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August 3, 2013

It is a great honor to provide this nomination of Dr. Michael Bahr for the Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Teaching. Mike joined the faculty in the Department of Educational Psychology, Research and Evaluation in 2005, and as will be demonstrated via this nomination letter and supporting documents, he immediately established himself as a master teacher, valued mentor, trusted colleague, and respected community leader among our fellow school psychologists. To understand what makes Mike such a special teacher, one needs to look no further than to his character. Specifically, Mike’s deep respect and genuine interest in the welfare of all people truly permeate all aspects of his life. His personal and professional values are perfectly aligned and guided by his high moral and ethical standards. Mike not only practices what he preaches, he lives it. I have never worked with a more patient and selfless colleague who so readily gives of himself. At the first sign of need, Mike’s immediate reply is not IF he can help, but what CAN he do to help. Add in an unwavering commitment to excellence, and these qualities engage and elevate everyone with whom he comes into contact.

Over the last eight years I have observed in Mike’s classes on numerous occasions, and we have co-presented multiple times. In all cases Mike routinely begins with an overview of the agenda and learning objectives to frame the lesson as he casually welcomes everyone and invites questions. From there he uses slides, handouts, and frequent guest speakers from the community to highlight and expand upon key concepts from assigned readings and to ensure everyone is operating from a common knowledge base. He purposely limits the content and number of slides to a minimum, sometimes with fill-in-the-blanks, to encourage active participation and discussion regarding theoretical concepts and knowledge-based content. As with any applied specialty in psychology, school psychology involves considerable skill development as well. This is an area where Mike excels, as he uses various combinations of modeling, small group activities, and simulations to show, provide opportunities for practice, and give feedback, both individually and for the group, to ensure acquisition of skills.

What may not be readily apparent to a casual observer in any of Mike’s classes is the incredible impact that course organization and design have on each class. By including weekly quizzes over assigned readings that are completed and graded prior to class, a hallmark feature of all of Mike’s classes, every person in attendance has sufficient prerequisite knowledge to contribute to and learn from class discussions and activities. Academic engagement is critical to learning, and Mike is a master facilitator. His soft-spoken and conversational style complements his personal values to create a safe environment that encourages student participation and questions. The following quote from a student letter not included with the nomination is representative of how students view Mike’s teaching: “His class was much more of a discussion than lecture, but bountiful learning. We all felt like important
class members, and everything we had to say was also important. The environment was a safe place to share and change opinions.” What a perfect example of how natural and effective Mike is as a teacher.

As described in the Philosophy of Teaching and Learning (pp. 26-28), Mike’s syllabi provide clearly articulated student learning objectives that are linked directly to program goals and assessed via detailed rubrics (pp. 32-52). By providing students with the rubrics well in advance of each assignment’s due date, students have a clear understanding of his expectations for any given assignment and plenty of time to seek help as needed. In addition to weekly quizzes, a quick review of Mike’s sample syllabi reveals the use of a variety of assessments in all classes that include research papers, presentations, case study reports, and participation. Not only do students benefit from the detailed feedback they receive about their performance in the class, but these assessments provide important course- and program-level assessment data that are used to make data-based decisions regarding revisions to a given assignment, course, or program curriculum (for examples see pp. 73-77).

The Department’s Course Evaluation Form (p. 53) uses a five-point scale from 1.0 (Very Low) to 5.0 (Very High). Mike’s Mean General Rating of Instructor and General Mean Rating (all items except textbook) are presented graphically (pp. 57-58), and complete course evaluation data are provided as well (59-72). These data provide compelling evidence of Mike’s sustained teaching excellence, as without exception his course evaluation ratings exceed departmental means with average ratings across all items falling in the range of 3.86-5.0 and the overwhelming majority at 4.6 and above. In fact, across all of the classes Mike has taught at least two times, his overall General Rating of Instructor mean is 4.87 (4.23 for the department) with a range of 4.43-5.00, and his overall General Mean Rating is 4.81 (4.23 for the department) with a range of 4.45-4.95. What lofty and consistent ratings!

Further reflecting Mike’s organizational skills and commitment to continuous improvement, he literally handed over a travel bag full of student comments using his own Qualitative Feedback Form (pp. 54-56). The comments were provided for every class he has taught, each in clearly marked file folders that were grouped by course and arranged chronologically. In contrast to the vague and rarely informative responses elicited by generic open-ended requests for comments, Mike’s form provides highly specific and detailed information regarding self-assessments of competence in course topics, student perceptions of the classroom climate, as well as solicits input on course organization, assignments, and potential course revisions. After, “Wow,” the next thought that came to mind was how well this one assessment reflects Mike’s values regarding student input and the relentless pursuit of perfection.

The overwhelming majority of student comments on the Qualitative Feedback Forms across all courses mentioned what a fantastic and organized teacher Mike is, how much they had learned and enjoyed his class discussions and activities, and how they felt respected and valued. These same comments appeared repeatedly in the letters received in support of this nomination. Amazingly, nearly 30% (26 of 87) of all students who have come through the UMSL School Psychology Program in the last eight years were represented in the letters received. The four student letters included with this nomination were written by a former doctoral advisee and three school psychology students from three different cohorts (pp. 79-86). These letters were selected because collectively, they capture the sentiments of all the letters received. In addition to echoing the above comments, Mike’s students expressed a deep appreciation for the profound impact he has had on their lives, both as professional school psychologists and as individuals. He motivates students to learn by believing in their ability to learn and challenging them to continue to improve in all that they do. This far reaching effect on so many students is the mark of a truly special teacher.
Up to this point the majority of this letter has highlighted Mike’s personal qualities and his work in the classroom, but before concluding it is necessary to acknowledge his expertise in course- and program-level design and assessment. It is one thing to be a great teacher in the classroom, and it is awesome when a teacher influences students’ lives outside of the classroom the way he does; however, as described in Dean Basile’s letter (p. 87), Mike’s teaching excellence has had a profound impact at the program and college level as well. As a faculty member of the School Psychology Program he helped the UMSL School Psychology Program become Missouri’s only National Association of School Psychologists-Approved training program, and as Director of Accreditation and Program Enhancement for the College of Education he led the recently completed and successful reaccreditation application via the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Along the way, he has consulted with programs and colleagues across the college and shared his knowledge and expertise. In other words, Mike’s expertise has helped others achieve teaching and program excellence.

Over the years as much as Mike and I have learned together about assessment of candidate and student learning outcomes, I have learned even more from him about course design and continuous program improvement. His leadership during the developmental stages of our School Psychology Program Unit Assessment System (UAS) was crucial. The UAS is a comprehensive database containing candidate information, curriculum mapping, and spreadsheets where course- and program-level level assessment data are managed (see p. 77). Thanks in large part to the School Psychology Program’s comprehensive assessment plan and regular use of data to identify needed course and curricular revisions, our NASP-Approval recently received a rare three-year extension until 2016.

Finally, as reflected in the letters of support, in addition to the many doctoral students who have been mentored over the years, Mike maintains an active research agenda in the areas of multicultural diversity, problem-solving consultation, and academic and behavior interventions. He values collaboration and routinely includes colleagues and students in his research. Mike has developed collaborative partnerships with community agencies, including The Special School District of St. Louis County (see letter of support on p. 89) and Pershing Elementary in the University City School District, where combinations of research, professional development workshops, and increased opportunities for school-based experience have occurred. Suffice to say, Mike’s research and service to the university and community are enhanced by his outstanding skills as a teacher.

As has been demonstrated throughout this nomination letter, Mike and his work exemplify the Campus Vision, Mission, and Values of the UMSL Strategic Plan in a multitude of ways. He clearly is a man of high integrity who respects, teaches, and conducts research in the area of diversity. His teaching is not only exemplary, but it transcends the classroom and promotes excellence for students, colleagues, programs, colleges, and the broader community. On behalf of the Department of Educational Psychology, Research and Evaluation, Mike’s current and former students, and our many community partners, it is an honor to nominate Mike for this prestigious award.

Donald A. Gouwens, Psy. D.
Associate Clinical Professor
Chair, Educational Psychology, Research and Evaluation
School Psychology Program Coordinator
Philosophy of Teaching and Learning

Michael W. Bahr, PhD

I begin this statement with some basic values and beliefs I hold about teaching and learning. This is followed by the foundations of my instructional practice: theory, engagement, cultural competence, and initiatives related to assessment.

Some Basic Values and Beliefs

In the College of Education, we refer to students as candidates. I value instructor accessibility, so I provide my contact information, including my personal cell phone number, and encourage candidates to contact me if they have questions or problems. Because organization and structure benefit all learners, I construct well-developed syllabi, provide explicit requirements for each class session, and use a daily agenda prior to beginning a class session to establish expectations. Because I believe all candidates can learn, I am always willing to adapt and modify instruction to accommodate the learning needs of candidates. This obviously includes accommodations for candidates with disabilities, but also it involves smaller modifications based on candidate suggestions, which come from in-class feedback or mid-semester evaluations. Lastly, I learn the name of each candidate (even in large classes) to convey personal interest in their success in my course.

Theory of Teaching and Learning

As a psychologist, I work primarily from a social-cognitive theoretical perspective. This approach privileges the role of cognition, behavior, and environment in learning. My specialty area is school psychology, and working with struggling young learners throughout my career, I know firsthand how complex learning is. Social cognitive theory allows me to help learners by understanding how and what learners think (cognition), by comprehending how and why learners act (behavior), and by realizing how a setting (environment) influences learning. Cognition, behavior, and environment influence each other reciprocally, and these concepts are applicable to the university classroom.

Here’s one example starting with environment. For each course I teach, I have an explicit goal of trying to create a safe, intellectual climate where opinions, debate, and disagreements can be shared in constructive ways that enhance knowledge. This is critical because the learning environment promotes how learners think (cognition); concurrently, the learners influence the environment by how they act and what they say (behavior). I prize civility in the classroom, because how an instructor and candidates
interact influences how and what we learn. Modeling is a core feature of social-cognitive theory; thus, as a psychologist who is preparing future professionals, I strive for my own classroom behavior to reflect respectful, professional conduct, and I monitor my language so that it’s appropriate and inclusive.

