8-1982

A Behaviorally-Based Graduate Practicum Program in Applied Behavior Analysis

James Harper Kaye
Western Michigan University

A BEHAVIORALLY-BASED GRADUATE PRACTICUM PROGRAM IN APPLIED BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS

by

James Harper Kaye

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Psychology

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August, 1982

A BEHAVIORALLY-BASED GRADUATE PRACTICUM PROGRAM IN APPLIED BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS

James Harper Kaye, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University, 1982

Although practica are often required of psychology students at various points during their graduate training, seldom are any resulting skills described and validated. Faculty are occasionally involved in campus-based clinics which serve some practicum students; however, when practica are based off-campus, faculty are seldom directly involved. As a result, practica are frequently uncoordinated, duplicative, and non-specific in terms of their practicum student training procedures.

Although there have been some attempts reported to systematize and coordinate either off-campus or on-campus practica, no such effort has been previously reported in relation to multiple complex organizations, both on-campus and off-campus.

In the present study, a behavioral systems analysis of Western Michigan University's doctoral practicum program in applied behavior analysis was undertaken, resulting in a comprehensive array of goals for improving the existing system. Certain goals were identified as outcomes of this study. In an effort to develop a coordinated and validated practicum network across multiple complex organizations both on-campus and off-campus, a committee was formed comprised of several supervisors from practicum sites. Site evaluation criteria were developed and approved by the University and subsequently field tested through a comprehensive site

evaluation system. As a result, sites which met different criterion levels of performance were awarded different levels of accreditation. Recommendations for improvement were provided to each site and the university.

As a result of this behavioral systems approach, all sites demonstrated or agreed to provide precise assessments and specifications of practicum student skill levels resulting from the practica. Most sites also agreed to modify their practicum training procedures to the extent that they meet the criteria provided in this study. Information concerning the training features and capabilities of all sites were configured in a matrix which will enable faculty to match practicum site features with student needs.

This study provided a basis for continued coordination and verification of practicum activities and outcomes across many diverse practicum sites. Further, it suggested a model which could be adopted (with minor modifications) by various disciplines.

Kaye, James Harper

A BEHAVIORALLY-BASED GRADUATE PRACTICUM PROGRAM IN APPLIED BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS

Western Michigan University PH.D. 1982

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank James Cowart, Eric Hayes, Richard Lodge, William Redmon, and William Uhlman, all of whom spent many hours with this writer, developing the site evaluation criteria utilized in this study.

Gratitude is also expressed to the members of the Department of Psychology's Doctoral Practicum Committee, Drs. Malcolm Robertson, Norman Peterson, and Nancy Petty, for their input and support during the course of this study.

I am indebted to the members of my dissertation committee, Drs. Jack Michael, chairperson, Howard Farris, Galen Alessi, and Elizabeth Lawrence-Patterson, who have provided considerable guidance and encouragement to me not only during the present study, but at various times over the years.

Special thanks go to Cyndee Brule, who worked many hours and long days and evenings typing the manuscript, and to Henriette, Andrea and Alison Kaye, who all displayed great patience and understanding over the course of this endeavor.

James Harper Kaye

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

In the training and practice of applied psychology, several distinctions have been made between practica and internships (e.g., Alessi, Lascurettes-Alessi, and Leys, 1981). Practica focus on the attainment of specific skills or competencies, generally while working with a specific population within a particular program or service area. Practicum students generally require more direct supervision than an intern might require. The internship is considered a preprofessional experience in which the student applies the knowledge and skills imparted by previous courses and practica to a wide range of situations and problems typically encountered within a professional role. The intern is assumed to have previously developed a repertoire of service skills, and is provided an opportunity to exercise these skills with limited supervision.

An increasing body of knowledge is developing in relation to internship programs and experiences. This is particularly true in relation to various areas within clinical and counseling psychology. For example, internship training programs for psychologists have been described in several specialty areas: behavioral medicine (Swan, Piccione, and Anderson, 1980; Belar, 1980); group

treatment (Carmody and Zohn, 1980); family therapy (Lombard, 1979); community and correctional psychology (Gormally and Brodsky, 1973); and behavior modification (Johnson and Bornstein, 1974).

Numerous issues relating to internships may be found in the professional literature. For example, the advangages/disadvantages of rotational internships (i.e., limited and alternating exposure to a variety of service populations) have been examined by Langston (1979). The exploration of increasing the employment options of new Ph.D. experimental psychologists by incorporating an applied internship with handicapped children has been reported by Young and Morrow (1980). Shapiro (1979) has articulated features of field placements and internship systems utilized by a professional school of psychology existing apart from a recognized university. Numerous reports have been published by psychologists detailing the experiences and impressions of the value of various components of their internships (Allen, 1970; Weiss, 1975; Hedlund, Hayden, and Mordock, 1979; Stout, Holmes, and Rothstein, 1977).

A review of the above literature fails to reveal clear delineation of what specific competencies resulted from internship experiences. This literature is typically either introspective, or survey oriented, and deals with the intern's attitudes regarding internship components, relevance of internship activities to later professional practice, general suggestions for improving internship

experiences, strengths and weaknesses of internship programs, etc. Some articles do describe, in general terms, some of the features of internship training; they do not, however, precisely relate what was learned and how such competencies were measured. This lack of specificity might be due to an underlying assumption that relevant skill repertoires were previously well established as a result of earlier practica. The extent to which loosely structured internships are effective in "cementing" entry level professional skills would therefore seem to depend, in part, upon the adequacy of practicum training activities.

Unfortunately, Dana, Gilliam and Dana (1976) report that internship settings indicate that 64% of their clinical graduate students are initially deficient in skills, and are especially not competent in assessment and psychotherapy techniques. Perhaps the assumption that graduate level practica produce substantive skill repertoires is erroneous. A critical review of practica features and impact is called for.

Although practica (or "field work") has been a common component in the training of clinical and counseling psychologists and others in areas such as medicine, social work, and education (Lunneborg, 1970), it has also been described as an "afterthought" to the training of many psychologists, and is seen as a supplement to classroom instruction, particularly appropriate for those students

who find it more difficult to learn through traditional didactic instruction than through active participation (McKeachie, 1968). Hanson and Moore (1966) suggest that practica are valuable insofar as they provide first-hand work experience and the demonstration of the relationship of theory to practice.

The Family Studies Program at Georgia State University offers a sequence of doctoral-level courses in clinical psychology which combine therapy and practice (L'Abate, Berger, Wright and O'Shea, 1979). Students initially take a course in theories and techniques related to enriching intra-family communication and relationships, followed by a course in theories of family therapy. The latter course might be concurrent with a practicum in family therapy, or might be followed by such a practicum. Supervision is didactic and instructional in nature, and is accomplished during practica through direct observation of student performance via either a one-way mirror or videotape playback.

A relatively thorough accounting of a practicum within a campus-based outpatient clinic has been provided by Wisocki and Sedney (1978). This practicum, offered by the Univeristy of Massachusetts at Amherst, emphasized skills acquisition as well as ethical and personal behavior benefiting the professional clinician. Each student selects two practicum "teams" in which s/he will participate in training. Each team represents a particular theoretical orientation (e.g., behavioral, interpersonal, family, psychodynamic,

community, etc.) which the student would be expected to apply to 2 to 3 cases. During the initial weeks of the behavioral practicum, students receive didactic instruction and are assigned readings, attend case demonstrations and lectures, and familiarize themselves with select cases. The complexity of problems presented by the cases is taken into account during the assignment of cases, with more advanced students getting the more complex and difficult-to-treat client problems. The first meeting with clients is a behavioral assessment conducted by either a faculty member or an advanced graduate student (who functions as the student's supervisor). The case is then presented to the team, and an initial treatment plan is developed utilizing suggestions from the students. After 3 to 4 weeks, the student assumes control over the client's therapy, under regular supervision. Sessions are observed by the supervisor either through a one-way mirror or through video tape recording playbacks. Additional clients are assigned as the student "feels reasonably secure" with his/her current case(s).

