April 23, 2009

Robert Hemenway
Chancellor
University of Kansas
Chancellor's Office, 230 Strong Hall
1415 Jayhawk Blvd
Lawrence, KS 66045

Dear Chancellor Hemenway,

At its meeting on April 2-5, 2009 the Commission on Accreditation (formerly Committee on Accreditation) conducted a review of the Ph.D. program in School psychology at the University of Kansas. This review included consideration of the program’s most recent self-study report, the preliminary review of May 14, 2008 and the program’s response to the preliminary review on August 11, 2008, the report of the team that visited the program on November 17-18, 2008, and the program’s response to the site visit report on January 24, 2009.

I am pleased to inform you that, on the basis of this review, the Commission voted to award accreditation to this program. In so doing, the Commission scheduled the next accreditation site visit to be held in 2015. During the interim, the program will be listed annually among accredited programs of professional psychology in the American Psychologist and on the Accreditation web pages. The Commission also encourages you to share information about your program’s accredited status with agencies and others of the public as appropriate.

Dr. Edward Craighead recused and therefore did not participate in the discussion and vote on your program.

The Commission would like to provide the program with a summary of its perceived relative strengths and weaknesses. This will be provided below according to each of the accreditation domains. At the end of the letter, the program will be provided with an itemized list of any actions that the program needs to take prior to the next accreditation review. A summary of the Commission’s review of this program is provided below.

Domain A: Eligibility
As a prerequisite for accreditation, the program’s purpose must be within the scope of the accrediting body and must be pursued in an institutional setting appropriate for the doctoral education and training of professional psychologists.

The Ph.D. program in School psychology is a part of the Department of Psychology and Research in Education, within the School of Education at the University of Kansas. The
institution is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of North Central Association of Schools and Colleges. The program enjoys considerable institutional support and above-adequate resources for its operation. The program evidences well-articulated plans for respecting and honoring diversity and individual differences.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

**Domain B: Program Philosophy, Objectives and Curriculum Plan**

The program has a clearly specified philosophy of education and training, compatible with the mission of its sponsor institution and appropriate to the science and practice of psychology. The program's education and training model and its curriculum plan are consistent with this philosophy.

The program espouses a scientist-practitioner model that is presented well and elaborated effectively. The program has clearly outlined objectives and associated competencies, and has identified courses and experiences related to these objectives and competencies. The program does a commendable job of integrating coursework with practicum experience beginning in the first year of training.

The program has several alternatives in place that are meant to provide the means whereby all students can acquire and demonstrate substantial understanding of and competence in cognitive and affective aspects of behavior consistent with Domain B.3(a) of the *Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation* (G&P). The program is asked to clarify how the course sequence alternatives of 1) PRE 805 (Individual Intelligence Testing), PRE 860 (Assessment of Behavior Problems and Personality), and PRE 705 (Human Development Through the Life Span); 2) PRE 702 (Advanced Educational Psychology: The Development and Education of the Child) and PRE 704 (Advanced Educational Psychology: Learning Processes in Education); or, 3) PRE 807 (Theory and Research in Human Learning) meet the broad and general requirement for cognitive/affective bases of behavior. Although all three of these alternatives provide some coverage of cognitive and affective bases of behavior, the primary purpose and content of several of the courses (PRE 805, PRE 860) is assessment, while the content of another (PRE 702) appears to deal primarily with development and education. The final two courses (PRE 704 and PRE 807) address learning and cognition but contain relatively little content on affective aspects of behavior. In the professional judgment of the Commission, neither cognitive nor affective aspects of behavior are adequately covered, with affective aspects of behavior containing the least coverage. In a narrative response due by **September 1, 2009**, the program is asked to clarify how all of the alternatives presented provide the means for students to acquire competence in both cognitive and affective aspects of behavior. The program is asked to provide the most current version of any syllabi mentioned in their response.