**Engagement**

One of the most stable predictors of academic achievement is engagement (Gettinger & Ball, 2008). I believe candidates need to be actively engaged—whether they’re talking or carefully listening to the comments of others—because of engagement’s impact on academic success. So, how do I attempt to promote engagement? For every course I teach, I reserve 10% of the course grade for attendance and participation. Candidates earn credit for attending class, but not by me judging the quality of their participation. Why? I always tell candidates that if they come to class, I can get them talking…even if they’re shy and prefer not to speak in a large group. This is because I use a variety of discussion and cooperative learning strategies (e.g., partner dyads, small/large group discussion, role-playing with debriefing) that hopefully match the candidates’ varying comfort levels. I structure my classes by planning discussion and not too much lecture for the purpose of creating an engaging learning environment.

**Cultural Competence**

One of my research areas is promoting culturally-competent practices by psychologists, counselors, and educators. I believe research should inform instruction, and toward that end, all my courses address cultural competence in some way. For example, in Professional Issues in School Psychology (ED PSY 6550), a specific component on identity development allows candidates to explore their cultural heritage, beliefs, values, and behaviors, and this is followed by course modules on topics such as race and affectional (sexual) orientation. In Consultation in Schools and Related Settings (ED PSY 6545), candidates from special education and school psychology complete a multicultural school consultation case study. Lastly, I supplement the standard departmental course evaluations with a separate evaluation using several open-ended questions, which allow candidates to comment on the extent to which I was sensitive to cultural and human differences.

**Initiatives for Assessing Teaching and Learning**

I’ve been involved in a number of initiatives associated with the assessment of teaching and learning. I mention some of these here and direct readers to appended samples of assessment products.
Rubrics. I use grading rubrics extensively in my courses. Rubrics are initially instructive because candidates receive them at the beginning of each course and are encouraged to use them for their projects. When I evaluate the projects, I am looking at the same criteria candidates do. In addition to individual feedback via a rubric, data may be aggregated by group, which provides a unique type of feedback for a class (please see Candidate Outcomes I and II in Supporting Evidence).

Student learning outcomes. In psychology and education, there is an emphasis on development of student learning outcomes. “Student” refers to public school students with whom our candidates work. When my UMSL candidates develop and implement intervention plans for students, intervention effectiveness is evaluated by analysis of student performance data (please see Student Learning Outcomes in Supporting Evidence).

Continuous improvement, program-level assessment. I regularly aggregate data across cohorts of candidates in the UMSL School Psychology Program. This information is then used for program evaluation purposes. In 2009, our program applied for accreditation from the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and was fully accredited in large part due to our comprehensive program evaluation process, which is predicated on continually using aggregate candidate data to identify the strength and weaknesses in our program. After receiving accreditation, NASP requested our permission to use three of our six program assessments as exemplars for other programs seeking accreditation. The data come primarily from course assessments on candidates; thus, good classroom assessment practices contribute to candidate evaluation as well as program evaluation (please see Program Level Data in Supporting Evidence).

Related Activities

I recently completed a 5-year appointment as Director of Accreditation and Program Enhancement for the College of Education, and in this role, I regularly presented to and consulted with small and large groups of faculty about our College assessment system and need for continuous improvement. In April 2013, the College was fully re-accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Lastly, I disseminate information about innovations in assessing teaching and learning by regularly presenting at annual conferences of professional organizations (please see Selected Presentations and Publications in Supporting Evidence).
Michael W. Bahr, PhD
Department of Educational Psychology, Research and Evaluation
List of Courses Taught by Semester

Fall 2005
ED PSY 6532 Psychoeducational Differences in Childhood
ED PSY 6545 Consultation in Schools and Related Settings

Spring 2006
ED PSY 6540 Psychoeducational Interventions
ED PSY 6550 Professional Issues in School Psychology

Summer 2006
ED PSY 6532 Psychoeducational Differences in Childhood

Fall 2006
ED PSY 6532 Psychoeducational Differences in Childhood
ED PSY 6540 Psychoeducational Interventions
ED PSY 6545 Consultation in Schools and Related Settings

Spring 2007
ED PSY 3312 Psychology of Teaching and Learning
ED PSY 6542 Psychotherapeutic Interventions in School Psychology
ED PSY 6550 Professional Issues in School Psychology

Summer 2007
ED PSY 6532 Psychoeducational Differences in Childhood

Fall 2007
ED PSY 6532 Psychoeducational Differences in Childhood
ED PSY 6540 Psychoeducational Interventions
ED PSY 6545 Consultation in Schools and Related Settings

Spring 2008
ED PSY 6542 Psychotherapeutic Interventions in School Psychology
ED PSY 6550 Professional Issues in School Psychology
ED PSY 6497 Problems in Educational Psychology

Summer 2008
ED PSY 6532 Psychoeducational Differences in Childhood

Fall 2008
ED PSY 6545 Consultation in Schools and Related Settings
ED PSY 6990 School Psychology Internship I
Spring 2009
ED PSY 6550 Professional Issues in School Psychology
ED PSY 6591 School Psychology Practicum II
ED PSY 6497 Problems in Educational Psychology
ED PSY 6991 School Psychology Internship II

Summer 2009
ED PSY 6532 Psychoeducational Differences in Childhood
ED PSY 6497 Problems in Educational Psychology

Fall 2009
ED PSY 6540 Psychoeducational Interventions
ED PSY 6545 Consultation in Schools and Related Settings
EDUC 7999 Dissertation Research

Spring 2010
ED PSY 6550 Professional Issues in School Psychology
ED PSY 6591 School Psychology Practicum II
EDUC 7882 Research Internship
EDUC 7999 Dissertation Research

Summer 2010
ED PSY 6532 Psychoeducational Differences in Childhood
EDUC 7999 Dissertation Research

Fall 2010
ED PSY 6540 Psychoeducational Interventions
ED PSY 6545 Consultation in Schools and Related Settings
EDUC 7999 Dissertation Research

Spring 2011
ED PSY 6550 Professional Issues in School Psychology
EDUC 7999 Dissertation Research

Summer 2011
ED PSY 6532 Psychoeducational Differences in Childhood

Fall 2011
ED PSY 6540 Psychoeducational Interventions
ED PSY 6545 Consultation in Schools and Related Settings
EDUC 7999 Dissertation Research

Spring 2012 (Note: Taught only one this semester due to writing accreditation self-study)
ED PSY 6550 Professional Issues in School Psychology
Fall 2012 (Note: Taught only one course this semester due to national accreditation visit)
ED PSY 6540 Psychoeducational Interventions

Spring 2013
ED PSY 6550 Professional Issues in School Psychology
ED REM 6710 Educational Research Methods and Design
ED PSY 6545 Consultation in Schools and Related Settings  
Division of Educational Psychology, Research, and Evaluation

Instructor:

Michael W. Bahr, Ph.D.  
Certified School Psychologist  
461 Marillac Hall  
Phone: 314/516-4739 (office); 812/243-0849 (cell)  
Email: bahrm@umsl.edu  
Office hours: Wednesdays, 2-4 pm, or by appointment

Course Description:

Prerequisite: Admission to the School Psychology or Special Education Program, or consent of instructor. Examines the theories, research, and legal/ethical issues related to consultation in schools and related settings. Emphasis on understanding the process of consultation using a problem-solving approach. Includes instruction in interviewing, observation, and development and evaluation of interventions.

Learner Outcomes:

- Candidates will gain knowledge of theory and practice of consultation and how consultation may be applied to enhance outcomes in education and other organizations, such as clinics and mental health settings.
- Candidates will gain knowledge of problem-solving consultation.
- Candidates will develop skills in consultation that enable linking assessment to intervention.
- Candidates will understand multicultural school consultation, thereby increasing knowledge and skills that promote culturally-sensitive practice with diverse individuals and families.
- Candidates will learn about the basic research designs most frequently used in school consultation.
- Candidates will learn about school-based interviews and begin to develop skills associated with effective interviewing.
- Candidates will acquire skills in identifying problems and in using data-collection techniques to assess them.
- Candidates will gain knowledge and acquire skills for assessing the function of a behavior and, using this information, developing appropriate interventions.
- Candidates will increase their knowledge of school-, clinic-, or home-based interventions that are appropriate with the focus of their consultation work.
- Candidates will learn how to collaborate effectively with other professionals and with families.
- Candidates will extend their knowledge of ethical principles and their application to consultation.
- Candidates will extend their knowledge of state and federal laws, regulations and administrative rules that impact the consultation.
**NASP Standards Addressed in ED PSY 6545:**

2.1 Data-Based Decision-Making and Accountability  
2.2 Consultation and Collaboration  
2.3 Effective Instruction and Development of Cognitive/Academic Skills  
2.5 Student Diversity in Development and Learning  
2.6 School and Systems Organization, Policy Development, and Climate  
2.7 Prevention, Crisis Intervention, and Mental Health  
2.8 Home/School/Community Collaboration

**Materials Required and Recommended:**

**Required:**


**Recommended:**


**Semester Schedule of Topics:**

The last three pages (pp. 6-8) of this syllabus contain the course schedule, specifically, the list of course topics, readings, and requirements.

**Instructional Strategies:**

Instructional formats for class meetings will include: didactic/lecture, large group discussion, small group discussion, role play, and field experiences.

Technology will support course learning via use of MyGateway. The instructor will place instructional materials for weekly topics on the MyGateway course site. These will be available by 6 pm the day before each class meeting. The instructor and candidates will use several communication features (e.g., announcements, email) in MyGateway. Finally, candidates may check their progress in ED PSY 6545 by accessing grades/course points in the MyGateway course site.
**Course Requirements:**

Requirement 1: Quizzes

A substantial portion of this course addresses knowledge-based information. In order to ensure candidate learning, quizzes are given throughout the semester. Quizzes are designed to be brief (i.e., 20 minutes) and cover material from the previous week(s) as well as the assigned readings for the current class. There are seven (7) scheduled quizzes, and each quiz is worth 5 class points and counts toward the course grade. Quizzes are administered through the MyGateway course website, and these must be completed by Sunday evening at 11 pm on the date they are due (see schedule on pp. 6-8). (Quizzes assess NASP Standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 2.7, 2.8.)