In relation to each assigned use, the student is expected to:

> (1) engage in a literature search of the previous behavior methods of treatment employed with the problem category; (2) present available research for discussion among the group; (3) develop a detailed behavioral assessment of the client's problem; (4) design a tentative treatment plan; (5) participate in a weekly discussion of various techniques, problems, ethical considerations, etc. among team members, allowing for revision of the treatment plan, as needed; (6) assist in the evaluation of therapy outcome and thera-

> pist's behavior by means of a structured questionnaire. Finally, each student is encouraged to develop an additional research project on some aspect of clinical behavior therapy and present it through professional channels. (Wisocki and Sedney, 1978, p. 142).

As detailed as the Wisocki and Sedney report is, it does not make clear what new skills the students acquire as a result of the practicum. For example, it might be reasonable to assume that most students already have the skills required to carry out a literature search, prior to enrolling in the practicum. Does the oral presentation of available research to the team require special skills to be learned during practica? If so, what are these skills, and how are they assessed? In the development of detailed behavioral assessments of client problem behaviors, does the student learn a particular procedure or format through the practicum? And if so, what skills result and how are they measured? Similar criticism may be levied in relation to various other descriptions of most other practica reported in the literature.

For example, Ottinger and Roberts (1980) provide a description of a campus-based practicum in pediatric psychology, but fail to precisely articulate what was learned as the product of the practicum. While relating the nature of student, pediatrician and psychologist interactions, the authors state that "learning to cooperate and respect each other's professional contributions... was an important lesson for all participants" (Ottinger and Roberts, 1980, p. 708). Unfortunately, such a description does not

specify the behavioral repertoire required for "cooperation" and "respect", nor does it make clear how one would know if such a repertoire existed.

Much of the remainder of Ottinger and Roberts' paper relates experiences provided to the students, again without regard for the learning outcomes of such experiences.

It is curious that the last two studies reviewed [above] lack adequate specificity in describing the behavioral changes in practicum students resulting from practicum activities, particularly since both practica espouse a behavioral orientation. Behavioral psychologists typically pay close attention to a careful operational definition of behaviors to be observed, precise descriptions of systems to measure such behaviors, clearly articulated goals and objectives of interventions (in behavioral terms), and detailed treatment procedures for modifying the behaviors and evaluating results.

Other advantages to behavioral techniques in relation to practica have been reported. Ottinger and Roberts (1980) state that behavioral techniques lend themselves well to the relatively brief therapeutic contacts often found within a practicum setting. This view is shared by Glickman and DiSipio (1975), who indicate "Although the behavioral approach represents only one of many possible approaches to treatment, it is emphasized because it is most amenable to brief but effective treatment" (Glickman and DiSipio, 1975, p. 259).

A survey of 472 psychology departments of American universities and colleges by Benassi and Lawson (1972) found that of 290 respondents, 180 stated that behavior modification courses were offered by their departments. Behavior Modification practicum experiences in some form were offered by all but 23 of these classes listed by these departments. Since the opportunity to learn behavior modification through practica exists in many universities and colleges, and since behavior modification and behavior therapy are often used with clients due to its relative effectiveness over the course of a semester or two, it would seem that the application of its principles with the practicum students and the structure and systems of practica could be undertaken with little difficulty, and might lead to more effective practicum training.

It has been suggested that many faculty supervisors of practica offer pass-fail grades or blanket A's due to difficulties in establishing what competencies should be taught, determining how they should be systematically taught, and evaluating the extent to which they are developed (Lloyd and Whitehead, 1976).

The competencies to be taught vary according to the theoretical orientation of the faculty. In relation to applied behavior analysis and behavior modification, a large body of knowledge has been developed over the past 20 years from which basic competencies could be derived. At least one such compilation has been developed by Sulzer-Azaroff, Thaw and Thomas (1975).

Techniques for teaching applied behavior analysis and behavior modification have been reported in the literature, and are merely logical extensions and applications of the very principles upon which behavioral psychology is based. Although little has been written about the behavioral practicum training of psychologists in applied behavior analysis and behavior modification, there have been numerous reports of behavioral procedures used to teach behavior modification skills to parents (e.g., Brehoug, Benson, Solomon and Luscomb, 1980; Rinn, Vernon and Wise, 1975), probation officers (Burkhart, Behles and Stumphauzer, 1976), teachers (Pascal, 1976), and institutional staff (Sanson-Fisher and Seymour, 1976).

The behavioral evaluation of performance in relation to established competencies in applied behavior analysis and behavior modification may be easily derived from the behavioral technology itself. The production of clearly specified skills under standardized and carefully monitored situations is not an untenable task. Several states already have installed competency-based hiring procedures for those applying for behavioral positions in state-supported facilities (e.g., Florida, Minnesota and Montana). Furthermore, Mazza and Pumroy (1975) provide a review of studies reporting techniques for evaluating the effectiveness of parent and teacher training in behavior modification across three categories: personality and attitude changes, written measures, and direct

observation of behavior.

In short, the technology exists to provide practicum courses which specify what is to be learned and how it is to be measured so as to verify and evaluate its acquisition.

A behaviorally taught practicum has been reported by Lloyd and Whitehead (1976). Although limited to master's level students, it demonstrates the effectiveness of applying behavioral strategies to teach applied behavior analysis skills to college practicum students.

Lloyd and Whitehead developed their behaviorally-taught practicum in response to highly variable practicum performance and the practice of awarding grades irrespective of such performance. Four campus-based clinic teams were formed, each with three students at various levels of training and a faculty supervisor. The skills to be mastered by each student were broken down into skill components and the practicum grade made contingent upon demonstrated competencies.

Fifty skills were identified by two faculty as appropriate competencies to be derived from practica. These skills seemed to fall within four general areas: personal management skills, such as promptness at team meetings; applied skills, such as writing treatment programs; social-professional skills, like dealing tactfully with others; and academic skills, such as familiarity with relevant applied literature.

Point values were allocated to each of the skills, and the final grade was awarded on the basis of total point accumulation in relation to the total points possible, with 90% or better equivalent to an A, 80 - 89% a B, 70 - 79% a C, etc.

The number of skills evaluated within each general area varied across four levels of training for all students, and were reflected in the "category weight" of each general area, or "category". Thus for first semester students the academic category represented 20% of the final grade, personal management 5%, applied 50%, and social-professional 25%. For second semester students the respective weightings were 15%, 5%, 55% and 25%. For third and fourth semester students, the relative weightings were 20%, 5%, 35% and 40%.

For each skill described, an evaluation instrument was identified (e.g., Social-Professional Rating Scale, Team Meeting Evaluation Form, study quizzes, etc.). Skills were evaluated through either thirteen rating scales or checksheets or by merely observing whether or not a student emitted a required behavior. Raters were either two faculty supervisors or a faculty supervisor and an intern, and reliability measures were taken.

The data obtained over two semesters from approximately thirty students indicated excellent performance from all students on personal management and applied skills, with nearly all students achieving the maximum points available.

Unlike the above two categories, social-professional skills were not directly taught; instead, faculty provided some modeling and periodic feedback to the students. Perhaps as a result, performance faired less well in this category. Students who earned C's during their first two semesters tended to perform poorly during subsequent semesters (i.e., during their internships). The authors suggest that such students had difficulty with social-professional skill development. The increase in category weightings from 25% (for the first two semesters) to 40% (for the internships) further exacerbated their relatively poor score in this area. The authors concluded that direct instruction and objective skill evaluation in relation to social-professional skills would be critical if in fact such skills are important.

Academic skills were taught in three seminars taken in sequence. Performance in these seminars varied, with poorest skill development purportedly evidenced due to the coverage of excessive amounts of material for the time and credits provided.

In addition to student evaluations of the practica, community members receiving service at the clinic also provided positive qualitative evaluations of the services provided by the clinic (and presumably, its practicum students).

