessment instrument to measure attitudes toward mathematics for students in kindergarten and first grade and to examine the reliability and validity evidence for potential use in a school setting. Further, Study 2 aimed to investigate the extent to which different attitudes such as perceived self-competence beliefs, enjoyment, and importance were related to student mathematics achievement as measured by teacher ratings and standardized mathematics assessments. This study is first in an emerging line of inquiry to understand how attitudes influence various achievement outcomes for young children, and, thereby identify if, how, and to what effect attitudes of young children might be targeted for intervention.

Kathrin E Maki (PhD, 2016, Advisor: Matthew K Burns)

School Psychologists’ Consistency and Confidence in Learning Disability Identification: The Impact of Identification Methodology and Inconclusive Student Data

Students with learning disabilities (LD) are a heterogeneous group of learners who exhibit below-average achievement theoretically caused by an underlying psychological processing deficit (Fletcher, Lyon, Fuchs, & Barnes, 2007). School-based identification of LD is necessary if students are to receive specialized supports and instruction through special education services (Burns & Ysseldyke, 2009; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1995; Ysseldyke, Burns, Scholin, & Parker, 2010). However, LD identification is convoluted due to variable practices and the psychometric and conceptual issues underlying identification methodologies. This study examined school psychologists’ decision-making regarding LD identification. Participants on both study 1 and study 2 included 376 practicing school psychologists from across the United States. Study 1 examined the consistency of school psychologists’ LD identification decisions across three identification methods (i.e., ability-achievement discrepancy, response to intervention, and pattern of strengths and weaknesses) and across student evaluation data conclusive levels (i.e., conclusive-not LD, inconclusive, conclusive-LD). Results showed that although there were not differences in identification consistency across identification methods, there were differences in identification consistency across conclusiveness levels of student evaluation data. Study 2 examined differences in school psychologists’ confidence in their identification decisions across identification methods, student evaluation data conclusiveness level, school psychologist experience, and identification consistency. Significant differences in school psychologist confidence across identification method and conclusiveness level were found with school psychologists reporting being the most confident using ability-achievement discrepancy and lower levels of confidence when student data were inconclusive. Significant differences in confidence were not found across school psychologists’ experience or identification consistency. The findings from study 1 and study 2 were discussed in the context of previous research as well as implications for future research, school psychological practice, and special education policy. Specifically, the need for further research regarding LD identification methods in order to ensure identification decisions are reliable and valid is discussed. Moreover, the potential impact on school psychologists’ LD identification practices and consequential student special education servicing are addressed. Limitations of the current research and conclusions are also outlined.
Kirsten Martha Westergard Newell (PhD, 2018, Advisor: Theodore J Christ)

An evaluation of the use of oral reading fluency as a screening tool with emerging biliterates

Students learning to read in more than one language, or emerging biliterates, are becoming increasingly common in schools. Early screening and identification of reading difficulties may lead to better outcomes for emerging biliterates as well as monolingual English students. Oral reading fluency (ORF) is one tool shown to be both a reliable measure of reading and an accurate method of identification of students at risk for poor reading outcomes. This project sought to build validity evidence for the use of ORF as a screening tool with emerging biliterates. Study one, a systematic review of literature, sought to synthesize available validity evidence for ORF with emerging biliterates. Studies were included that were empirical investigations about the use of ORF with emerging biliterate students in grades K through 8. All included studies (n = 25) were conducted with English language learners. Results suggested that although ORF is correlated with reading outcomes, the accuracy of ORF to identify emerging biliterates at risk of poor reading outcomes did not meet criteria. The strength of validity evidence differed by language proficiency of participants. Finally, there were substantial flaws in the quality of the reviewed studies. Study two, an empirical study at a German immersion school, sought to evaluate the use of ORF as a reading screening tool across German and English for students in third (n = 60), fourth (n = 60), and fifth grade (n = 42). Students were given ORF in English and German in winter, and a German proficiency and English reading exam in the spring. ORF in English, the first language of participants, was a good measure of reading and an accurate screening tool when predicting English and German outcome measures. English ORF outperformed German ORF as a predictor in all instances. Overall, results of the present studies suggest that though ORF has promise as a screening tool, more evidence is needed before it can be considered a valid, accurate screening tool for emerging biliterates.