Requirement 2: Multicultural School Consultation Case Study

On September 13, the class topic will be multicultural school consultation. The readings and discussion for this class will introduce a model of multicultural school consultation and, more specifically, focus on the diverse characteristics of consultees and clients to which consultants must attend. At the conclusion of that class period, candidates will receive a consultation case study. Candidates must conduct an individual analysis of the case study—this is not a group project—and produce a written product, which will be approximately 2-3 pages in length, typewritten, and double-spaced. More information will be given when the case study is posted on the course website and discussed in class. The purpose of this assignment is to assist candidates in developing knowledge of multicultural school consultation that will enhance the development of culturally-competent professionals. See the schedule of topics on pp. 6-8 for the due date of this requirement. (This assignment assesses the following NASP Standards: 2.2, 2.5.)

Requirement 3: Classroom Observations

Each candidate must conduct five (5) classroom observations, and each observation must be at least 20 minutes in length. One of each of the following classroom observation techniques must be conducted: frequency recording, duration recording, whole interval recording, partial interval recording, and momentary time sampling. Candidates must submit their observational protocol, which includes the observation data and a summary, for each of the five observations. Candidates should submit each observational protocol when it is completed. If an observation is conducted incorrectly or inaccurately, it must be completed again and may not receive full credit. See the schedule of topics on pp. 6-8 for the due date of this requirement. (Observations assess NASP Standards 2.1 and 2.3.)

Requirement 4: Functional Behavioral Assessment

Each candidate is required to conduct a functional behavioral assessment (FBA) with a teacher. This assignment requires completion of one indirect FBA (e.g., teacher interview) and an FBA report. Copies of the indirect FBA must be submitted with the FBA report. See the schedule of topics on pp. 6-8 for the due date of this requirement. (The FBA requirement assesses NASP Standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4.)

Requirement 5: 6545 Log

This course requires candidates to conduct a series of school-based activities (observations, FBA-related activities). To ensure accountability of these field-based experiences, candidates must complete a 6545 Log that documents their school-based work throughout the semester. The 6545 Log is available on-line for candidates to download. See the schedule of topics on pp. 6-8 for the due date of this requirement.

Requirement 6: Class Attendance/Participation

Candidates are expected to attend and participate in class sessions. Candidates may miss one class without an impact on their grade. Thereafter, candidates will lose 2 points (up to a total of 10) for every class missed.
Evaluation Criteria and Grading:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 1: Quizzes (7 quizzes x 5 points)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 2: Multicultural Case Study</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 3: Classroom Observations</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 4: FBA</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 5: 6545 Log</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 6: Attendance</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points Possible: 100 points

Grade Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 - 95</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 - 92</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 - 88</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 - 81</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 77</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 - 70</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 70</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Competence:

Since this is a core course in the School Psychology Program, candidates are expected to abide by the Principles for Professional Ethics of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). Section II of the NASP Ethics pertains to Professional Competence. Competence assumes that psychologists recognize the strengths and limitations of their training and experience, and this also involves refraining from any activity in which personal problems or conflicts may interfere with professional effectiveness. Competence assumes that psychologists will act with integrity, a standard for all members of ED PSY 6545 class.

This course may be part of your Special Education, Elementary, Secondary Education, or Counseling Graduate Program. The professional conduct of special educators is guided by the Code of Ethics for Educators of Persons with Exceptionalities, Council of Exceptional Children (CEC). The professional conduct of teachers is guided by the Code of Ethics, Association of American Educators (AAE). The professional conduct of counselors is guided by the Code of Ethics, American Counseling Association (ACA). According to these codes, special educators, teachers, and counselors should promote and maintain high standards of professional behavior in terms of integrity and competence. Competence assumes that professionals will act with integrity, again, a standard for everyone in ED PSY 6545.

The CEC Code of Ethics may be found at: http://www.cec.sped.org/Content/NavigationMenu/ProfessionalDevelopment/ProfessionalStandards/EthicsPracticeStandards/default.htm

The AAE Code of Ethics may be accessed at: http://www.aateachers.org/code-ethics.shtml

**Academic Honesty:**

All candidates are expected to observe and abide campus policies in the University's Student Conduct Code.

**Civility:**

Each of us has responsibilities as members of our ED PSY 6545 learning community. As the instructor, I will strive to create a safe environment that is conducive to learning. As a learning community, it is important for us to respect each other and maintain professional dispositions. For example, one of the things I would ask is that each of us turn off cell phones and beepers during class. Candidates are expected to adhere to the standards in the Student Conduct Code.

Note: The instructor is member of the First Alert System established by UM-St. Louis. In the unlikely event of an emergency, I will be notified via a call to my cell phone. For this reason, I will keep my cell phone on during class sessions.

**Access, Disability, Communication:**

Candidates requiring special accommodations should contact me directly via email or phone so that we can discuss how to meet your needs this semester. According to University policy, prior to our meeting be sure you have met with someone in Disability Access Services (MSC 144; 516-6554).
### Schedule of Topics

**ED PSY 6545, Consultation in Schools and Related Settings**

**Fall 2011**

Note: This schedule reflects the sequence of topics, readings, and course requirements. The dates of the topics are subject to change/adjustments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Required Readings</th>
<th>Course Requirements / Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 23</td>
<td>Organizational Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 30</td>
<td>Consultation Theory</td>
<td>Erchul &amp; Conoley (1991); HM 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 6</td>
<td>Working Together I: Teachers, Psychologists, and Counselors as Collaborators</td>
<td>CEC (2002); NASP (2010); 2 articles on special education teacher and psychologists from Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010-2011)</td>
<td>Take Quiz 1 by Sept. 4, 11 pm deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The readings are light this week—consider reading ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 13</td>
<td>Multicultural School Consultation</td>
<td>Ingraham (2000)</td>
<td>Check the course website for the MSC case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 20</td>
<td>Promoting Change in Schools: A Theory of Social Influence</td>
<td>Erchul &amp; Martens (2002, pp. 27-48); HM 2, 6</td>
<td>Continue working on your MSC case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Case Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>Take Quiz 2 by Sept. 18, 11 pm deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 27</td>
<td>Introduction to Problem-Solving Consultation</td>
<td>HM 4 SW 6</td>
<td>Deadline: MSC case study due today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Identification: Data-collection techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin conducting classroom observations after this class session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic(s)</td>
<td>Required Readings</td>
<td>Course Requirements / Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Oct. 4 | Problem Identification Lab  
Introduction to Problem Analysis  
SW 2; PII script  
HM 5                | Take Quiz 3 by Oct. 2, 11 pm deadline  
Continue conducting classroom observations |                                                                    |
| Oct. 11| Problem Analysis: Focus on FBA  
SW 5, 7-8, 12                                                                 | Take Quiz 4 by Oct. 9  
Continue classroom observations and submit completed protocols |                                                                    |
| Oct. 18| Intervention Implementation:  
Focus on Treatment Planning  
Erchul & Martens (2002)  
监测 Treatment Plans/Treatment Integrity  
HM 7               | Make your life easier tip: Finish your classroom observations and submit completed protocols by today  
Begin your FBA after this class session |                                                                    |
| Oct. 25| Treatment Evaluation  
HM 8  
Sheridan (2000)       | Take Quiz 5 by Oct. 23, 11 pm deadline  
Continue classroom observations and submit completed protocols  
Continue with your FBA |                                                                    |
| Nov. 1 | School-Based Intervention Teams  
Kovaleski & Pedersen (2008)                                                                 | Take Quiz 6 by Oct. 30, 7, 11 pm deadline  
Continue classroom observations and submit completed protocols  
Continue with your FBA |                                                                    |
| Nov. 8 | Creative Problem Solving with General Education Intervention Teams  
Bahr et al. (2005)                                                                 | Deadline: Final date for submitting observational protocols  
Make your life easier tip: Submit your FBA report today—a week early! |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Required Readings</th>
<th>Course Requirements / Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 15</td>
<td>Working Together II: Teachers, Psychologists, and Counselors as Collaborators</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Deadline: Final date for submitting FBA report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Consultation</td>
<td>Knoff (2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 22</td>
<td>Fall Break Week—Happy Thanksgiving! (No class)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relax and enjoy your break!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 29</td>
<td>Ethical and Legal Issues</td>
<td>Brown et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Deadline: Due date for the 6545 Log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Take Quiz 7 by Dec. 4, 11 pm deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 6</td>
<td>Course Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class discussion on classroom observations, FBA, and other school-based work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Wrap-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 13</td>
<td>Final Exam Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name: ______________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insufficient (0)</th>
<th>Adequate (1)</th>
<th>Proficient (2)</th>
<th>Exemplary (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction to the FBA**

- Consent form is included, if appropriate
- Identifying information is listed at beginning of report
- “Reason for Referral” section is included
- The reason for the FBA is stated succinctly
- “Assessment Procedures” section is included with names of the FBA techniques used

**Rating for Introduction**

**Assessment Results**

- Evidence of FBA—copy of FAIR-T is attached to report
- Section describes the FAIR-T clearly
- FBA is completed accurately
- Results of the FBAs are clearly explained

**Rating for Assessment Results**

**Hypothesized Functions of Behavior**

- The skill deficit hypothesis is rejected or confirmed
- The performance deficit hypothesis is rejected or confirmed
- A third hypothesis is discussed (Note: this is optional—only two hypotheses are required)

**Rating for Hypothesized Functions of Behavior**

**Recommendations for Intervention Plan (Optional)**

- Section contains at least two recommendations
- Recommendations are reasonable and accurate

**Rating for Recommendations for Intervention Plan**

Subtotals for p. 1

(over)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insufficient (0)</th>
<th>Adequate (1)</th>
<th>Proficient (2)</th>
<th>Exemplary (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Manuscript</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript contains original content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to APA style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report is child focused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript is well organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of writing style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar, punctuation, spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating for Quality of Manuscript</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals for p. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals for p. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class Points: __________ (out of 20 possible)