The Lloyd and Whitehead study provides examples of the evaluation tools (questionnaires, forms, rating sheets, etc.) used in the practica, and advances our knowledge of precisely what skills

practica can (and should) produce. However, the authors fail to clearly articulate the nature of instruction provided, other than to reference a competency-based merit system (i.e., the point system leading to the determination of final grade) and a modified Personalized System of Instruction (PSI) (Keller, 1969). The latter system features student self-pacing of skill acquisition, mastery of old material prior to moving on to new material, lectures which provide motivation rather than information dissemination, emphasis on written verbal student performance, and student proctors (Johnston, 1975). The extent to which PSI was modified or applied, and the skills which it taught are left unclear by Lloyd and Whitehead. In addition, any increment in practicum system performance can not be scientifically validated in their study, especially since no baseline data were reported. Furthermore, the specific effects of the competency-based merit system or the modified PSI can not be separated from each other, or from the effects of simply monitoring and evaluating student performance on an empirical basis, without regard to outcome.

Evans (1976) has provided a behavior therapy training model which includes both behavioral systems and PSI approaches. The author provides the model in the absence of implementation data, with the intent of describing a course designed to teach clinical psychology graduate students basic behavioral intervention techniques. The PSI features of the Evans model include student self-pacing,

mastery of course units prior to moving on to new units, and demonstration of mastery to instructor. The behavioral systems features include analysis and synthesis of behaviors necessary to implement a specific therapeutic technique, environmental measures that affect implementation of therapeutic techniques, and student behavior objectives stated in observable terms. In addition, Evans' course stresses four important behavior modification steps: behavior analysis, initiation and execution of intervention plans, monitoring of each plan, and termination and follow-up.

The course is designed to teach seven basic behavior therapy techniques (e.g., systematic desensitization, covert sensitization, flooding, etc.), variants of these techniques, the identification of clinical problems to be treated by these techniques, and supporting research. Training is accomplished through a three-part process: pre-practicum training, practicum training, and theoretical background training.

Pre-practicum training requires the student to learn and engage in the behaviors which would be characteristic of someone competent in each of the seven basic techniques. Reading relevant literature, enacting the various techniques, role playing, and evaluation of progress are utilized throughout the pre-practicum experience. Tasks are repeated until a criterion level of performance

is reached. Twenty-four tasks must be completed. Each task is worth six points, for a total of 144 possible points. Points are awarded for the other two components as well, and final course grades are determined by the number of points awarded by the end of the semester. Although students may work at their own pace, the pre-practicum component must be completed in the first six weeks of the course.

In the second component (practicum), each student is assigned a volunteer undergraduate student and an outpatient at the psychology clinic. Practicum students are expected to generalize their pre-practicum training skills to actual work with clients. In addition, two case reports must be completed. The student's work could result in up to 72 points.

Concurrent with the behavior analysis section of the practicum is the third component, theoretical background training. Three tasks worth six points each and a review paper worth sixty points represent the tasks in this component.

Evans reports that such a course triples the time investment of the instructor, but results in better grounding of the student in course content areas crucial to behavior therapy. The systems approach lends itself to an analysis of effectiveness, and is easily modified according to student-instructor feedback. The practicum procedures seem to offer a process for generalizing the skills learned. The case reports may lend themselves to publica-

tion, and student practice in the review paper should enable the students to better review relevant literature in the behavior modification area.

Evans' model is quite specific in relation to the skills expected of the student, the literature to be considered, and the course of training. Its competency-based merit system and PSI components are similar in design to Lloyd and Whitehead's (1976), although training seems to be limited to more narrowly defined areas.

All of the practicum offerings described above were carried out in university-operated clinics, and represent a recent move in such clinics toward expanding community services. In a recent survey reviewing the organization and development of psychology department clinics (Serafica and Harway, 1980), it was noted that until about 25 years ago (in the late 1950s), such clinics typically dealt with children experiencing socioemotional, developmental or learning problems. In recent years, these clinics have expanded services to include providing organizational consultation, assessing community mental health needs, and facilitating social change within the community.

However, the primary mission of the psychology department clinic remains in training of graduate students and research (Serafica and Harway, 1980). The clinic meets the needs of students at

various levels of training, while also providing an opportunity for faculty to develop clinical expertise and explore new treatment procedures and experimental techniques.

Of the 83 APA-approved doctoral programs in clinical psychology who responded in the Serafica and Harway survey, 75% indicated that their departments operated clinics. Only 38% of the respondents reported that they employed full time personnel at their clinics.

Thus the modal psychology department has no faculty associated full-time with the department's clinic, where such a clinic exists. Such clinics must rely on the contributions of some or all faculty and/or students of the department, all of whom typically have other responsibilities and competing tasks. No carefully constructed cost-benefit analyses have been reported dealing with part-time vs. full-time clinic staff. In the absence of data, it seems reasonable to assume that the present modal department clinic appears to provide a satisfactory function, particularly in combination with other off-campus training programs. The latter type of resource seems to be often affiliated with psychology graduate programs.

Off-campus training programs often offer a wide range of services to the community surrounding the university or college, while providing practical experience to the participating students.

Several problems are encountered with field placements, however, which are not typical of most psychology department clinics. First, department faculty are geographically separated from off-campus sites, and often have no direct "line" responsibility for activities undertaken on a regular basis at these sites. These limitations to the faculty's access and authority provide a barrier to effective monitoring and direction of student activities at these sites. Second, the matching of student needs with the services offered by various off-campus training sites requires that department faculty be cognizant of the services, operations and moment-to-moment needs and limitations of the off-campus sites, a requirement which is difficult for many faculty to meet given their classloads, research and other obligations to the university or college (cf., Fawcett and Miller, 1975, p. 6).

Fawcett and Miller (1975) suggest some resolutions to the above problems. In relation to establishing the work activities of a student at an off-campus training site, the authors suggest that the off-campus site personnel identify the behaviors to be performed by field-work students. This reduces the demand on the faculty to be aware of appropriate tasks for the student to engage in at each site. Unfortunately, the authors fail to account for the other factor in the assumed matching operation, that is, the learning needs of the student. These needs are typically best known by the faculty, not the off-campus sites.

In relation to the monitoring and evaluation of student performance, Fawcett and Miller suggest an adaptation of PSI, i.e., the use of student proctors. The authors describe the use of PSI in a field-work course taught at the undergraduate level at the University of Kansas. Students were placed in a neighborhood service center for one semester, and worked on tasks assigned by service center personnel. Student proctors recorded the time-in and time-out for each student, as well as the location and type of each activity undertaken by each student. Points earned throughout the semester determined the final course grade (e.g., 90% or more of the available points equaled an A, 80% to 89% a B, etc.). During baseline conditions, points were provided noncontingently, that is, without regard to work output. Following the collection of baseline data, points were made contingent upon each hour of community service behavior (as defined by the service center staff). A return to baseline (noncontingent points) conditions followed by reintroduction of the independent variable (contingent points) resulted in high rates of work hours per student during contingent reinforcement conditions and decreasing or low rates of work hours per student during baseline (noncontingent points) conditions.

Although the Fawcett and Miller study did not speak to the development of high-level preprofessional and professional skills, its implications for graduate training seem clear: there are

alternatives to the traditional psychology department clinical experience; these alternatives can result in specific outputs from participating students; these outputs can be measured without direct faculty observation; and student performance can be modified through independent variables controlled by the faculty.

One field placement alternative to psychology department clinic practica not frequently explored is private practice practica. A survey by Lowe, Jr. and Ritzler (1980) of 107 American Psychological Association (APA)-approved graduate clinical programs found that of 61 respondents, only 13% provided practicum training supervised by a private practitioner. Programs not featuring private practice practica anticipated more problems with such practica than did programs incorporating such practica. Problem areas reported most often by both types of programs were malpractice protection and the occasional lack of a scientist-practioner model. The latter problem related to the scope of the present paper, since doctoral studies in psychology (particularly in applied behavior analysis) typically have a strong research orientation.

A frequently stated concern is that the private practitioner might not be involved in sufficient research activities to maintain expertise in such activities, and therefore might not be

able to provide adequate research supervision to practicum students (Lowe, Jr. and Ritzler, 1980). However, other researchers have found that practitioners have made significant contributions to the research literature (cf., Bornstein and Wollensheim, 1978; Perry, 1979). Nevertheless, no data have been reported from scientist-practitioners in the private sector documenting effective practica of the type previously described by Lloyd and Whitehead (1976), and Evans (1976), and Fawcett and Miller (1975).