Rosalie Le Febvre Palan (PhD, 2015, Advisor: Sandra L Christenson)

Parental Trust of Schools and Its Role in Postsecondary Readiness.

Postsecondary education is increasingly important to achieving a middle-class lifestyle, but many students are entering college unprepared and are not graduating. The role of parents in postsecondary preparation could make a difference in preparation. In this study, the author used surveys of parents and students in a Midwestern suburban high school to determine the relationships between parents' level of trust in the school, parents' own educational experiences, parents' knowledge of the postsecondary process, and students' perceptions of their postsecondary readiness skills. A significant correlation was found between parental trust of school and parental postsecondary knowledge (r (126) = .322, p< .05). In linear regression models, student gender and grades were found to be significant predictors of postsecondary readiness skills. The model functioned better for males and lower achievers than for females and higher achievers. Implications and directions for future research are discussed.

Laura M Potter (PhD, 2018, Advisors: Amanda Sullivan and Scott Rushton McConnell)

Training Educators to Implement Mindfulness-Based Interventions: Evaluating the Effects of In-Service and Coaching on Intervention Fidelity

School-based interventions that utilize mindfulness and yoga exercises to build students' self-regulation skills have become increasingly popular, both in practice and in published literature. Yet little information has been gathered about how to effectively train educators to deliver these interventions with fidelity. The present paper aimed to advance the research on school-based mindfulness interventions by examining the extent to which educators were able to deliver a specific intervention, Yoga Calm, with fidelity following a series of in-service trainings and follow-up coaching. Study 1 examined intervention fidelity outcomes for fifteen educators following a series of in-service trainings, finding that a majority of educators were able
to deliver the intervention with high levels of adherence to the intervention’s core components. Study 2 used a multiple-baseline design to examine fidelity outcomes for four educators at baseline and following the introduction of side-by-side coaching supports. The data demonstrated four replications of an effect when comparing baseline to treatment, indicating a functional relation between participation in side-by-side coaching and adherence to Yoga Calm’s core components. Both studies also used quantitative and qualitative analysis to identify potential moderators of intervention fidelity, with results highlighting the importance of factors related to educator buy-in, educator self-efficacy, program delivery factors (e.g., scheduling barriers), and accountability. The implications of these findings for educator training and practice, suggestions for future research, and the limitations of this study are also discussed.

Sandra Moran Pulles (PhD, 2016, Advisor: Matthew K Burns)

The Comparative Effects of Dyad Mathematics Interventions on Improving Multiplication Proficiency

Proficiency in mathematics across the United States has become an area of concern as performance on state accountability tests continues to demonstrate that less than 50% of students in 4th and 8th grade are proficient in mathematics (NCES, 2013). With such large numbers of students lacking proficiency in mathematics, systematic interventions that target many students need to be utilized to intervene when large numbers of students are demonstrating limited proficiency. The current study implemented a classwide intervention with 133 third- and fourth-grade students to increase proficiency in multiplication. Students were randomly assigned to the cognitive strategy (CSI), timed drill (TD), or a control condition. The intervention occurred for 15 school day sessions for 30 minutes. Results indicated that students in the timed drill (TD) condition improved on measures of basic multiplication and near transfer measures of division fluency, and students in the CSI condition improved on a measure of multiplication word problem solving. Findings from this study indicate that classwide dyad interventions can be used to help classrooms with large numbers of students struggling with basic multiplication. Future research is needed to determine what interventions should continue for those students not making adequate progress in tier 1 interventions, but given the promising data found here and the pressing need for increased student mathematics proficiency, additional research seems warranted. Implications for research and practice, limitations, and future directions are discussed.