**Key**

*Exemplary (3):* Represents the highest standard of professional work; exceptional  
*Proficient (2):* Exceeds the standard for acceptable professional work; masterful  
*Adequate (1):* Meets the standard for acceptable professional work; satisfactory  
*Insufficient (0):* Fails to meet the minimum standard for acceptable professional work; unsatisfactory
# Scoring Guidelines FBA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FBA Report</strong></td>
<td>The manuscript does not conform to the template for a written FBA report. Within a specific subsection(s), not all of the individual features of the subsection are completed. Data from the FBA are incomplete. The report does not accurately explain how the FBA was conducted, and the interpretation of the FBA outcomes is not accurate. Hypotheses (skill deficit, performance deficit) are not clearly confirmed or rejected.</td>
<td>The manuscript generally follows the template for a written FBA report. Within a specific subsection(s), most of the individual features of the subsection are completed. Data from the FBA are generally complete. The report adequately explains how the FBA was conducted, and the interpretation of the FBA outcomes is generally accurate. Hypotheses (skill deficit, performance deficit) are confirmed or rejected.</td>
<td>The manuscript follows the template exactly for a written FBA report. Within a specific subsection(s), all of the individual features of the subsection are completed. Data from the FBA are complete. The report clearly explains how the FBA was conducted, while minimizing technical language. The interpretation of the FBA outcomes is completely accurate. Hypotheses (skill deficit, performance deficit) are confirmed or rejected, and hypotheses lend themselves to linking assessment outcomes to intervention development.</td>
<td>The manuscript follows the template exactly for a written FBA report. Within a specific subsection(s), all of the individual features of the subsection are completed, and they are discussed in a thorough fashion. Data from the FBA are complete. The report does an excellent job of technical aspects of the FBA are understandable to teachers and parents. The interpretation of the FBA outcomes is completely accurate, and the hypotheses give way to clear links between assessment outcomes and intervention development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of Writing</strong></td>
<td>Manuscript appears to contain original content; manuscript lacks organization; headings are not used or are used inconsistently; headings lack clarity; problems with applying APA-writing exist; manuscript contains several grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors; overall, the manuscript lacks clarity and has poor readability.</td>
<td>Manuscript contains original content; manuscript is generally organized, although clarity of headings could be improved; some problems with APA-style are apparent; manuscript contains limited grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors; overall, the manuscript’s readability could be improved.</td>
<td>Manuscript clearly contains original content; manuscript is organized via use of headings; appropriate applications of APA-style writing are applied; manuscript is generally free of grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors; overall, manuscript is characterized by its writing clarity and readability.</td>
<td>Manuscript is exceptional; clearly contains original content; readability is enhanced by excellent organization and use of headings; no errors when applying appropriate aspects of APA-style writing; manuscript contains no grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors; overall, manuscript is characterized by strong writing clarity and high readability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note: Rubric Ratings and Course Points**

Course points will be assigned by the instructor based upon the ratings from the rubric and by use of professional judgment. Projects that have consistently high ratings (e.g., all Exemplary; all Exemplary with one Proficient rating) will earn most or all of the available course points. Projects that consistently have ratings of Proficient typically earn between 80%-90% of the course points. Ratings primarily in the Adequate range generally result in 70%-80% of the course points. Projects with Insufficient and/or Adequate ratings receive less than 70% of the course points.
ED PSY 6550 Professional Issues in School Psychology
Division of Educational Psychology, Research, and Evaluation

Instructor:
Michael W. Bahr, Ph.D.
Certified School Psychologist, State of Missouri
461 Marillac Hall
Phone: 314/516-4739 (office); 812/243-0849 (cell)
Email: bahrm@umsl.edu
Office hours: Wednesday, 1-4 pm or by appointment
Course meets: Mondays, 7:00 – 9:40 pm, 110 SCC

Course Description:
Prerequisites: Ed Psy 6530. Advanced examination of professional issues facing school psychologists including legal and ethical considerations, standards of practice, and alternative models of service delivery.

Learner Outcomes:

- Gain familiarity with state and federal legislation that regulates the practice of school psychologists
- Understand the primary ethical principles that guide the practice of psychologists
- Obtain foundational knowledge of identity development and its relationship to culturally-competent practice in school psychology
- Develop knowledge about race and affectional orientation and their relationship to culturally-competent practice
- Develop expertise about a particular professional issue (approved by the instructor) that influences contemporary practice in school psychology
- Acquire skills in identifying problems and in using data-collection techniques to assess them.
- Gain knowledge and acquire skills for assessing the function of a behavior and, using this information, developing appropriate interventions.
- Develop skills in presenting a professional issue that impacts contemporary practices in school psychology
- Enhance skills in the use of technology to improve competence in related clinical skills for school psychologists.
- Increase knowledge about the role and function of school psychologists and how psychologists function as data-based leaders in schools.
Required Texts:


Other readings as assigned (see pp. 6-8).

Semester Schedule of Topics

1. Introduction to Ethical, Legal, and Professional Issues in School Psychology
2. Legal Issues: State and Federal Legislation
3. Privacy, Informed Consent, Confidentiality, and Record-Keeping
4. Civil Legislation
5. Indirect Service Delivery/Consultation
6. Psychoeducational Assessment/Functional Behavioral Assessment
7. Counseling and Therapeutic Interventions
8. Research Ethics/Laws
9. Supervision
10. Cultural Diversity and Identity Development
11. Cultural Competence related to Race and Affectional Orientation
12. Information Technology
13. Psychologists as Data-Based Leaders in Schools
14. Additional Topics on Professional Issues (identified by candidates)

Instructional Strategies:

Instructional formats for class meetings will include: didactic/lecture, large group discussion, small group discussion, case study analyses, role play, and a field experience. Because of the size of our group, a seminar format will be primarily used, and candidates are expected to contribute to class discussions.

Technology will support course learning via use of MyGateway. The instructor will place instructional materials for weekly topics on the MyGateway course site. The instructor and candidates will use several communication features (e.g., announcements, email, etc.) in MyGateway. All quizzes will be taken online through MyGateway. Finally, candidates may check their progress in ED PSY 6550 by accessing grades/course points in the MyGateway course site.
Course Requirements:

Requirement 1: Quizzes

A substantial knowledge base exists on ethical and legal issues in the profession of school psychology. It is imperative that candidates have a working knowledge of the primary ethical principles and state/federal laws that regulate the practice of psychologists. Use of frequent quizzes (a) assists candidates in learning about ethical, legal, and professional issues in school psychology and (b) facilitates accountability in completing required course readings.

Six (6) on-line quizzes, each worth 5 course points, will be offered during the semester. Quizzes are linked to a course topic(s) and are based primarily on assigned course readings. Candidates must complete each quiz no later than six days after the date it is listed on the syllabus, which means the deadline is always on a Sunday evening at 11 pm. See pp. 6-8 for a schedule of topics associated with quizzes.

Requirement 2: Research Paper

Each candidate is required to obtain instructor approval on a topic that is a relevant, contemporary professional issue in school psychology. The topic should be one of interest to the candidate. Perusing the text Best Practices in School Psychology V (Thomas & Grimes, 2008) is an excellent way to identify a potential professional issue. A candidate is required to research the topic and demonstrate expertise by producing an 8-10 page manuscript that contains, minimally, 6 scholarly references (i.e., journal articles, book chapters, edited books). The manuscript must adhere to the publication guidelines of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.). On March 12, one week before the final due date, candidates will bring their rough draft to class for feedback and shared discussion. The manuscript is due March 18.

Requirement 3: Self-Assessment

This assignment assists candidates in understanding their self identity. The goal of this requirement is to facilitate the development of culturally-sensitive psychological practices. In particular, it allows candidates to understand their cultural background and experience and, subsequently, to relate these to their work with students, families, and other professionals. Candidates will focus on salient characteristics that influence their work as a school psychologist. The self-assessment is designed to answer the following question: To what must I pay attention in order to be an effective helper? Candidates base this discussion on an understanding of their self-identity and how they perceive themselves as professional helpers.

“Discovering Your Ethnicity” (Green, 1982) has been a potentially important activity to facilitate knowledge about self-identity. Ideally, candidates will use this activity to talk with family members (e.g., parent, siblings, grandparents) or other significant persons who have participated in the candidates' upbringing. Another useful resource may be Hidalgo's (1993) notion of concrete, behavioral, and symbolic representations of self. Both of these resources are on the course website.

This assessment results in a written product, and a component of the course is designed to provide activities that support the self-assessment. It is due on April 22 or 29.

Requirement 4: Presentation of the Professional Issue

Each candidate is required to do a multimedia presentation of the professional issue on which their paper is based. Presentations are 10 minutes in length. If using a Power Point slideshow, candidates should email the file to the instructor a week before the presentation. This will allow the slides to be posted on the course website. Two important criteria for the presentation include meeting time limitations and developing a unique format for the presentation. Candidates are required to use technology in their presentation.
Course Requirements (continued):

Requirement 5: Field Experience with Functional Behavioral Assessment Interview and Report

In order to continue their professional formation as a school psychologist, candidates will participate in a field experience as part of the course. This requires candidates to visit a school for the purpose of conducting classroom observations and a “practice” functional behavioral assessment (FBA) interview with a teacher. Upon completion of the FBA interview, candidates will write a brief report. A copy of the FBA interview must be submitted with the FBA report. The dates and location of the field experiences will be discussed in class.

Candidates will also have the option of participating as interventionists at Pershing Elementary School.

Requirement 6: Reflections on NASP Standards

Candidates must also provide written reflections on academic and field experiences. The reflections must address the following NASP Domains:

I. Data-Based Decision Making  
V. Diversity  
X. School Psychology Practice  
XI. Technology

A primary purpose of the reflections is to assess candidate knowledge of the most important roles and functions of school psychologists. A final set of reflections is required for the program comprehensive examination (due during the internship year), and the intermittent course requirements for written reflections serve as a formative assessment of candidate knowledge and understanding.