Another issue regarding off-campus field training is the apparent occasional conflict between the dictates of sound research design and clinical treatment goals. Glickman and DiScipio (1975) have reported a model training practicum which attempts to deal with this conflict through the integration of academic and research skills with clinical skills. Students enroll in an academic course (Principles of Behavior Modification) during their first year in their doctoral program, and spend several weeks discussing theoretical issues and reading a variety of texts on behavior modification. Students then participate in a laboratory section at a local hospital in an adult psychiatric ward, where they are supervised 2-4 hours per week. The goals of the program include the provision of direct client contact concurrent with the student's first year of graduate work, experience of dealing with the problems of carrying out both treatment and research in

a clinical setting, and direct contact with clinicians who function as scientist-practitioners.

Subsequent to the few weeks of didactic coursework, the student is given a general orientation to the hospital. This includes a review of the hospital's policy regarding community psychiatry, features of the patient population, and the respective roles of professional/nonprofessional staff. By registering the students as volunteers, the students become recognized as legitimate service providers within the hospital community. Although the authors do not precisely relate the identity of the students' hospital supervisor, it appears to be a professional psychologist, who provides the treatment goals and objectives established for each patient. The primary functions of the student are to refine data collection instruments, collect and evaluate data, and participate in designing/modifying experiments and treatment programs. They begin to undertake these tasks by the third meeting with hospital staff. The supervisors meet with the students on a weekly basis. The authors indicate that "observational learning" (i.e., modeling) using the clinician as the model is frequently used. The evaluation of student progress is carried out by the university professor based upon course work and a report (presumably) written by the student describing the treatment plan utilized at the hospital including suggestions for future interventions employing the supervisor's methods.

The description of the model provided by Glickman and DiScipio suffers from many of the same flaws described in many of the studies reviewed earlier in the present paper. No description is provided of exactly what was learned. If the student was to design or redesign data collection instruments, what skills did this require? Did the student learn how to record data using time sampling, event recording, interval recording, etc.? How was the evaluation of the treatment plan (by the university professor) carried out, and how did it relate to the students' skills in data collection?

It is curious that Glickman and DiScipio do not indicate the relationship between the university professor and the hospital psychologists, and the nature and frequency of communication between them, since elsewhere in their paper they state

> The need for formalized communication lines between academic institutions and mental health facilities, particularly when located within the same community, is apparent. Interlocking systems or contracts of reciprocal training and service should extend beyond the present system of brief and uncoordinated field placements and one-year internships, completely separated from the university. (Glickman and DiScipio, 1975, p. 258)

It would seem to be folly to assign a grade to a student's practicum experience in the absence of data specifically related to the skills to be developed as a result of the practicum. We have seen earlier in the Fawcett and Miller (1975) study that the use of student proctors in field study courses provides a mechanism for evaluating student progress in the absence of

direct university staff observation. Perhaps such an application within the Glickman and DiScipio model would yield more appropriate evaluation data than those described by the authors.

By way of a review, the present author has summarized recent research which reports practicum activities undertaken both on and off campus, in clinics, private practice, hospitals and specific field placements. In general, such practica involve a particular course (e.g., practicum in behavior modification) undertaken at a single site. However, some practica within certain specialty areas involve multiple sites, various supervisors, and complex service delivery systems. Such practica present unique logistical problems and require a more systematic approach to student training and monitoring. Maher (1980) has reported a field training practicum for graduate students in school psychology that utilizes a fairly sophisticated systems approach in the management of students, training and direct services.

The systems framework developed by Maher was implemented in the Somerville, New Jersey, public schools with practicum students from Rutgers University School Psychology Training Program. The framework was developed to meet four field placement needs:

> (a) It provides a systems perspective on various roles and service functions of the school psychologist in relation to a range of possible clients; (b) it offers a system for coordination of the field training experiences of school psychology trainees who are at different levels of professional

> development; (c) it allows for the design of an individual field training program for each trainee, based on the needs of the trainee; and (d) it requires systematic evaluation of the progress of each trainee toward program goals embodied in the individual program. (Maher, 1980, p. 551)

Maher identifies three levels of student service providers; third year students possessing state certification as school psychologist (level A); second year students (level B, and; first year students (level C). The field training experiences for level A students involves fairly large systems (e.g., department of special education, a school building, etc.) and groups of clients (e.g., teachers, classrooms, etc.). Level A students carry out needs assessments, program planning/evaluation, consultation, and limited supervision of level B and C students.

Level B students provide direct services to certain client groupings (e.g., parents of preschool handicapped children, learning disabled children, etc.) and individual clients (e.g., problem adolescents, classroom teacher, etc.). Level B students carry out psychological assessments, planning/evaluation of individual educational programs (IEP), consultation to teachers regarding specific children, and in-service training of teachers in behavior management techniques.

Level C students carry out classroom observations of children with problem behaviors, teacher/parent interviews, psychological assessment and report writing.

Practicum students are involved in training 1½ days per week throughout the school year, and receive weekly supervision from a doctoral-level school psychologist employed by the district. The practicum students service a variety of elementary and secondary school buildings, and also function as part of an interdisciplinary team for each building.

Maher conceptualizes the service recipients as either individual clients (e.g., a child or teacher), group clients (e.g., all children in a given classroom, all teachers of history, etc.), or organizational clients (e.g., a special education department, a school, etc.).

Maher's system employs a five-step service delivery process: problem assessment, program design, program monitoring, program evaluation, and feedback. As noted earlier (cf., Evans, 1976), these elements are important features of an effective behavioral systems approach.

An important and unique feature of Maher's system is in the individual field training program (ITP) developed jointly by the student and his/her field supervisor in September. The ITP is developed during the problem assessment phase, and is accomplished through the simultaneous assessment of student and client needs. During the first two weeks, student trainees are assessed by any of four techniques: a comprehensive review of written reports of the students' past performance from previous supervisors and instructors; a review of previous work samples from the student;

self-reports by the student regarding his/her current needs; and, direct observation of the student in service activities. After the collection of such baseline data, the student and supervisor meet to reach a consensus on the priority needs of the student.

At the same time, the client needs are identified. Again, clients might be individuals, groups or organizations within the school district. Methods used to assess individuals and groups include reviews of group achievement test data, interviews with counselor and principals about pupil needs, administration of questionnaires to teachers to determine their needs in relation to classroom behavior management and instruction, and analysis of descriptive data (e.g., truancy rates, absenteeism, discipline referrals). Organizational needs assessment procedures and field-tested organizational assessment instruments are used to assess organizational needs.

A critical matching of student need to client need is then articulated during the program design phase, resulting in a formal ITP. In essence, the ITP is a written contract that clearly specifies the nature and parameters of the field training (practicum) over the first half of the school year. Four elements comprise the ITP:

> (a) the clients who will be provided school psychological service; (b) the goals of the training program in relation to particular clients; (c) goal indicators, which are behavioral referrants that provide evaluative

> criteria for judging degree of goal attainment; and (d) service activities engaged in by the trainee, which serve as means to goal attainment. (Maher, 1980, p. 555)

During the monitoring phase, weekly assessments of progress toward goals established by the ITP are carried out. Should a lack of client progress subsequent to intervention be noted, or unrealistic goals or other significant problems be identified, a revised ITP and related goals may be renegotiated between student and supervisor.

A formal goal-based evaluation of progress in the ITP is carried out by the student and supervisor both in January and June. This comprises the program evaluation phase, during which established goals and goal indicators serve as evaluative criteria. This process is crucial to the systems framework, for it allows the supervisor to measure and document the acquisition of student skills relative to particular clients, and forms the basis for any adjustments to the ITP.

The feedback phase provides the process whereby information regarding the procedures and products of the practicum program is provided to students and faculty. As indicated above, students receive feedback on their performance of services on a weekly base, and also receive feedback at both mid-year and year-end in relation to their ITP. Written and verbal reports are submitted to faculty by the field supervisor as a result of these supervisory and program evaluation meetings. The information

provided by this feedback is then incorporated by faculty in future course work plans and training experiences for the student.