The program states that the course PSYC 961 (Biological Foundations of Psychopathology) meets the broad and general requirement for biological bases of behavior as required by Domain B.3(a) of the G&P. Examination of the syllabus reveals that biological bases are addressed primarily in the context of pathology and may not deal with the broad biology of human
behavior. The program is asked, in a narrative response due by September 1, 2009, to clearly demonstrate how this course provides broad and general coverage in biological aspects of behavior consistent with Domain B.3(a) and Implementing Regulation C-16 (attached).

The program has identified minimum levels of achievement as course grades or practicum/internship ratings on a non-behavioral anchored 5-point Likert-type scale. Course grades as minimum levels of achievement may not be an optimal measure because competencies may extend over several courses and many courses cover more than one competency, rendering interpretation of competency evaluations difficult. In its next self-study, the program is asked to identify minimum levels of achievement more closely related to program goals and objectives in terms of measurable competencies. The program is asked to consider additional types of behavioral measures aside from course grades that would further demonstrate student achievement of program goals, objectives and competencies.

**Domain C: Program Resources**

*The program demonstrates that it has resources of appropriate quality and sufficiency to achieve its education and training goals.*

Program faculty and students are very well-suited by orientation and experiences to the program model and characteristics. Support for faculty and students is generally excellent. The small core faculty work together effectively and are available to advise and consult with students. The students appear to be committed to and enthusiastic about the program. The program maintains excellent resources in support of students, including practicum sites.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

**Domain D: Cultural and Individual Differences and Diversity**

*The program recognizes the importance of cultural and individual differences and diversity in the training of psychologists.*

The program and its supporting organization have stressed recruitment of diverse faculty and students and establishment of a nurturing and supportive environment. Diversity is emphasized throughout the curriculum and is a major component of the program’s mission. The program is encouraged to continue and modify its efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty and students in order to increase success in this area.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

**Domain E: Student-Faculty Relations**

*The program demonstrates that its education, training, and socialization experiences are characterized by mutual respect and courtesy between students and faculty and that it operates in a manner that facilitates students’ educational experiences.*
Faculty-student relations is a strength of the program. Student input is solicited, valued, and integrated into program functioning and decision-making. Annual reviews are comprehensive, systematic, and informative. Students are informed effectively of expected performance and procedures to follow in the event of unresolved issues.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.

**Domain F: Program Self-Assessment and Quality Enhancement**

The program demonstrates a commitment to excellence through self-study, which assures that its goals and objectives are met, enhances the quality of professional education and training obtained by its students, and contributes to the fulfillment of its sponsor institution's mission.

The program regularly engages in self-assessment involving program core faculty, students and school representatives to review data on student progress and program evaluation data.

1) The program, with appropriate involvement from its students, engages in regular, ongoing self-studies that address:

   (a) Its effectiveness in achieving program goals and objectives in terms of outcome data (i.e., while students are in the program and after completion);

The program has outcome data, but shows little evidence that it is using these data for quality review and program enhancement, as needed. For example, data show that there have been negative results in recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and students, but there have been no documented changes in the program’s efforts to address this negative outcome. In a narrative response due by **September 1, 2009**, the program is asked to examine its outcome data and describe how the program engages in regular, ongoing self-assessment that addresses the program’s procedures to maintain current achievements or make program changes as necessary, consistent with Domain F.1(c) of the G&P.

The program's stated time to completion is a minimum of 5 years of full-time graduate study (narrative self-study, p. 3), yet according to the information provided on the program’s website, it appears that students on average take 8.23 years to complete the program. The program is asked, given the data they have collected, how the program is using these data to make programmatic changes to facilitate timely completion of the program, consistent with F.1(c) of the G&P. The program is also asked to clarify how the program is organized in a manner that allows timely completion. In a narrative response due by **September 1, 2009**, the program is asked to discuss how the program is organized to facilitate timely completion, and, given the data obtained on time to program completion, the program is asked to discuss what programmatic changes have been made in order to decrease the time it takes a student to complete the program.
Domain G: Public Disclosure

The program demonstrates its commitment to public disclosure by providing written materials and other communications that appropriately represent it to the relevant publics.