Requirement 7: Attendance / Class Participation (on-going)

Our ED PSY 6550 group is a community of learners. Toward this end, all candidates are expected to participate in class discussions and activities. The seminar format used in the course will facilitate opportunities for discussion and enhance our community of learners. Candidates are expected to attend classes. Candidates may miss one class without an impact on their grade. Thereafter, candidates will lose 2 points (up to a total of 10) for every class missed.

Note: In addition to the course requirements, each candidate will have an individual meeting with Dr. Bahr at the end of the semester. At this meeting, the candidate and instructor will review the candidate’s performance in 6550, discuss the candidate’s overall progress in the School Psychology Program, and confer about issues pertaining to a practicum assignment in August 2011. Candidates typically find these meetings to be very helpful, and they usually last about 30-40 minutes.
Evaluation Criteria and Grading:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 1: Quizzes</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 2: Research Paper</td>
<td>20 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 3: Self Assessment</td>
<td>15 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 4: Presentation</td>
<td>10 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 5: Field Experience</td>
<td>10 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 6: Reflections</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement 7: Attendance/Participation</td>
<td>10 &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points Possible: 100 points

Grade Scale:

- 100 - 95: A
- 94 - 92: A -
- 91 - 88: B +
- 87 - 81: B
- 80 - 77: C +
- 76 - 70: C
- < 70: F

Professional Competence:

Since this is a core course in the School Psychology Program, candidates are expected to abide by the Principles for Professional Ethics of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP, 2010). Section II of the NASP Ethics pertains to Professional Competence. Competence assumes that psychologists recognize the strengths and limitations of their training and experience, and this also involves refraining from any activity in which personal problems or conflicts may interfere with professional effectiveness. Competence assumes that psychologists will act with integrity, a standard for all members of ED PSY 6550 class.

Academic Honesty:

All candidates are expected to observe and abide campus policies in the University's Student Conduct Code.

Civility:

Each of us has responsibilities as members of our ED PSY 6550 learning community. As the instructor, I will strive to create a safe environment that is conducive to learning. As a learning community, it is important for us to respect each other and maintain professional dispositions. For example, one of the things I would ask is that each of us turn off cell phones and beepers during class. In general, candidates are expected to adhere to the standards in the Student Conduct Code.

Note: The instructor is member of the First Alert System established by UM-St. Louis. In the unlikely event of an emergency, I will be notified via a call to my cell phone. For this reason, I will keep my cell phone on during class sessions.

Access, Disability, Communication:

Candidates requiring special accommodations should contact me directly via email or phone so that we can discuss how to meet your needs this semester. Prior to our meeting be sure you have met with someone in Disability Access Services (MSC 144; 516-6554).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Recommended Readings</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 28</td>
<td>Organizational Meeting</td>
<td>JDH 1; JDH</td>
<td>BP 122</td>
<td>Generate ideas for your research paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Ethical Issues</td>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 4</td>
<td>School and the Law</td>
<td>JDH 2</td>
<td>Prasse (2005), BP120</td>
<td>Complete Quiz 1 by Feb. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education Legislation: IDEA</td>
<td>JDH 4</td>
<td>BP 40</td>
<td>Generate ideas for your research paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 11</td>
<td>Civil Legislation: Section 504 &amp; ADA</td>
<td>JDH 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Quiz 2 by Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privacy, Informed Consent, Confidentiality, &amp; Record-Keeping</td>
<td>JDH 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Get instructor’s approval tonight for research paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 18</td>
<td>Privacy, Informed Consent, Confidentiality, &amp; Record-Keeping (continued)</td>
<td>JDH 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Quiz 3 by Feb. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Service Delivery</td>
<td>JDH 8</td>
<td>BP 103-105</td>
<td>Read material on your research paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 25</td>
<td>Psychoeducational Assessment</td>
<td>JDH 6</td>
<td>SW 5, 6, 8; BP 19</td>
<td>Complete Quiz 4 by Mar. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Behavioral Assessments</td>
<td>SW 4, 7</td>
<td>BP 17, 39, 42, 90, 91, 111</td>
<td>Continue reading material on your research but begin writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Readings</td>
<td>Recommended Readings</td>
<td>Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 4</td>
<td>School-Based Interventions</td>
<td>JDH 7; BP Corporal Punishment in Schools, lxix; BP Sexuality Education, cxxv; BP 134</td>
<td>BP 47</td>
<td>Complete Quiz 5 by Mar. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continue writing your research paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 11</td>
<td>Special Topics in Systems-Level Consultation</td>
<td>JDH 9</td>
<td>Supervision, JDH 11</td>
<td>Complete Quiz 6 by Mar. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Paper Feedback Session</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research, JDH 10</td>
<td>Bring a draft of your research paper to class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 18</td>
<td>Cultural Diversity &amp; Identity Development</td>
<td>BP 108 (Ortiz et al., 2008); BP 109 (Miranda, 2008); BP Racism, Prejudice, and Discrimination, cxxiii</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Self-Assm Checklist (Goode, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research paper due today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Spring Break (no class)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 1</td>
<td>Models of Racial Identity Development</td>
<td>Bahr (2008); Tatum 4, 6 (2003); McIntosh (1989); Henning-Stout (1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 8</td>
<td>Models of Racial Identity Development (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FBA Report due today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Affectional Orientation</td>
<td>Tharinger &amp; Wells (2000); BP Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning Youth, lxxxix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin writing Self-Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Readings</td>
<td>Recommended Readings</td>
<td>Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 22</td>
<td>Class Presentations (6)</td>
<td>Assigned by presenters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Assessment due today, unless you’re presenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 29</td>
<td>Class Presentations (5)</td>
<td>Assigned by presenters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Assessment due today if you presented last week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6</td>
<td>Course Evaluation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Written reflections due today. Candidates have individual meeting with Dr. Bahr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion on Identity Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Wrap-Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>Final Exam Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates have individual meetings with Dr. Bahr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient (0)</td>
<td>Adequate (1)</td>
<td>Proficient (2)</td>
<td>Exemplary (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor sense of self-identity; discusses cultural background very little; limited discussion or no discussion of personal strengths, weaknesses, privileges</td>
<td>Some acknowledgement of self-identity; discusses cultural background; identifies at least two important factors that contribute to self identity; essay demonstrates some awareness of strengths, weaknesses, privileges</td>
<td>Strong sense of self-identity; discusses cultural background; identifies at least two or more factors that influence self-identity; clearly understands implications of personal strengths, weaknesses, privileges</td>
<td>Unusually well-developed sense of self-identity; openly discusses life experiences and links them to culturally-relevant factors that will influence work as a psychologist; outstanding sense of personal strengths, weaknesses, and privileges</td>
<td>Understanding self-identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response fails to reflect a minimally adequate understanding of the influence of biological, social, cultural, ethnic, experiential, socioeconomic, gender-related, and linguistic factors in learning and development</td>
<td>Response reflects an adequate understanding of the influence of biological, social, cultural, ethnic, experiential, socioeconomic, gender-related, and linguistic factors in learning and development</td>
<td>Response reflects a strong understanding of the influence of biological, social, cultural, ethnic, experiential, socioeconomic, gender-related, and linguistic factors in learning and development</td>
<td>Response reflects an extraordinarily well-developed understanding of the influence of biological, social, cultural, ethnic, experiential, socioeconomic, gender-related, and linguistic factors in learning and development</td>
<td>Diversity in development &amp; learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (or no) links between self-identity and one’s practice of psychology</td>
<td>Some links between self-identity and one’s practice of psychology are discussed</td>
<td>Many links between self-identity and one’s practice of psychology are discussed</td>
<td>Links between self-identity and one’s practice of psychology are unusually well-developed for a psychologist-in-training</td>
<td>Link between self-identity &amp; the practice of psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript is difficult to read and poorly organized; sentence structure is inconsistent with expectation of a graduate student; problems with grammar, punctuation, and spelling</td>
<td>Manuscript is easy to read and organized; sentence structure is consistent with expectations of a graduate course; grammar, punctuation, and spelling are appropriate</td>
<td>Manuscript is very easy to read and extremely well organized; sentence structure clearly meets expectations of a graduate course; grammar, punctuation, and spelling are appropriate and nearly flawless</td>
<td>Manuscript is exceptionally well-written; compelling reading material, extremely well organized; there are no grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors; manuscript has high readability</td>
<td>Quality of writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Points (out of 15): ___________
Key

**Exemplary (3):** Represents the highest standard of graduate work; exceptional

**Proficient (2):** Exceeds the standard for acceptable graduate work; masterful

**Adequate (1):** Meets the standard for acceptable graduate work; satisfactory

**Insufficient (0):** Fails to meet the minimum standard for acceptable graduate work; unsatisfactory

Relationship of Rubric Ratings to Course Points

Course points will be assigned by the instructor based upon the ratings from the rubric and by use of professional judgment. Projects that have consistently high ratings (e.g., all Exemplary; all Exemplary with one Proficient rating) will earn most or all of the available course points. Projects that consistently have ratings of Proficient typically earn between 80%-90% of the course points. Ratings primarily in the Adequate range generally result in 70%-80% of the course points. Projects with Insufficient and/or Adequate ratings receive less than 70% of the course points.
This form constitutes the primary source of data for the rating of instruction in the Division of Educational Psychology, Research and Evaluation. You are asked to rate the Instructor for this course on sixteen (16) items. Please consider your responses carefully since they constitute a critical basis for teacher evaluation; these data may also be made available to various councils and committees which make judgments about faculty promotion or tenure. Now grade your Instructor for this course on the sixteen (16) items listed to the right.

**RATING SCALE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>5 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>1 pt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, after you have completed your ratings, please provide your suggestions about how this course might effectively be improved. (Use the reverse side of this page.) You may wish to comment in terms of the course prerequisites, its difficulty, the textbook(s), as well as its practical versus its theoretical value. Also, factors such as adequacy of classroom, acoustics, and time schedule might be mentioned. You are of course free to comment on any other matters which you deem relevant to this evaluation. PLEASE BE SURE to COMMENT, YOUR OPINIONS are very IMPORTANT!!!
This part of the course evaluation allows for open-ended responses. Your participation is voluntary and anonymous. This information will be shared with the instructor after grades are submitted. Thanks in advance for your comments if you choose to complete this section.