Maher's systems framework provides us with an elegant model of an effective off-campus practicum program with multiple service features. The model could be effectively applied to other areas within psychology, as well as within other human service fields. Unfortunately, similar systemic applications to practica in other areas have not been reported in the literature. Furthermore, no report can be found in the literature of a behavioral systems approach to the coordination and validation of practicum activities carried out across multiple complex organizations, both on and off-campus. For example, some practicum programs might not be limited to one school district, but might provide opportunities to students to engage in practica both on-campus (in clinics) and off-campus, in schools, mental health out-patient clinics, residential treatment programs, partial day programs, juvenile detention facilities, etc.

The Problems

In summary, practicum experiences, while crucial to the development of effective professional entry level skills for the practitioner or researcher in applied behavior analysis, often are not clearly identified, monitored, evaluated, or validated in relation to actual skill acquisition. With few exceptions, little attention is given to the specification of what is learned through the practicum, how it is learned, how it is taught, the competency of the supervisor, and the relevance of what is taught to the student's course of study. Furthermore, no documentation can be found of effective coordination and validation of multi-site practicum programs comprised of numerous complex organizations. Such a multi-site practicum program can be found at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

At Western Michigan University, the Department of Psychology (hereafter referred to as the Department) offers two graduate level practica, Psy 599 and Psy 699. The former provides training in the application of the principles of psychology to specific and restricted problem areas within applied behavior analysis, and is generally viewed as an opportunity for graduate students to participate in direct service rendition under adequate supervision. The latter course is more advanced and is aimed at

providing the student with the opportunity to engage in applied research leading to the resolution of a particular research problem. In addition, the Department offers Psy 712 (Professional Field Experience) which is aimed at providing students with an opportunity to engage in pre-professional and professional behaviors in a supervised setting.

The Department has partially reviewed its practicum system and has assessed its weaknesses (Fuqua, 1979). Several problems have been identified.

First, although most practicum sites have been approved by the ABA Doctoral Practicum Committee, the approval mechanism seems inadequate, since it 1) fails to provide criteria for approving sites, 2) fails to provide an accountability system to validate the actual execution of practicum functions by the sites, 3) fails to identify skill repertoires to be established by the sites with participating practicum students, and 4) fails to provide a system for re-evaluating sites on a regular and timely basis.

Second, the selection of the practicum site by the students does not seem adequately guided and coordinated either by the Department or the site. A large majority of students never consult with their advisors regarding the advantages/disadvantages of various sites in relation to the student's professional development needs. Furthermore, the student's needs are often not clear, since an objective assessment of the student's current professional repertoire is not

systematically undertaken. Since skills to be trained by the site are not commonly identified in advance, matching of site to student according to the latter's need is not possible. Neither clearly defined prerequisite behavior skills nor identification or required coursework are commonly specified either by the faculty or the site to the prospective student, further aggrevating the potential site-student mismatch. Finally, there is no evidence of a coordinated sequence of practica leading to the steady acquisition and development of an effective and broadly based professional behavior analysis repertoire; instead, no time frames are provided to students as to when they may elect practica, and the same practicum activities may be repeated within and between sites, leading to no substantive gains in skill level and needless repetition.

Third, the quality and quantity of on site training may vary between sites, and no mechanism currently exists to monitor and/or modify such discrepancies. It has been suggested that

> Some sites have sophisticated on-line supervision and training with occasional academic meetings supplementing the on-line training; other sites presumably use the "osmosis" training approach (hope that some skills "seep" into the student's repertoire). (Fuqua, 1979, p. 1)

In addition, the training and skill level of those charged with supervising practicum students may also vary from site to site, and no minimal competencies have been established for such supervisors.

Fourth, the current procedure for evaluating the practicum by student and supervisor seems imprecise, inadequate, and inconsequential. Evaluation forms are fairly open ended, and are submitted

upon completion of the practicum. They are consequently ambiguous and untimely, serving no instructional purpose during the practicum itself. A careful description of newly acquired skills demonstrated by the student during the practicum is often lacking. The student may receive credit for the practicum even without submitting the evaluation forms. It is not clear that the student might not receive credit even with a poor-to-fair evaluation by his/her supervisor. As a result, no consequences are differentially applied according to the outcome of the practicum, and no system has emerged which utilizes whatever information is obtained from the evaluation in an effort to modify the practicum quality.

Fifth, the roles of the faculty and site personnel are not well understood; in fact, they are typically not articulated. Little consideration has been given to identifying either the role, tasks, or supporting reinforcement systems pertaining to these individuals. In general, faculty refer prospective students to the sites, and confer with site contact personnel on some timely basis, typically through site visits. The purpose of these visits and personnel contacts is not specified within any uniform way across sites or faculty. No evaluation of the faculty in relation to practica has been carried out. Similarly, the role of the supervisor is unclear, and his/her tasks may vary across sites. The payoff for site, supervisor or faculty is not clear. Do faculty receive teaching credit for practica? Do sites and supervisors obtain clear benefits from accepting practicum students?

The central problem seems to be the lack of a data-based practicum process which is clearly related to student skill acquisition. This central problem results from the above five problem areas, namely: inadequate site approval systems, inadequate guidance and coordination of practicum site selection and site activities, inadequate monitoring of the quality and quantity of site training, inadequate evaluation procedures relative to supervisor and student performance, and unclear roles and functions of the faculty and site personnel.

Problem Resolution Goals

The resolution of the problems addressed above should result in the achievement of five narrow goals and one broad goal.

First, the Department will systematically and selectively approve ABA practicum sites on a continuing basis, utilizing clearly specified criteria for approval. Each site approval will require, in part, the specification of systems aimed at identifying the student skills to be obtained through the practicum for each participating student. The approval system will also require the validation of actual site training activities consistent with those activities mutually agreed upon by the Department and each site.

Second, the Department will ensure adequate guidance of each ABA doctoral student with regard to practicum site selection and a sequence of behavior analysis competencies to be obtained through the student's participation in Psy 599/699. This goal will require each student to

consult with his/her advisor in order to map out a sequence of skill development and appropriate site selection, according to the student's need. This goal will further require the timely assessment of each student's progress in acquiring the skills to be derived from practicum participation.

Third, the Department will monitor the quality and quantity of training carried out by each site, and will ensure that only site personnel with demonstrated applied behavior analysis competencies actually provide student supervision.

Fourth, the Department will require the submission of both student and site supervisor evaluations of practicum performance prior to the awarding of academic credit. Furthermore, the Department will encourage objective and data-based evaluations throughout the practicum and will monitor the effect of sharing such data on both supervisor and student performance.

Fifth, the Department will provide, in cooperation with site personnel, a clear description of the role of the faculty and the responsibilities of the site personnel. Incentives to both the faculty and the site personnel will be offered.

The accomplishment of these five narrow goals should result in the attainment of the broad goal of the establishment of a data-based, behaviorally-oriented doctoral practicum in applied behavior analysis within the Department, aimed at the development and verification of specific competencies for each of its doctoral graduates.

Barriers to Problem Resolution

Crucial to the resolution of problems is the identification of possible barriers which currently prevent or interfere with the attainment of established goals. Such barriers may be faulty contingencies, inadequate resources, poor communications, hostile political climate, or any number of other environmental features. A review of possible barriers related to the six problem resolution goals expressed above might suggest either limitations to the present study, or logical and viable ways in which the present study might proceed.

The first goal is comprised of four parts. The first part requires a mechanism for approving sites as well as criteria for judging site performance. The approval mechanism has already been provided by the Department, viz., the Doctoral Practicum Committee. However, no criteria have been developed. Several barriers to developing these criteria may be anticipated. The establishment and validation of such criteria would likely be a lengthy and time consuming process. Since current faculty resources barely meet the instructional needs of the student body as well as the research requirements of the Department and University, it is doubtful that the faculty could effectively and directly undertake such a project. In addition, it would seem politically expedient to involve the sites themselves in this process, since the sites must be supportive of the criteria developed if students are to continue to find placements at these sites. However, another related barrier might be the willingness of the sites to participate in establishing criteria, since the resources at the various sites are also limited.