Shanna S Sadeh (PhD, 2016, Advisor: Amanda Sullivan)

School Psychologists’ Decision Making in Evaluations for Emotional Disturbance

For decades, there has been a persistent national trend of public schools disproportionately qualifying more Black students relative to White students for special education under the category of serious emotional disturbance (ED). Such disproportionality suggests but does not prove racial bias in ED evaluations. I experimentally tested how much, if at all, school psychologists’ racial bias impacted eligibility determinations using a vignette methodology and between-group design with three conditions that varied by level of data ambiguity: (a) low-ambiguity data that do not meet ED criteria; (b) low-ambiguity data that meet ED criteria; and (c) highly ambiguous data. The hypothetical student in each vignette was a fifth grade male who had primarily externalizing problems. Participants completed one vignette in each ambiguity condition; student race (Black versus White) was experimentally manipulated. Participants were 60 practicing school psychologists in a northeastern state that adopted the federal regulations for ED eligibility. For each vignette, participants decided whether the student qualified as ED, rated their confidence in their decision and the diagnosticity of data included in the evaluation, and had the option to describe additional data they wish had been included in the results. Chi-square analyses indicated there were no statistically significant differences based on race between students qualified and disqualified as ED across ambiguity conditions,
providing some evidence against the racial bias theory of disproportionality. Under the highly ambiguous data condition, there was no statistically significant difference between students qualified as ED and those not qualified – i.e., regardless of race, all students had a coin-toss chance of qualifying as ED. This finding makes sense in light of the numerous ambiguous key terms in the ED criteria, which allow for more than one reasonable interpretation. Results also showed that most school psychologists were at least moderately confident in their determinations across ambiguity conditions. Their confidence in the low-ambiguity conditions makes sense because those vignettes were designed to be relatively easy. Their confidence in the highly ambiguous data condition may illustrate the potency and frequency of confirmation bias in decision making under conditions of high uncertainty. Across ambiguity conditions, participants frequently identified behavior rating scales and infrequently identified achievement and intelligence scores as highly diagnostic. They identified interviews, family information, and observations with varying frequency across conditions, demonstrating that the diagnosticity of data can fluctuate depending on the presenting problems and evaluation results. Finally, school psychologists who opted to describe additional data they wish had been included in the evaluation results primarily requested more information about interventions that had been attempted and consultation with outside mental health providers. Implications for practice and further research opportunities are discussed.

Alyssa Schardt (PhD, 2019, Advisors: Amanda Sullivan and Faith Miller)
Engagement versus Motivation: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Motivation and Engagement Wheel

Both engagement and motivation have been identified as constructs that are critical to student success and are linked with later academic achievement. However, the multitude of conceptualizations around these constructs and how they relate to one another has become a point of contention within the field. The primary aim of the current study is to examine a model of academic engagement and motivation, the motivation and engagement wheel (MEW), using the Motivation and Engagement Scale (MES; Martin, 2009; Martin, Ginns, & Papworth, 2017) and replicating the model structure with a more diverse, elementary-aged American population. Secondarily, the current study aimed to expand the MEW by examining an adapted model structure that included alternate components of motivation and engagement as measured by the Engagement Versus Disaffection with Learning-teacher and student reports and Patterns of Adaptive Learning Scale. Participants included 270 students in 3rd - 6th grade (predominately African American, 67.4%), from an urban area in the Midwestern United States. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) techniques were used to compare the higher order structure across models. As hypothesized, the four-factor higher order models, comprised of adaptive engagement, adaptive motivation, maladaptive engagement, and maladaptive motivation, which best align with the MEW, demonstrated best fit across both the replication and adaptability models. Thus, this study provided additional support for the structure of the MEW, and preliminary evidence for its adaptability as a theoretical model.