1. This is a list of the major topics presented in the course. Keeping in mind that 6540 is designed to be an introduction to data-based assessment and intervention, and given that this is your first case study, please rate your perceived competence in each area. Your norm group should be a first-semester practicum candidate. Use the following scale:

   3 = I think I am competent in this area
   2 = I think I am minimally competent in this area
   1 = I think I am not competent in this area

   _____ a. General knowledge of teaching strategies, classroom organization/routines, etc.
   _____ b. Assessment of the instructional environment
   _____ c. Assessment of instructional placement
   _____ d. Completion of an FBA
   _____ e. Development of academic interventions
   _____ d. Progress monitoring
   _____ e. Evaluation of intervention

2. Please comment on the organization and structure of the course (i.e., lectures, practice sessions on instructional placement or PALS, large group discussion, sharing information about your projects, etc.). Describe how any or all of these activities were helpful in facilitating your learning?

3. Please comment on the course requirements (i.e., course readings, on-line quizzes, case study, reflections, attendance/group participation) and the degree to which they enhanced your learning.
4. As you know, the case study is submitted in three parts. This allows candidates to take a major assignment and complete it in smaller segments. What is your opinion of submitting the case study in two parts, instead of three? The table on the next page shows a proposed approach compared to the current approach. What are your thoughts—keep it as is or change it? Why?

Overall Recommendation (check one): ______ It’s fine—keep it in three parts. ______ I suggest two parts.

5. Using a 5-point scale, please rate and then comment on the course texts.

Rating Scale: 5 = Great text, 4 = Good, 3 = Satisfactory, 2 = Poor, 1 = Very Poor

_____ Academic skills problems: Direct assessment and intervention (Shapiro, 2011)

_____ Academic skills problems workbook (Shapiro, 2011)

_____ Effective school interventions: Evidence-based strategies for improving student outcomes (2nd ed.; Rathvon, 2008)

Any comments on the texts?

6. One of the instructor’s goals for this course was to create a safe, on-campus, class environment in which the candidates and instructor could discuss issues in an open, intellectual, and critical fashion. To what extent was this accomplished? Any suggestions for improvement?

7. Is there any other information that you think would be helpful to Dr. Bahr the next time he teaches 6540?
**This table is used for Question #4 on the course evaluation.**

Relationship between the Current Approach to submission of the case and the Proposed Approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Current Approach</th>
<th>Proposed Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part I</td>
<td>Part II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Identification</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Implementation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Instructional placement is the only part of Problem Identification included in the beginning of Part II.
Bahr Supporting Evidence

Candidate Outcomes I
ED PSY 6545, Consultation in Schools and Related Settings
Functional Behavioral Assessment

The following table contains aggregate data on candidate performance for a project-based learning assignment on functional behavioral assessment.

This project requires a candidate to meet with a teacher and conduct a structured interview concerning a student with challenging behavior. The candidate completes the interview form and summarizes it via a written report, which is then evaluated by me according to the four categories on the rubric (Introduction, Assessment Results, Hypothesized Functions, and Quality of Writing—see the course syllabus to view the actual rubric). Each candidate’s report is evaluated on these categories using a 4-point scale shown below the table. The goal is to have candidates achieve at or near the Proficient level (i.e., rating of 2).

Individual candidate performance can be evaluated by viewing the data in column 6, which presents a mean score across the four categories. In perusing these means, it is apparent that Candidate 10 ($M = 2.50$), for example, had Exemplary ratings for the first two categories and Proficient ratings for the next two. By contrast, Candidate 11 ($M = .75$) needed additional support for the skills assessed by this project, and this is denoted by ratings of Adequate in three categories and Insufficient in the fourth.

By perusing the means at the bottom of the table (row 13), the overall performance by the group may be evaluated. It is apparent that this group of candidates performed at the Proficient level for the first two categories (Introduction, Assessment: $M = 2.00$). By contrast, the next two categories had average scores between the Adequate and Proficient Levels (Hypothesized, $M = 1.64$; Quality, $M = 1.82$). These two areas became targets for additional instruction and feedback to the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Introduction to the FBA</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
<th>Hypothesized Functions of Behavior</th>
<th>Quality of Writing</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.82</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.40</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

_Exemplary (3):_ Represents the highest standard of professional work; exceptional

_Proficient (2):_ Exceeds the standard for acceptable professional work; masterful

_Adequate (1):_ Meets the standard for acceptable professional work; satisfactory

_Insufficient (0):_ Fails to meet the minimum standard for acceptable professional work; unsatisfactory
Candidate Outcomes II  
ED PSY 6550, Professional Issues in School Psychology  
Self-Assessment

This table contains candidate performance data for the Self-Assessment assignment in ED PSY 6550. The Self-Assessment is a reflective essay written by candidates to discuss their cultural heritage (or self-identity) and how it will impact their ability to practice effectively as a psychologist. Candidates write the essay after a 4-5 week course component on self-identity, cultural background, race and racism, and related topics. I evaluate this essay using the rubric in the ED PSY 6550 syllabus, which is attached to this document. The goal is to help candidates move toward a Proficient level (i.e., rating of 2).

Similar to the preceding table, analysis of the mean scores in column 6 indicates scores ranging from 1.25-2.25. Most candidates demonstrated a mix of Adequate and Proficient ratings. Candidate 3 earned Exemplary ratings of 3 in Understanding Self-Identity and the Link between Self-Identity/Practice; however, this candidate also needed instructional feedback to improve Quality of Writing (i.e., rating of 1). By comparison, Candidate 7 had stronger writing skills (Proficient rating) but had only Adequate ratings in the three substantive categories. The contrast in their ratings reveals the difference in their instructional needs.

Group performance may be evaluated by examining the mean scores by category (see row 12). This group achieved Proficient rating in Understanding Self-Identity and the Link between Self-Identity/Practice. The area for targeted instruction was Quality of Writing, which had a rating (1.50) between Adequate and Proficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Understanding Self-Identity</th>
<th>Diversity in development and learning</th>
<th>Link between Self-Identity &amp; the practice of psychology</th>
<th>Quality of Writing</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

*Exemplary (3):* Represents the highest standard of graduate work; exceptional

*Proficient (2):* Exceeds the standard for acceptable graduate work; masterful

*Adequate (1):* Meets the standard for acceptable graduate work; satisfactory

*Insufficient (0):* Fails to meet the minimum standard for acceptable graduate work; unsatisfactory
Student Learning Outcomes  
ED PSY 6540, Psychoeducational Interventions  
Fall 2012

With an increasing emphasis on accountability in education, school psychologists can provide evidence of their effectiveness with students by assessing student learning outcomes. Such evidence allows psychologists to understanding their impact on assisting the student with learning.

In my Psychoeducational Interventions class, candidates consult with a teacher who is concerned about a student with reading problems. A candidate uses the problem-solving process to identify the learning problem and to collect data verifying the problem and linking assessment to an intervention. A candidate then develops a remediation plan and implements it for several weeks. Data are collected on an ongoing basis to assess student progress, and at the conclusion of the intervention, student learning is evaluated.

Candidates use a single-case research design for these projects. Here are brief descriptions of four student learning outcomes that I use to assess the effectiveness of interventions used by our candidates to improve student learning. These are followed by actual student learning outcomes from Fall 2012.

1. Percent of Non-Overlapping Data (or PND)

In a single-case design, data are collected on an ongoing basis beginning at baseline (or preintervention) and continuing through the intervention phase. Using the baseline’s most extreme data point in the preferred direction of change, the data points in the intervention phase that are higher (or better) in the intervention phase can be calculated as the percent of non-overlapping data. Criteria for PND effectiveness are: 60%-70% = low; 70%-80% = moderate; 80%+ = high. In the example below, a line drawn through the highest baseline data point (see arrow) allows a calculation of the percent of data points in the intervention phase that do not overlap. The PND is 73% (or 8 / 11), showing a moderate level of intervention effectiveness.

2. Effect Size

In single-case research, an effect size is a statistic used as an estimate of the intervention’s effectiveness compared to baseline (or no intervention). Cohen’s d is a commonly used effect size estimate that measures effectiveness in standard deviation units. Criteria for evaluating Cohen’s d are: < .30 = low; .40-.70 = moderate; > .80 = high. In the example below, Cohen’s d is 1.19, indicating a high level of intervention effectiveness.

Example of a student’s reading performance between baseline and intervention
3. Goal Attainment Scaling (or GAS)

GAS is a widely used measurement system in psychology, education, and business/industry. It is a standardized, 5-point scale ranging from -2 to +2. GAS ratings are designed to measure improvement after the implementation of an intervention. Ratings of +1 or +2 indicate positive changes because of the intervention. Although descriptors for each point of the GAS scale can vary, a generic interpretation is: 

-2 = Problem significant worse; 
-1 = Problem worsens; 
0 = No change; 
+1 = Improvement; 
+2 = Significant improvement. Our candidates have teachers provide the GAS ratings to evaluate intervention impact.

4. Visual Inspection/Trend Analysis

When using single-case designs, intervention effectiveness can be quickly evaluated via visual inspection to determine if a positive trend is apparent in the outcome data. In the example above, reading achievement increases during the intervention phase and thus has a positive trend.

Student Learning Outcomes, Fall 2013

In Fall 2012, candidates taking my ED PSY 6540 class completed teacher consultations that included working with a student with reading problems. The table below summarizes student learning outcomes and the interventions that each candidate used with the student.