The program demonstrates its commitment to public disclosure by providing written materials to the public.

The program provides information on licensure as a school psychologist in addition to information on professional psychology licensure information that is required by Implementing Regulation C-20. This information may be confusing as both the school psychology license and professional psychology license are referred to as “licensure.” A prospective student may not know the difference between a licensed psychologist and a Kansas state licensed school psychologist who can practice in the school system. The program is asked, in a narrative response due by September 1, 2009, to demonstrate that it has more clearly differentiated between the types of licensure it is reporting in the public information available to prospective students.

In addition, in reviewing the program’s public disclosure data (provided within the student handbook, linked from the program’s website), some of the information is confusing, particularly regarding the time to completion data. One table represents information on students from the years 2001-2008, and another table represents a smaller subgroup of students “who entered the program in 2000 or later” (student handbook, p. 24). This second group is referred to as a “subgroup” and appears to be information on students who were enrolled full-time in the program. However, these data, in opposition to the first table (p.23 of the handbook), create confusion when trying to ascertain how long it will take a student to complete the program. Further, it appears that the program did not provide the attrition data for the past 7 years in the tabular format required by IR C-20 (attached). Lastly, the data are presented within the student handbook and the location of these data was not clearly indicated on the website. The program is asked, in a narrative response due by September 1, 2009, to update the public disclosure information to be consistent with IR C-20, to ensure that the time to completion data is clearly described and presented, to provide attrition data in the required format, and to ensure that the data is easily located and accessible to a prospective student to allow for program comparison.

Domain H: Relationship with Accrediting Body

The program demonstrates its commitment to the accreditation process by fulfilling its responsibilities to the accrediting body from which its accredited status is granted.

The program demonstrates its commitment to the accreditation process and appears to fulfill its responsibilities to the accrediting body.

The program is consistent with the provisions of this domain.
In order to keep the Commission informed of the program’s commitment to the ongoing self-
study process, the program is asked to address the following issues in a narrative response by
September 1, 2009:

- Differentiate between the types of licensure the program is reporting (e.g. school
  psychology licensure and professional psychology licensure) and more clearly explain the
  difference between the two so a prospective student can make an informed decision.

- Update the public disclosure information to be consistent with IR C-20, ensure that the
time to completion data is clearly described and presented, provide attrition data in the
required format, and ensure that the data is easily located and accessible to a prospective
student to allow for program comparison.

The program is asked to address the following issues in a narrative response by September 1,
2009 for formal review by the Commission:

- Clarify how all of the course alternatives presented provide the means for students to
  acquire competence in cognitive and affective aspects of behavior. The program is asked
to provide the most current version of any syllabi mentioned in their response.

- Clearly demonstrate how PSYC 961 (Biological Foundations of Psychopathology) provides
broad and general coverage in biological aspects of behavior consistent with Domain B.3(a)
and Implementing Regulation C-16.

- Examine program outcome data and describe how the program engages in regular,
ongoing self-assessment that addresses the program’s procedures to maintain current
achievements or make program changes as necessary consistent with Domain F.1(c) of the
G&P.

- Discuss how the program is organized to facilitate timely completion, and, given the data
obtained on time to program completion, discuss what programmatic changes have been
made in order to decrease the time it takes a student to complete the program.

Please note that while these annual report items are considered an addendum to the data provided
in the Annual Report Online (ARO), they are not to be submitted online. Narrative responses to
the items listed above should be identified as ‘Narrative Response – Program Review’ and
mailed or faxed to the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation by the designated due
date(s).

In closing, on behalf of the Commission on Accreditation, I extend congratulations to faculty and
students of the professional psychology program for their achievements. The Commission also
expresses its appreciation for your personal commitment, and the corresponding support of your administration, to develop and maintain the best possible quality of graduate education and training in psychology. If the Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation may be of service at any time on administrative matters of accreditation, please call upon us.