Gregory R Simonson (PhD, 2018, Advisor: Theodore J Christ)
The Effects and Generalization of a Choice-Based Intervention with Highly preferred Items on Student Off-Task Behavior

Opportunities for choice are often taken for granted among individuals without disabilities. Choice is an important dimension of quality of life and a frequent occurrence for many. Many people with disabilities have limited access to making even simple choices. In addition, many individuals with disabilities display problem behaviors that can decrease achievement and put them at risk for exclusion from typical school placements. Choice making is an effective intervention that can help reduce problem behaviors while allowing increased access to choice opportunities. Choice based interventions are person centered and allow an
element of self-determination for individuals with disabilities. The concurrent operant paradigm offers a methodology that enhances choice making opportunities. The purpose of this paper was to implement a systematic choice-based intervention based on the concurrent operant paradigm in the classroom with 4 students referred for behavioral difficulties and at-risk for further exclusion from general education. Keywords: choice, concurrent operant assessment, behavior intervention, school-based

Ethan R Van Norman (PhD, 2015, Advisor: Theodore J Christ)
An Evaluation of the Accuracy of Time Series Interpretations of CBM-R Progress

Curriculum based measurement of reading (CBM-R) is used to monitor the effects of academic interventions for individual students. Decisions to continue, modify, or terminate instructional programs are made by interpreting patterns of observations collected across time. Educators visually analyze or apply decision rules to evaluate student progress. Despite the popularity of CBM-R as a progress monitoring tool, there is a paucity of research evaluating the accuracy of visual analysis and decision rules. Inaccurate interpretations undermine the use of CBM-R as a progress monitoring tool because educators may continue ineffective interventions or prematurely terminate effective interventions. The accuracy of visual analysis and decision rules were investigated in this project. In Study 1 a large extant dataset was analyzed to identify measurement characteristics of CBM-R progress monitoring data. In Study 2 the accuracy of visual analysis and decision rules were evaluated by comparing responses from visual analysts and decision rules with responses of an expert panel. One hundred eight progress monitoring graphs were evaluated in Study 2. The manner in which progress monitoring graphs differed was informed by the results of Study 1. The results of this project suggest evaluation method, number of weeks data are collected, variability of observations, and whether the student is making adequate progress influence the probability of correct decisions. Educators and researchers can improve the probability of correct decisions by visually analyzing progress monitoring graphs with a goal line and trend line, minimizing variability, and collecting data for longer than six weeks. The implications of the findings, limitations, and needs for future research are discussed.

Christopher M Walick (PhD, 2015, Advisor: Matthew K Burns)
A Proposed Algebra Problem-Analysis Model.

The National Mathematics Advisory Panel (2008) states that algebra is a gateway to high school graduation and college success. While existing research emphasizes the importance of quality algebra instruction, the current body of research on algebra problem-analysis for struggling secondary students is small. This paper proposes a problem-solving model to help support those students struggling with algebra. The model integrates the recommendations from math policy boards and research. It is composed of five core sections, each section focusing on a specific critical component of school algebra. The study examines the relationship between the five skills within the model to an established measure of algebra, as well as the validity of the measures being used to assess the different skill areas. The results indicate that there is a significant relationship between the five sections of the model and algebra proficiency, and that the model is able to identify non-proficiency students with a high degree of accuracy.

Jenna Marie Ward (PhD, 2016, Advisor: Matthew K Burns)
Defining and Measuring School Readiness using Confirmatory Factor Analysis Techniques

School readiness skills in kindergarten have been linked with later academic and social achievement; promoting these skills may be a way to help prevent later concerns. A first step is to define school readiness and identify those skills that are most important for later school success. The current dissertation took a two-study approach to measuring school readiness in
kindergarten. Study one proposed a model for measuring school readiness in the fall of kindergarten, comprised of developmental and early academic formative measures. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) techniques were used to test five nested models proposed to explain school readiness. A two factor cross loading indicators model, comprised of achievement in developmental milestones and early academic skills, appeared to provide the best explanation of school readiness in the fall of kindergarten. Study two examined which of those school readiness skills across the kindergarten year best predicted end of kindergarten early academic achievement. Developmental milestones were measured through composite scores, based upon findings from the first study, as well as early reading and early math measures. Path analysis techniques were used to examine the variance accounted for in springtime early academic skills by fall and winter early academic and development skills. Developmental milestones did not appear to provide additional predictive value for end of kindergarten early academic skills, after accounting for beginning of kindergarten early academic skills. The results of these two studies support a clear definition and efficient measurement approach for school readiness skills in kindergarten. Limitations, future research, and practical implications of these findings are discussed.