As a group, the average PND was 74.78, which indicates a moderate degree of intervention effectiveness. By contrast, the average Cohen’s $d$ was 1.35, thereby indicating a high level of intervention efficacy. These outcomes were complemented by the teacher GAS ratings that had a mean of 1.33, which is at the high end of the GAS scale (i.e., between +1 and +2). Lastly, each intervention had a positive trend analysis, which is consistent with the other student learning outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>PND</th>
<th>Cohen’s $d$</th>
<th>GAS</th>
<th>Trend Analysis</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 1</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>Repeated readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>FCRR letter ID &amp; phonics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 3</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>Repeated readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 4</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>Paired rdg, Q generation, Click or Clunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>Letter ID &amp; phonics; use of flashcards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 6</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>FCRR Picture Slide for phoenemic awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 7</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>P4R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 8</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>paired rdg &amp; incremental rehearsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate 9</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>Elkonin boxes for phonemes; incremental rehearsal (sight words; repeated rdgs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>74.78</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>23.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, use of student learning outcomes is an emerging area in education, and the UMSL School Psychology Program is leading the way with the adoption of these measures to provide evidence of student learning.
Program Level Data
ED PSY 6550, Professional Issues in School Psychology
Self-Assessment

Much of the evidence for program effectiveness in the UMSL School Psychology Program comes from candidate outcomes. The table below reflects data generated from the Self-Assessment, a course assignment that entails a reflective essay written by candidates after completing a course component on self-identity, cultural background, race and racism, and related topics.

For program evaluation purposes, however, it is optimal to (1) review data every year and (2) compare it over time to assess program effectiveness. Using the same assignment with the same evaluation rubric, the table below displays aggregate candidate outcome data for four cohorts on the self-assessment. The number of candidates is represented parenthetically next to the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Self Identity</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Self-Awareness</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link of Self-Identity and Practice</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Writing</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.49</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.52</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.51</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- Exemplary (3): Represents the highest standard of graduate work; exceptional
- Proficient (2): Exceeds the standard for acceptable graduate work; masterful
- Adequate (1): Meets the standard for acceptable graduate work; satisfactory
- Insufficient (0): Fails to meet the minimum standard for acceptable graduate work; unsatisfactory

Given that our goal is for candidates to achieve at or near the Proficient level, a score of 2 on the 0-3 scale, review of the Total Score row shows means ranging from 1.83 to 2.20 with three of the cohorts earning total mean scores over 2.00. All of the groups scored well on the dimension Understanding Self Identity, which is a critical skill for school psychologist to develop in order to engage in culturally-sensitive practice. All of the cohorts scored relatively lower on Quality of Writing compared to other dimensions. Although the scores are not unacceptable—that is, at or lower than 1.00—they indicate this area is a relative weakness for candidates. In some ways, this is not surprising given this course is in the first year of graduate school and candidates are learning to master technical writing. However, the data on Quality of Writing indicate that school psychology faculty, myself included, need to continually focus on enhancement of professional writing skills in the second and third years of the program.

One final comment about aggregate candidate outcome data. The descriptors for the dimension Level of Self-Awareness on the rubric come from the accreditation standard Diversity in Learning and Development from the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). For example, the rubric description under the level of Proficient is, “Response reflects a strong understanding of the influence of biological, social, cultural, ethnic, experiential, socioeconomic, gender-related, and linguistic factors in learning and development.” When NASP evaluates the UMSL School Psychology Program for reaccreditation, the language used in the rubric will quickly alert accreditors to aggregate outcome data related to this standard, thus serving as evidence for addressing (and hopefully meeting) accreditation standards.
Select Presentations Related to Teaching and Learning


Publication


Note: Although this publication was not discussed in my essay, it was funded by an UMSL Innovation Grant. The purpose was to conduct a program evaluation of the incorporation of handheld computers into the curriculum of graduate psychology classes to improve candidate skill in using technology to assess student problems.
July 14, 2013

516 Coverdale Lane
Kirkwood, MO 63122

Donald A. Gouwens, Psy.D.
Chairperson/ Department of Educational Psychology,
   Research, & Evaluation
Associate Clinical Professor
School Psychology Program Coordinator
University of Missouri-St. Louis
One University Boulevard
459A Marillac Hall
St. Louis, MO 63121

Dear Dr. Gouwens,

I am delighted that you nominated Dr. Michael W. Bahr for the Chancellor’s Award for Teaching Excellence at the University of Missouri-St. Louis (UMSL), and thank you for this opportunity to speak to his extraordinary teaching abilities, especially as a research advisor.

I first met Dr. Bahr in August 2005 as my instructor of a graduate school psychology course at UMSL. At that time, I was a practicing school psychologist of some years in the St. Louis area with a desire to pursue a doctorate degree. Dr. Bahr provided me with invaluable feedback and guidance regarding my potential course of study. I was admitted to the Teaching and Learning Ph.D. program in 2006, and recently graduated from this program in May 2013. Dr. Bahr was instrumental to my achievement by serving on my Advisory and Dissertation committees, supervising critical internship and teaching experiences, and providing constructive feedback for my growth as an emerging researcher.

For my dissertation study, I investigated the cultural competency of practicing school psychologists, including myself, in real world settings. Dr. Bahr helped me to turn my desire to understand complex and difficult issues surrounding racism, racial identity development, dominant culture, male and White privilege, sexual orientation, disability, and poverty into coherent research questions. Dr. Bahr, working with my dissertation committee, provided me with the tools to examine those questions in a rigorous and safe way. I could never have navigated the complex maze of doctoral research without Dr. Bahr’s guidance. I cannot express how grateful I am for his help, and for his continued interest, review, and support of my work and research goals going forward.

Dr. Bahr demonstrates a commitment to all of his students, and has a genuine talent for scaffolding experiences that lifts us to our fullest potentials. Overall, I would rate Dr. Bahr as one of the best instructors I have ever encountered. Additionally, his work and research actively promotes university/school partnerships which develop the capacity for problem-solving teams to support students and families, especially those with diverse needs and learning experiences. His scholarship provides invaluable knowledge and assistance to educators striving to make differences in the lives of the students they serve.
Dr. Bahr’s strong and positive leadership is undoubtedly far reaching, and Missouri and the University of Missouri-St. Louis is indeed fortunate to benefit from his life-long commitment to scholarship and education. Dr. Bahr is a trusted leader, cherished professor, and valued colleague to many scholars and educators nationwide, and he is highly deserving of the Chancellor’s Award for Teaching Excellence.

Sincerely,

Jill Johnson, Ph.D.
Assistant Adjunct Professor
Certified School Psychologist
Division of Educational Psychology, Research & Evaluation
University of Missouri-St. Louis
Elissa Clair Ed.S. NCSP
SSD School Psychologist
4454 Laclede Ave.
St. Louis MO, 63108

July 7, 2013
Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Teaching
Attn: Selection Committee

Dear Selection Committee Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to recognize the accomplishments of my past professor and current mentor, Michael Bahr Ph.D. I have known Dr. Bahr for six years, beginning with the winter semester of my first year in the School Psychology Educational Specialist program. The first of five classes in which Dr. Bahr was my professor was Ed Psy 6550 Professional Issues in School Psychology. In this class two qualities of Dr. Bahr were soon apparent: (1) his innovative teaching methods (2) his exceptional ethical practice. My instruction from Dr. Bahr continued with Ed Psy 6540 Psychodevelopmental Intervention, Ed Psy 6545 Consultation in Schools and Related Settings, ED Psy 6591 School Psychology Practicum II, and ED Psy 6542 Psychotherapeutic Interventions in School Psychology.

Dr. Bahr is by far the best teacher I have had the pleasure to work with at UMSL, my Masters of Education program at University of Illinois at Chicago or my undergraduate program at the University of Chicago. He is knowledgeable, approachable and excited about his area of expertise. Of all the classes I attended at UMSL, the ones taught by Dr. Bahr have most affected my practice as a School Psychologist. His about the field and His depth of instruction have caused me to shape my position at Special School District so that I can spend more of my time on areas I learned from Dr. Bahr, such as consultation, and less on areas I learned from any other instructors, such as assessment.

Dr. Bahr’s instructional methods and devotion to ethical standards left an impression on me. A few years into the field of School Psychology, I developed an interest in pursuing field research. Of course I was interested in an area opened to me by Dr. Bahr. I was in need of an advisor and mentor. Although I was not a graduate student in his program he agreed to assist me without hesitation. We have continued our collaboration over the past two years. My studies would never have been possible without his substantial support. When family obligations allow it, I hope to matriculate to UMSL as a PhD student in the area of Educational Psychology to continue my work with Dr. Bahr.

Dr. Bahr employed two innovative teaching methods I had not experienced before, Curriculum Based Measurement (brief repeated measurement) and assignment initiation comprehensive rubrics. In the field of School Psychology, we believe in repeated measurement (brief, weekly skills tests) to measure academic growth.
These can be used to correct misconceptions or limited growth along the way as teaching progresses, as opposed to end of unit tests which, by giving feedback after instruction has ended, may be too late for meaningful understanding and retention. Dr. Bahr assigned weekly quizzes and examined them as a class. My classmates and I had opportunities to ask questions and ensure that we understood the material covered in the previous week while we were still immersed with in that unit of study.

Dr. Bahr provided comprehensive rubrics for all written and oral projects before we started. At this university, I have rarely had rubrics provided before a project is due, and when provided, never as comprehensive as he gave us. His rubrics are thorough guides for completing a written or oral project. They supply an outline for proper sections and list of necessary components. His rubrics also explain the writing style/mechanics quality that is expected. Development of writing skills is important, as a significant part of a School Psychologist's job is writing reports. My writing skills improved dramatically under the tutelage of Dr. Bahr. My first writing assignment for him was marked with enough mechanical and style corrections that it was difficult to see the text. My writing style/mechanics was evaluated as Inadequate to Adequate. My errors were explained and correlating sections of the APA style manual were provided as a method to improve my performance. By my final written assignment, five classes later, there were three corrections in an eleven-page paper. My writing style/mechanics were evaluated as Proficient to Exemplary.

Dr. Bahr is devoted to ethical practice. During each of my classes with Dr. Bahr, he instructed by word and exceeded by example the ethical standards expected of School Psychologists. He impressed upon us the need to protect the dignity and rights of all persons we come in contact with, be it children, families, teachers, or other school psychologists. We were taught when and how to "speak up" when this did not occur. His personal ethical practice was demonstrated by his careful use of language, explanations, with personal examples, of when practices were or were not ethical, and his caring manner during discussions of delicate topics.