This barrier seems the weakest of the two for several reasons. First, there is a modest supply of ABA doctoral students who are themselves site supervisors, and therefore might participate in the development of criteria if given special consideration (e.g., acknowledgement) by the faculty. Second, if site supervisors are to be evaluated along with their sites, they might have a vested interest in contributing to criteria development. The extent to which they might attenuate requirements of the criteria would be limited by the Doctoral Practicum Committee which could adopt, modify or delete any of the criteria as it might see fit.

The second part of the first goal suggests something other than a one-time approval of each site. Although the Doctoral Practicum Committee might review each site, perhaps annually, on the basis of the site's performance in relation to a set of criteria, the actual acquisition and analysis of the necessary raw data might be beyond current faculty resources, as described above. This barrier might be circumvented by drawing on a pool of site personnel and/or doctoral students to assest in the submission and analysis of data, given sufficient safeguards to protect the validity and confidentiality of the data.

A third part of this goal requires the identification of skills to be learned as a result of the practicum for each student. A possible barrier might be faulty communication between the student, site and faculty. Effective communication systems would need to be developed to overcome this barrier.

The fourth part of the first goal requires the validation of site activities, and its attainment seems limited by the same barriers as the second part of this goal, viz., faculty resources. A similar remedy is envisioned: the utilization of site personnel and/or doctoral students in the evaluation of data obtained from site activities.

The second goal of ensuring adequate student guidance would seem to require a directive from the Department Doctoral Committee. No major obstacle to this is foreseen. However, the part of this goal requiring faculty to assist each student with regard to practicum site selection in view of the student's unique skill development needs assumes the faculty's familiarity with each site's training specialties and capabilities. Such an assumption might not be warranted, since no such validated data base currently exists. The lack of such a descriptive set of data configured in such a manner so as to be useful to faculty in guiding their students is seen as a current barrier.

Another part of this second goal requires timely assessment of student progress over several practica. It is doubtful that faculty could directly observe and measure the performance of each of their practicum students due to time constraints and the sheer number of students involved. This barrier might be removed through the use of site supervisory personnel to fulfill this function. The validity and reliability of the resulting data might be questionable, however,

unless some reliability measures were independently obtained. These data might naturally obtain from a comparison of pre- and post-measures taken within and between various practicum sites.

The third goal of monitoring training provided at each site and ensuring competent supervision by site personnel might not meet with enthusiastic support from potential practicum sites. The administrators and/or supervisors of various sites might not wish to "lay bare" their respective competencies/incompetencies, and if pushed in this regard might opt for discontinuing their practicum relationship with the Department. This protective or insulating barrier might be overcome through the use of nonpunitive and corrective measures brought by the Department to aid and support the development of more effective training within each site. Some risk would likely be taken at losing some potential sites. Nevertheless, an overall improvement in practicum quality, quantity and supervision should obtain.

As with the second goal, the fourth would seem to require a directive from the Department Doctoral Committee. Such a directive might indicate that no practicum credit will be awarded until a satisfactory evaluation of student performance was obtained from both supervisor and faculty. Although no barrier to this action is foreseen, the current lack of a validated and effective evaluation instrument to objectively determine "satisfactory" performance would seem to constitute a barrier. The development and implementation of such an instrument might be hindered by inadequate faculty

resources and might be resisted by site personnel if increased response effort was required on their part.

In addition, the fourth goal requires a flow of evaluative data to and from student, supervisor and faculty aimed at improving practicum quality. The current lack of such a data system provides an additional barrier to be removed.

The fifth goal requires role delineation and the examination and orchestration of incentives, and is perhaps the most difficult. Site supervisors are hired by the sites (or parent organizations) to provide either direct or indirect services to the population served by the site or to those providing such services. Their job descriptions generally do not include the training of WMU ABA doctoral practicum students. As agency resources dwindle, site supervisors become hard pressed to deliver basic services for which they were hired. Agency administrators or boards might therefore be reluctant to reallocate resources in order to provide adequate practicum supervision unless clear advantages were obtained for the agency, thereby offsetting the resulting increased direct cost or opportunity cost. Most sites are more receptive to accepting interns than practicum students, since the former are considered to have already acquired a professional repertoire of sufficient depth and breadth to allow them to function with less supervision and support than the less sophisticated practicum student. Finally, site supervisors are already

overburdened with federal, state, and local regulations and restrictions; increased response requirements from the Department might be rejected by these personnel, and the sites lost from the sources of practica. The apparent lack of clear and powerful incentives to agencies, their sites and personnel in relation to modifying and improving the current practicum system is a formidable barrier.

As indicated above, the role of the supervisor is dictated by his/her agency. The supervisor's immediate supervisor is either another agency administrator, or a governance board. Lines of accountability incorporating the Department's faculty would therefore be difficult to configure given the typical agency's organizational structure. To whom does the site supervisor report? Given a conflict between needs of the practicum student or faculty and the needs of the agency's service recipient, which set of needs does the site supervisor select to meet? In general, the agency holds the most powerful reinforcers, and the prevailing contingencies will likely be controlled by the agency, not the faculty or Department. This barrier is not likely to be removed, except possibly in those cases where the practicum is undertaken within some branch of the University or operation of the Department. However, a clear understanding of who is responsible to whom for what by when might still be derived, given sufficient motivation to do so, and given acceptance of the resulting constraints on and between all parties.

The role of the faculty seems to vary according to the extent of accountability held by the faculty for the operation of the site.

Sites directly operated or managed by faculty might generate more faculty involvement than those sites operated by outside agencies. In the former case, the interface between the site supervisor and the faculty may be clearly articulated and formalized. Barriers arise when the faculty must interface with agencies for whom no direct operational responsibility is assumed. Faculty are given no authority over such site personnel, and the extent of the faculty's influence is limited not by some authority, but by the nature of an array of relatively weak consequences and contingencies at the faculty's disposal. Again, roles may be spelled out, but current barriers are in the form of non-specific and ineffectual contingencies and consequences.

The barriers described above serve to make difficult the achievement of the data-based, behaviorally-oriented doctoral practicum program we desired. Some barriers seem immovable; others seem minor. Those which might be realistically overcome through the efforts of this study may now be selected for elimination and articulated through a series of relatively narrow goal statements.

Selected Goals

1. A set of ABA practicum site evaluation criteria will be established through the combined efforts of selected sites, site supervisors, the Doctoral Practicum Committee, and this researcher.
2. A practicum site evaluation system will be developed and field tested to ensure adequate data collection and analysis, while

conserving faculty and site resources. This system will provide for regular re-evaluation of selected sites.

3. Practicum site performance in relation to training activities to be undertaken by the site will be evaluated and validated through the combined efforts of select sites, site supervisors, the Doctoral Practicum Committee, practicum students, and this researcher.
4. A process for monitoring and developing improved site training and supervision by qualified applied behavior analysts will be developed and field tested.
5. A set of data describing the validated training capabilities of each site will be generated, formatted and disseminated to faculty as an aid in matching student needs with site training capabilities. In addition, each site's ability to provide qualified supervision required by state licensure requirements will be provided.

The attainment of the above goals will be the principal task of the present dissertation. The nature of this research requires a departure from experimental methodology employing dependent and independent variables and elegant experimental designs. Instead, this research will be descriptive and exploratory in nature. It will describe systems and activities which lead to goal attainment, and will explore the utility and possible continuing impact of such systems and activities on the Department's ABA doctoral praticum program. This exploration will require the field testing of new systems in order

to ascertain their effectiveness and utility. Data collection systems relative to field testing will be evaluated as to data reliability and validity.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects and Setting

The problems previously identified in the Introduction and their related problem resolution goals are primarily systemic in nature; therefore, the subjects of the present study are the systems directly related to these identified problems. The systems currently in place by Western Michigan University's Department of Psychology in relation to the approval and selection of ABA practicum sites for ABA doctoral students and the awarding of credit for such practica will be considered relevant primary subjects for this study.

Since systems are developed and implemented by people, the latter will be considered secondary subjects. The individuals participating in this study will be members of the Department Doctoral Committee, Doctoral Practicum Committee, the Doctoral Practicum Committee's Subcommittee on ABA Practicum Site Evaluation, practicum site supervisors, practicum sponsoring Department faculty, and the practicum students themselves.