Sincerely,

Susan F. Zlotlow, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation

cc: Richard Lariviere, Ph.D., Provost, Exec. Vice Chancellor
Lori Reesor, Ph.D., Associate Vice Provost for Student Success
Rick Ginsberg, Ph.D., Dean
Karen Multon, Ph.D., Chair
Patricia Lowe, Ph.D., Director of School Psychology Program
Carlen Henington, Ph.D., Chair of Site Visit Team
John Brantley, Ph.D., Member of Site Visit Team
Gary Burger, Ph.D., Member of Site Visit Team
C-16. Evaluating Program Adherence to the Principle of “Broad and General Preparation” for Doctoral Programs

(Commission on Accreditation, November 2001)

The Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation of Programs in Professional Psychology (G&P) stipulate, in section II, B., 1., that preparation at the doctoral level should be broad and general. According to the G&P, “this preparation should be based on the existing and evolving body of knowledge, skills, and competencies that define the declared substantive practice area(s) and should be well integrated with the broad theoretical and scientific foundations of the discipline and field of psychology in general.”

The Commission on Accreditation evaluates a program’s adherence to this provision in the context of the G&P Domain B, Section 3 (reprinted, in part, below), using the following guidelines.

(From the G&P: Domain B, 3. for DOCTORAL programs):

In achieving its objectives, the program has and implements a clear and coherent curriculum plan that provides the means whereby all students can acquire and demonstrate substantial understanding of and competence in the following areas:

(a) The breadth of scientific psychology, its history of thought and development, its research methods, and its applications. To achieve this end, the students shall be exposed to the current body of knowledge in at least the following areas: biological aspects of behavior; cognitive and affective aspects of behavior; social aspects of behavior; history and systems of psychology; psychological measurement; research methodology; and techniques of data analysis;

Accredited programs ensure the competence in these content areas including the history of thought and development in those fields, the research methods, and the applications of the research. Demonstrating that the program is consistent with the G&P in this regard would preclude coverage only of ...

... a narrow segment of the aspect of the content area (such as biological basis of gerontology, race relations, preschool learning)

... the application of these aspects of the content area to practice problems or settings (such as cognitive therapy; group therapy, multicultural counseling)

Further, it is expected that the program will ensure understanding and competence in these content areas at the graduate level.

It is recognized that there are a variety of ways in which programs achieve this component of their program requirements, and that there are multiple points in the curriculum sequence at which these experiences may be placed.

If the program chooses to supply courses directed to these areas within its own curricular offerings, then it must ensure that they are taught at the graduate level, by individuals who, by education, training and/or experience, are qualified to teach in the given area at the graduate level.

(Continuing from the G&P: Domain B, 3. for DOCTORAL programs):
(b) The scientific, methodological, and theoretical foundations of practice in the substantive area(s) of professional psychology in which the program has its training emphasis. To achieve this end, the students shall be exposed to the current body of knowledge in at least the following areas: individual differences in behavior; human development; dysfunctional behavior or psychopathology; and professional standards and ethics;

(c) Diagnosing or defining problems through psychological assessment and measurement and formulating and implementing intervention strategies (including training in empirically supported procedures). To achieve this end, the students shall be exposed to the current body of knowledge in at least the following areas: theories and methods of assessment and diagnosis; effective intervention; consultation and supervision; and evaluating the efficacy of interventions;