Mike has been an invaluable teacher and mentor to me. I highly recommend him for the Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Teaching.
July 12, 2013

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing you today in support of Dr. Mike Bahr’s nomination for the Chancellor’s Award for Teaching Excellence. I have had the pleasure of knowing Mike for about six years. During that time, I have gotten to know Mike in several capacities. He has served as my professor for several graduate level courses in the School Psychology program, he has served as my practicum supervisor, and I have attended his workshops at the Missouri Association of School Psychologists Conference. Most recently, I attended a cultural competency training he co-led. In all of these roles, Mike has taught me more about what it means to be a school psychologist than I ever thought was possible.

As my professor, Mike had a unique way of structuring his classes. He always allowed students to ask questions, offer opinions, and he strongly encouraged student-led discussions. I always looked forward to Mike’s classes for this reason. I always felt comfortable offering my opinions in his class and asking questions. Mike always listened carefully to me, and offered answers and responses in a non-judgmental way. Mike was always clear about his expectations for assignments, and he returned graded work promptly always with notes and helpful advice. Mike was always accessible for questions or conversations with students, even on weekends. On the first day of class, Mike gave all of his students his cell phone number and instructed us to call him if we had questions about anything. He was the first professor I had that did that. He returned emails promptly as well.

As my practicum supervisor, Mike met with my practicum mentor and me on a regular basis. Mike ensured I was learning what I needed to learn during my practicum. As part of my practicum, I completed case studies. Mike’s expectations were clearly stated and a rubric was provided. He checked-in with me regularly to ensure I understood the expectations as well as answer my questions. Mike offered assistance whenever I asked, and he always offered constructive suggestions to assist me.

As I mentioned previously, I have had the pleasure of attending workshops and trainings led by Mike. Mike is very knowledgeable and passionate about the topics he presents. As in his course, he encouraged participants to ask questions, offer opinions, and lead discussions. He represented the University of Missouri-St. Louis with professionalism, knowledge, and pride. I am always proud to tell my colleagues Mike was my professor, and I had the privilege to attend his courses.

On a personal note, I began my career as a School Psychologist at Special School District in 2010. I love my career, and I feel I was more than prepared when I graduated. In Mike’s classes, I learned some of the most important things a school psychologist needs to be successful. He
taught me how to build rapport with students, staff members, and parents. He taught me how to deliver difficult news with compassion, always keeping in mind cultural differences.

I am truly grateful for the time Mike spent teaching me, providing feedback to me, and advising me. Without him, I would not have graduated and I would not have a career that I love. But more than that, I am thankful for the confidence he gave me. By the time I graduated, I was prepared for my career.

Thank you for considering this letter as a nomination for Dr. Mike Bahr to receive Chancellor’s Award for Teaching Excellence. He goes above and beyond for his students and truly deserves to be recognized for all of his efforts. Mike’s greatest strengths are his passion and knowledge for the field of school psychology. In all of my coursework at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, both undergraduate and graduate, I cannot think of a professor more deserving of this award.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Katie Janssen, Ed.S, NCSP  
Email: katiej1985@yahoo.com  
Cell: 314-712-1603
Perhaps the most important characteristic of any teacher is the ability to communicate and understand the needs of his or her students, and no professor understands this quite like Dr. Michael “Mike” Bahr. An astute and caring listener, Mike always takes the time to ask people about their day or how they are doing. Often, this translates to a five-minute conversation about personal events, which never seems forced or contrived. It may be one of the most basic, and sometimes inane, pleasantries of our culture, but Mike is genuinely interested in these exchanges—in person or as part of a class dynamic. It has occurred to me that it is part of the foundation on which Dr. Bahr has based his success.

Teaching is difficult, and it takes more than genuine empathy for students to be successful. Many teachers may take an academic-centered approach to teaching in which they assault students with endless reading and writing assignments, only to be followed with dry lectures over the same material, with nothing of value added to the course. Dr. Bahr turns that model on its head, instead preferring to focus on student contributions. The typical model of the professor ruling class discussion does not apply with Dr. Bahr. In his courses, students dominate discussions and provide ample opportunities for subjective and objective learning, which is much more insightful than dusty journal articles or pedantic professors. Mike is keenly aware that less of him and more of his students is a good thing. However, I am quite sure that my classmates would welcome a two-hour lecture from Mike—because he is that good! You can see how the philosophy of Dr. Bahr permeates his teaching. With each class, assignment, and exam, Mike solicits feedback, and not merely as a perfunctory task, but as a way of improving his courses. Some professors may take feedback and wait until the next semester to make improvements, or not at all, but Mike will actually make changes during the semester if he believes that his students will benefit from them.

Thus far, I have neglected to say much about his academic acumen, which should tell you how much I value Mike Bahr, the person, but it must also be told that Dr. Bahr is a terrific scholar and researcher. As a student who values, and participates in, research Mike has been a great mentor. The same qualities that make him a terrific professor also make him a quality researcher, and I have learned that anything in the lab can be accomplished if there is an open spot on the calendar. Our research groups are marked by consistent student contribution, with feedback and facilitation by Dr. Bahr. All of this has been revelatory because for most of my life, I have been “taught” by professors and teachers who observed the lecture and assignment model. I mistakenly assumed that good teachers always behaved a certain
way, but Mike has challenged that viewpoint. He has shown that quality teaching can be student-centered, efficient, engaging, and fun.

Lastly, Dr. Bahr has helped me redefine how I approach research, and more importantly, how I approach people, and the profession of school psychology—a sure sign of learning that sprung from good teaching! Rarely do I find myself wanting to emulate other people, but I cannot help hold Dr. Bahr up as a standard for all school psychologists and teachers. An interesting irony about Dr. Bahr is that he may be a better person than he is a teacher, but without that grounding as a person, he might never have become such a wonderful teacher and scholar. He is the person and professional we should all strive to be and is more than deserving of the highest accolades.

James Le Duc
Ed. S. in School Psychology Candidate
July 18, 2013

Dear Selection Committee:

Great teaching is not something that just happens. It takes a tremendous amount of effort and hard work. Dr. Michael Bahr not only excels at teaching but he does so with passion and energy that excites and engages students and truly makes a difference in their lives. Quality teaching is a way of life for Dr. Bahr. I see it in his course and program design and the work he has done throughout the whole College on outcomes assessment, program improvement and transformation.

In the College of Education, we define teaching broadly. It includes curriculum design and planning, innovations in course design, quality of instruction, reflective practice, and impact on practice of the profession. The best teaching ensures that content is presented in an engaging and meaningful way and that the instructor is continuously improving to provide a quality experience for each and every student. Dr. Bahr has been instrumental in designing and developing the School Psychology program. He teaches multiple courses in the program and all are taught at an exceptionally high level as reflected in his course evaluations. The School Psychology program is well regarded and serves the community through thoughtful and innovative course and program design. His excitement for his work knows no bounds. He pushes the limits, thinks reflectively, and consistently introduces new ideas to the table. His course evaluations and student comments are indicative of the relationships he builds with students.

However, individual course and program quality is one thing, but Dr. Bahr has also had a significant influence on the entire College as he has also served as the Director of Accreditation and Program Enhancement. Accreditation and continuous program quality are critical to the College. Staying current in the field of education means that we are constantly working to improve P-12 student learning a difficult and complex task at best. In this role, Dr. Bahr was responsible for reviewing data, implementing new systems for continuous improvement, developing new assessments that connect to student learning, and ensuring that accreditation standards were exceeded. In my view, we couldn’t have had anyone better. He was meticulous and relentless in this work. The College was once again accredited in the
spring by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and we have systems in place that are being touted nationally as some of the best. This would not have happened without his leadership and understanding of teaching and learning.

There is no question that Dr. Bahr has all the qualifications for this award. He is driven by continuous improvement and quality reflected in his teaching, research, and service to the College. This is what drives everything and above everything else, this passion, is what makes him an excellent candidate for the Chancellor’s Teaching Award.

Sincerely,

Carole G. Basile
Dean and Professor
July 23, 2013

I would like to add my support for the nomination of Dr. Mike Bahr for the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching at the University of Missouri - St. Louis. I have had the pleasure to work with Mike through UMSL’s School Psychology program and within my roles as both Effective Practice Specialist at Special School District of St. Louis County and President of the Missouri Association of School Psychologists. My experiences with Mike include coordination of practica and internship placements for Ed. S candidates at Special School District, on the MASP board, as a presenter at MASP’s annual conference, and as a trainer for our SSD staff of school psychologists, diagnosticians and examiners.

Mike never fails to give of his time and expertise generously in support of our profession. In workshops, his presentation style when addressing difficult topics like bullying, LBGQT youth, and culturally competent practices includes not only current and timely research, but also an atmosphere of safety where participants can think critically and express their concerns candidly.

His students consistently praise him as an inspiring and encouraging mentor. Mike not only supports his student’s growth, but also with experienced school psychologists and diagnosticians at SSD to continue their professional growth. Feedback from participants is overwhelmingly positive each time Mike presents at our workshops and trainings.

Mike is actively engaged in contemporary research around these important topics. Along with another colleague from Maryland, Mike worked with me last school year (2012-13) to develop and deliver content to SSD psychologists as part of a series of professional development modules designed to increase awareness, knowledge and skills around issues of race, poverty and special education identification. I am pleased to note that this partnership will continue into 2013-14 as we collect and analyze data around the
outcomes of our efforts. Mike demonstrates genuine commitment to research that informs practice around cultural and ethnic differences, over-identification of ethnic minorities in Special Education, and within the LGBTQ community.

I feel privileged to have had the opportunity to work with Mike over the years, to learn from his experience and scholarship, and to enjoy his friendship as a colleague in our state association. His positive, can-do attitude and welcoming affect is a bonus, as he has never declined to help in any situation where I have sought his counsel or assistance.

Mike is a credit to the university, which happens also to be my alma mater, and he genuinely deserves the recognition of this award.

Sincerely,

Karen Walsh
Effective Practice Specialist in School Psychology
Special School District of St. Louis County