The Department is comprised of 22 faculty members, of which about half are actively involved in applied behavior analysis. Of these, 5 are currently affiliated with some practicum site at which ABA practica may be undertaken. Of this latter group of

faculty, 2 are considered directly responsible for the administration & operation of at least 1 of their sites. A listing of sites supervisors, and faculty practicum sponsors is provided in Table 1.

The Department Doctoral Committee consists of 6 faculty, while one of its subcommittees, the Doctoral Practicum Committee, is comprised of 3 faculty and the present researcher. The ABA Practicum Site Evaluation Subcommittee (a subcommittee of the Doctoral Practicum Committee) consists of 5 site supervisors and the present researcher. The supervisors had previously been enrolled in the Department's ABA doctoral program. At the time of this study, 2 of the supervisors had dropped out of the ABA doctoral program, 3 of the subcommittee members were in the final phases of their course of study, and 1 had been awarded the doctorate.

The practicum site supervisors often are students or graduates of the Department, while others have had little behavioral training in the area which they supervise. The extent of the supervisors' ABA training remains unclear at this time, and will be clarified as a result of this study. An overview of the sites, their target populations and service features is presented in Table 2. This listing is not exhaustive since students may petition to obtain credit from work experiences in the applied areas in lieu of practicum participation. This listing does however include practicum sites previously approved by the Doctoral Practicum Committee and available to the WMU student at the time of this study.

APPROVED ABA PRACTICUM LISTINGS

Site type	Site Name	Supervisor	Faculty
A. Western Michigan University	Psychological Services	Miltenberger	Fuqua
B. Primary/Secondary Schools	Croyden Avenue School		
	a) Classrooms	Green	Mountjoy
	b) Home-School Comp.	Cowart	Fuqua
	Schoolcraft Project	T.B.D.	Farris
	Valley Center	Kaye	Petty
C. Community Mental Health	McKercher Rehabilitation	Lodge	Fuqua
	Center for Developmentally Disabled Adults	D. Sluyter	Fuqua
	Valley Center	Kaye	Petty
D. Residential Treatment (public/private)	Lakeside Boys & Girls Residence	Anne Sluyter	Fuqua

Table 1.

OVERVIEW OF SITES

Site type & name	Target Population	Service Features
A. Psychological Services	Ambulatory, modertaely impaired-to-normal children (4 yrs. & up) and adults from surrounding area.	1:1 and group therapy, family therapy, counseling, self-management education.
B. Croyden Avenue School: Classrooms	Severely mentally and/or multiply impaired, birth through 25 years.	Basic classroom programming, behaviorally-based, multidisciplinary approach
B. Croyden Avenue School: Home-School Component	(Same as above) and their relevant family systems and teachers.	Consultation, behavior measurement and intervention, staff & parent training.
B. Schoolcraft Project	Children in regular and/or special education, grades K-12.	provides consultation to teachers, administrators, and parents. Carries out educational program design, evaluation & research.

Table 2.

OVERVIEW OF SITES (continued)

Site Type & name	Target Populations	Service Features
B. Valley Center & C.	Emotionally impaired children and adolescents (8-16 years) and their families.	(Special Education): Behaviorally-based self-contained classrooms with token economies, performance contracting, etc. (Mental Health): Consultation with teachers, parents. other mental health workers; 1:1 counseling & therapy, group therapy; parent training.
C. McKercher Rehab.	Moderately mentally impaired adults	Sheltered workshops, work activity centers.
C. Center for Developmentally Disabled Adults	Severely mentally impaired adults	Speech & language training, basic adult instruction in activities of daily living, multidisciplinary team approach
D. Lakeside Boys & Girls Residence	Emotionally impaired children (6-14 years) and their relevant family systems.	Campus-based residential treatment facility, multidisciplinary, behaviorally-based treatment programs; parent (natural & foster) training.

Table 2. (continued)

Faculty members volunteer to sponsor a practicum on the basis of their interest in a given population or service, their willingness to serve as the faculty contact person in relation to a given site, and on the size and distribution of their workloads. The faculty member might be responsible for several sites, and/or may be involved with both undergraduate and masters-level practica in addition to doctoral-level practica.

As of December, 1981, there were 52 ABA doctoral students, 29 of whom had yet to complete their practicum requirements. Of these 52 students, 44% were successful in petitioning and obtaining a waiver of at least 3 credit hours of practicum requirements, often due to past work experiences, prior coursework or practica undertaken elsewhere. Furthermore, 20% of these 52 students were able to waive 6 credits, while 20% were successful in having 9 or more credits waived.

Approximately 28% of the 32 ABA students awarded the doctorate by December, 1981, had waived at least 3 credit hours of practicum. About 16% of those 32 graduates had waived 6 credit hours of practicum. Approximately 6% had 9 or more credit hours of practicum requirements waived.

The rate of practicum selection by all ABA doctoral students was relatively low, with the total practicum enrollment averaging 1.22 students per fall and winter semesters and .89 students per spring and summer terms.

These data represent a low number of students actually affected by the Department's ABA doctoral practicum systems from semester to semester.

Procedure

The development of an effective system requires procedures specifically related to previously established goals. Provided below under each relevant goal is the specific procedure to be followed leading to goal achievement.

GOAL 1: A set of ABA practicum site evaluation criteria will be established through the combined efforts of select site supervisors, the Doctoral Practicum Committee, and this researcher.

A tentative list of ABA competencies considered to have general utility to the professional behavior analyst will be developed. The basis of initial competency selection will be documents provided by the Doctoral Practicum Committee members, other Departmental faculty, the State of Minnesota (evaluation criteria leading to state approval as an expert behavior analyst), and informal communication with other professional behavior analysts.

A subcommittee of the Doctoral Practicum Committee will be formed. This subcommittee, the ABA Practicum Site Evaluation Subcommittee, will be comprised of representatives of both the

University and community agencies which employ behavior analysts and provide services to a variety of recipients. Service populations to be represented include developmentally disabled adults, youths and children, emotionally impaired children and youth, parents, college students, public school personnel and mental health agencies. Service delivery systems represented will include residential services, sheltered workshop and day activity centers, community mental health out-patient services, special education, public school consultation services, Department courses, and a research and consultation corporation.

This subcommittee will be provided with the tentative list of ABA competencies and will be asked to rate each competency area and each specific skill requirement on the basis of its relative importance to the professional behavior analyst in the applied setting. A 1-to-5 scale will be employed, 1 representing not important and 5 representing very important. The rating process will occur during subcommittee meetings on an instrument provided by this researcher (see Appendix A). Each item will be discussed to the subcommittee's satisfaction, and a rating obtained from each committee member. An average rating will be obtained for each item and a report of the results will be provided to the Doctoral Practicum Committee. This report will provide both a summary of the results as well as an item-by-item mean rating of each competency receiving a mean rating of 2.5 or higher.

The Doctoral Practicum Committee will then consider the recommended ratings and will accept, modify or reject each of the items presented and their relative ratings. Once consensus is reached, this committee will submit a report to the Department Doctoral Committee recommending adoption of the general criteria to be utilized in ABA Practicum site evaluation. This report will contain all the relevant competencies recommended by the Doctoral Practicum Committee. It will not contain the ratings, which might later need to be adjusted as suggested by the data. Once approval and adoption of the criteria is obtained, the collection of data relative to these criteria will be legitimatized through Departmental sanction.

GOAL 2: A practicum site evaluation system will be developed and field tested to ensure adequate data collection and analysis, while conserving faculty and site resources. This system will provide for regular re-evaluation of selected sites.