Mary Chloe Staggers Webb (PhD, 2019, Advisor: Amanda Sullivan)

Examining the Structural Validity of the My Class Inventory – Short Form for Teachers (TMCI-SF) in Early Elementary School Classrooms

There has been an increased interest among researchers, policymakers, and educators in climate as an indicator of the health and functioning of a school. Climate is a complex, multidimensional construct that can be examined at the school, classroom, and individual levels. There are currently few open-access, brief measures of classroom climate, and previous research focused predominantly on upper elementary and secondary school settings. The primary purpose of the current study was to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of the My Class Inventory – Short Form for Teachers (TMCI-SF), which is a 30-item, five factor measure of classroom climate, when used with early elementary school teachers. Results of the CFA indicated that a revised 14-item, three factor TMCI-SF best fit the data. The revised TMCI-SF was used to examine the relationship between classroom climate and students’ social, emotional, and behavioral wellbeing, as measured by the Devereux Student Strengths Assessment – Second Step® Edition (DESSA-SSE), the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), and the two direct observation variables (academic engagement and disruptive behavior). Results of hierarchical linear regression (HLR) analyses indicated that there were statistically significant relationships between the revised scales of the TMCI-SF and the DESSA-SSE scales, SDQ scales, and DBO variables. Finally, classroom climate was treated as an outcome to examine whether it changed as a function of the implementation of social-emotional learning (SEL) curriculum. Results indicated no significant changes as a result of the function of SEL implementation. Implications of the results, limitations of the study, and future directions are discussed.

Anne Follen Zaslofsky (PhD, 2015, Advisor: Matthew K Burns)

Using Measures of Mathematics to Predict Response to Supplemental Intervention.

The method for correctly identifying and intervening with students who are not meeting grade level expectations has varied. Historically, an approach relying on underlying cognitive characteristics or processing skills was used. This approach, referred to as an Aptitude-by-Treatment Interaction (ATI) was criticized for not fully capturing student needs or explaining intervention effectiveness (Cronbach & Snow, 1977; Kearns & Fuchs, 2013). Alternatively, a framework called a Skill-by-Treatment Interaction (STI) relies on matching interventions based on measurable and alterable skills (Burns, Codding, Boice, & Lukito, 2010). Preliminary research in the area of mathematics suggests that the STI approach may be useful in identifying
specific subskill needs, such as conceptual understanding or computational fluency, for students (Burns, 2011). The purpose of the current study was to better understand the relationship between mathematics assessment and intervention design. Specifically, the study examined the link between specific skill assessments of conceptual understanding, computational fluency, and application and word problem solving with a conceptually-based or computation-based intervention. Participants were 46 third and fourth grade students attending a suburban elementary school in the upper Midwestern United States. All participating students received a conceptually-based and computation-based intervention, the order of which was counterbalanced, for two weeks, respectively. Students were assessed using measures of conceptual understanding, computational fluency, and application and word problem solving. Results indicated that gains in computation and application and word problem solving were best predicted by students’ pretest performance on the same measure, regardless of intervention. Interestingly, gains in computational fluency following a computation-based intervention were predicted by students’ prior conceptual understanding. Pretest performance on the conceptual understanding and computational fluency measures were used post hoc to analyze groups of students based on identified need. Students’ identified need did not account for a significant proportion of the variance following intervention. The current results were contextualized within previous research and potential implications for practice were discussed. Specifically, the results of the study were discussed in terms of their contribution to (1) the role of and relationships between essential knowledge bases comprising mathematical proficiency, and (2) how the current study might inform frameworks for matching assessment data to intervention. Lastly, limitations to the study and future directions for research were outlined.