With regard to the scientific, methodological, and theoretical foundations of practice in the substantive area of psychology in which the program has its training emphasis, and to the coverage of assessment and intervention, the question of breadth of exposure has been interpreted by the Commission in the context of (a) the particular substantive area in question and (b) the particular model and goals of the program. That is, a program is considered not only as based on its own particular training model and goals, but also in the context of the broader domain of doctoral training in the substantive area(s) (e.g., clinical, counseling, or school psychology, or combinations thereof). Thus, the Commission would look for reasonable coverage in the breadth of the substantive area(s), as well as the breadth needed to provide quality training toward the program's specific goals. It is expected that the program will ensure that understanding of and competence in these areas is demonstrated at the graduate level.
C-20. Disclosure of Education/Training Outcomes and Information Allowing for Informed Decision-Making to Prospective Doctoral Students
(Commission on Accreditation, May 2006; revised November 2006; July 2007)

EFFECTIVE January 1, 2007

Domain G of the Guidelines and Principles for Accreditation of Programs in Professional Psychology (G&P) requires that doctoral graduate programs provide potential students, current students and the public with accurate information on the program and with program expectations. This information is meant to describe the program accurately and completely, include education and training outcomes, and be presented in a manner that allows applicants to make informed decisions about entering the program.

As stated above, the information requested should include education and training outcomes as well as information that will allow applicants to make informed and comparative decisions. The Commission believes that all doctoral programs should therefore minimally provide the following information regarding education and training outcomes and accurate program descriptions as of January 1, 2007 to potential students in its public documents including its website, if it has one: time to program completion; costs (tuition and fees); internship acceptance rates; fellowships and other funding available; student attrition rates; and licensure outcomes. These are further defined below:

1. Time to Completion

In their public materials, programs should provide the mean and the median number of years that students have taken to complete the program from the time of program entrance. These data should be provided for all graduates over the past seven years. Where applicable, these measures should be provided separately for students who began the program as bachelor level graduates and those who began with advanced standing (e.g., after having completed a separate master's program in psychology). The program should also provide the percentage of students completing the program in fewer than five years, five years, six years, seven years, and more than seven years.

2. Program Costs

Programs are expected to make available the costs (i.e., tuition and fees) per student for the current first year cohort. This information should include full time student tuition, tuition per credit hour for part time students, and any fees assessed to students beyond tuition costs. Programs may also provide information regarding current adjustments to tuition including, but not limited to: financial aid, grants, loans, tuition remission, assistantships, and fellowships.

3. Internships

Programs are expected to provide data for at least the most recent seven years of graduates showing their success in obtaining internships. These data should show the number and percentage of students in the following categories:
- Those who obtained internships
- Those who obtained paid internships
- Those who obtained APPIC member internships
- Those who obtained APA/CPA accredited internships
- Those who obtained internships conforming to CDSP guidelines (school psychology only)
- Those who obtained two year half-time internships
NOTE: In calculating the percentages, the program must use the total number of students applying for internship that year.

4. Attrition

Programs are expected to report the number and percentage of students who have failed to complete the program once enrolled. These data should be calculated for each entering cohort by dividing the number of students in that cohort who have left the program for any reason by the total number of students initially enrolled in that same cohort. These data should be provided by cohort for all students who have left the program in the last seven years or for all students who have left since the program became initially accredited, whichever time period is shorter.

The format below is required as of January 1, 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of enrollment</th>
<th># Enrolled</th>
<th># Graduated with doctorate</th>
<th># Still currently enrolled</th>
<th># No longer enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Licensure

Reporting of program licensure data is an expectation of the US Secretary of Education’s National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for program accreditors, including the APA Commission on Accreditation. Programs are expected to report the number and percentage of program graduates who have become licensed psychologists within the preceding decade. This percentage should be calculated by dividing the number of students who have both graduated and become licensed psychologists within the 8 years spanning the period of 2-10 years post-graduation by the number of doctoral degrees awarded by the program over that same period. That is, the figures reported by a program for 2007 would be number of students who graduated from the program during the period 1997-2005 and who have achieved licensure divided by the number of students graduating from the program during that same 8-year period. Program licensure rates are to be updated at least every three years. Programs may interpret their licensure rate in light of their training model and program goals and objectives.

1 Consistent with institutional definition and policy