The ABA Practicum Site Evaluation Subcommittee will explore and develop a model evaluation system which will then be implemented on a trial basis across several select sites. At least one site will be randomly selected from each of the 4 site groupings (i.e., WMU, Academic, CMH, Residential). In order to facilitate model development, a proposed design will be provided for initial discussion. This proposed model will feature a ten-step process:

1. The site evaluator will make an appointment to visit the site and relevant site personnel.

2. The evaluator will interview site personnel and complete a site application form, describing the features and capability of the site and supervising personnel (See Appendix D).
3. The evaluator will complete an initial evaluation form utilizing site evaluation criteria approved by the Department. This will be accomplished during an interview with site personnel.
4. The students who have earned practica credits at the site over the past 1½ years will be identified, as will students currently earning practicum credit at the site.
5. Questionnaires will be submitted to these students requesting information relevant to the site evaluation criteria.
6. The evaluator will tabulate results.
7. The evaluator will provide a summary of the results to the Doctoral Practicum Committee.
8. The Doctoral Practicum Committee will approve/disapprove the site according to criteria developed by the committee, and make recommendations for improving site training activities. These recommendations will be transmitted to the faculty site sponsor, the site supervisor and the site administrator.

9. On the anniversary date of initial approval, the original site application form will be recycled back to the site, which in turn will pen in (in red) any changes it deems necessary and appropriate. The site will then return the form to the Doctoral Practicum Committee for re-accreditation.
10. Student feedback from data systems to be described below will be analyzed. These data will relate to site performance from the previous evaluation to the current reapplication. Recycle back to Step 6.

Each subsequent re-evaluation will follow the same procedure, except that the updated site application form current as of the date of the re-evaluation will be recycled back to the site in lieu of the original Site Application Form. This procedure will reduce the response effort and time requirement incurred by each site in the reapplication process.

It is anticipated that this researcher would function as the evaluator. Alternate evaluators will be explored and a recommendation provided to the Department regarding who might fulfill this role on a regular basis should this model be eventually accepted by the Department. Alternatives to be provided might be the utilization of a part-time adjunct faculty having as his or her responsibility the role of the evaluator; and/or, perhaps a team of graduate students might perform data collection functions in exchange for academic credit and/or faculty recognition.

GOAL 3: Practicum site performance in relation to training activities to be undertaken by the selected sites will be evaluated and validated through the combined efforts of relevant selected site supervisors, the Doctoral Practicum Committee, practicum students, and this researcher.

The actual validation of training activities accomplished by the sites will result from the implementation of the model evaluation system. Crucial to this system will be the WMU ABA Practicum Site Evaluation Form, which will contain the site evaluation criteria approved by the Department and the relative ratings approved by the Doctoral Practicum Committee. Each selected site will be evaluated by the administration of this instrument, and a total score derived. The maximum score will be 100. Following trial implementation, the resulting data will be reviewed by the Doctoral Practicum Committee and tentative minimally acceptable scores derived. The results of the execution of step 5 of the model (student questionnaires) will corroborate, challenge, or invalidate the data obtained by the Site Evaluation Form, and might thereby result in the modification of the results of the latter. Since it would be possible for a site to revise its practicum training program along the lines suggested by the evaluation criteria subsequent to the last practicum credit earned at the site, a lack of student questionnaire - Site Evaluation Form correspondence/corroboration might be obtained. Sites would therefore be able to appeal their accreditation rating should such discrepancies exist.

The appeal of accreditation ratings may occur at any time, contingent upon the site requesting a re-examination by the Doctoral Practicum Committee. A form will thereupon be sent to the site, which will require the site to articulate the basis for their appeal. Supportive documentation will also be requested. Appendix G contains an example form.

Accreditation ratings will be of three types: full, partial, and temporary. The latter type will be awarded by the Doctoral Practicum Committee should the site meet minimally acceptable standards prior to the actual enrollment of students. Once student questionnaires are obtained and evaluated, the site could be awarded full or partial accreditation (or, of course, be rejected).

Full accreditation will result from the site meeting minimally acceptable standards supported by student feedback.

Partial accreditation could be awarded should major portions of the evaluation criteria be met and verified through student feedback, although the total site performance might fall below minimally acceptable standards. Partial accreditation would be offered to a site contingent upon its willingness to work toward full accreditation, which in turn must be achieved by the site within one year from the partial approval. As indicated earlier, accreditation would hold for one year, and would be renewable annually.

GOAL 4: A process for monitoring and developing improved site training and supervision by qualified applied behavior analysts will be developed and field tested.

Monitoring of site performance will be accomplished through site visitations by the site evaluator and through practicum student responses on questionnaires. A questionnaire will be developed based on site evaluation criteria, and will be sent to students participating in practica, and to students who have previously enrolled in practica within 1½ years. A cover letter from both the Department Doctoral Committee chairperson and the Doctoral Practicum Committee chairperson will accompany the questionnaire, describing the desire of the Department to obtain information of site training activities. The questionnaire will be returned directly to the Doctoral Practicum Committee and will be analyzed by this researcher. The data obtained will be compared to data obtained by the site evaluator on the site evaluation form. A pattern of significant discrepancies across several student respondents and a site evaluation form will suggest possible site misrepresentation, resulting in a request from the Doctoral Practicum Committee to the site for clarification and documentation. Again, the eventual outcome of this process will be the acceptance or rejection of site accreditation.

The monitoring described above will produce data revealing areas in which the sites need assistance. The extent to which assistance might be required by any and all sites remains an empirical question, and no attempt will be made to provide extensive and exhaustive technical assistance to all sites. To the extent that resources and time provide, this researcher will provide technical assistance to the selected sites, upon their request, in an effort to resolve problems identified by prior site evaluation. Furthermore, a "Practicum Site Manaul" will be developed by this researcher, identifying the essential features of a fully accreditated site, providing necessary forms, background information and other materials potentially useful to the site. The results of the prior site evaluation will also be shared, and help offered in relation to solving some of the problems identified. These materials will be provided immediately following accreditation. The utilization of temporary or partial accreditation ratings provides each site with the opportunity to resolve clearly articulated site deficiencies, and to seek technical assistance to this end.

The results of the application of technical assistance on site performance will be monitored through the systems developed by this study (e.g., Site Evaluation Form) and through data collected by this researcher and verified by site personnel. The data will in-

dicate what was attempted, when, and what the results were. The documentation of favorable gains will result in an appropriate correction or modification of the prior Site Evaluation Form, and the prior deficiency will be considered ameliorated. This information will be shared with the Doctoral Practicum Committee, and the Site Capability Matrix updated, if necessary.

GOAL 5: A set of data describing the validated training capabilities of each site will be generated, formatted and disseminated to faculty as an aid in matching student needs with site training capabilities. In addition, each site's ability to provide qualified supervision required by state licensure requirements will be provided.

Subsequent to the evaluation of site performance, data will be placed on a practicum site capability matrix representing the current site status and capability. On one side of the matrix all practicum sites will be listed. On an adjoining side, several features and performance areas derived from the site evaluation criteria will be listed. The various features and areas are:

1. faculty contact person
2. check prerequisite listing
3. entry level skills assessed
4. licensed psychologist supervisor
5. normal population
6. behaviorally (emotionally) impaired

7. mentally impaired
8. multiply impaired
9. physically impaired
10. children
    a. pre-school
    b. elementary (grades K-6)
    c. adolescents (grades 7-12)
11. adults
12. special training in items 3-9 above
13. behavior analysis
14. behavior change
15. public relations training
16. research
17. systems/management
18. staff training
19. parent training
20. consultation

The data placed within the matrix will be coded as (F) for full approval, (T) for temporary approval, and (P) for partial approval. These data will reflect the accreditation status of each site as well as site capabilities. The matrix will thus provide a "shopping list" for both students and faculty, allowing them to match site features with student interest and needs.

Copies of the matrix will be provided to all Department faculty.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Goal 1

In order to establish site evaluation criteria, the Doctoral Practicum Evaluation Sub-Commiteee met on October 26 and 29, and November 10 and 16, 1981, and explored possible site evaluation criteria utilizing the format developed by this researcher (see Appendix A). The sub-committee subsequently developed and sent to the Doctoral Practicum Committee the report found in Appendix B, which describes various dimensions on which sites should be evaluated. Each dimension has various components and subcomponents, each of which is rated in terms of the relative importance of that item to the dimension which it addresses, as indicated earlier.

The Doctoral Practicum Committee considered the recommendations brought to it, and made several modifications to the dimensions and ratings recommended by the subcommittee. In April of 1982, the committee submitted its recommendations to the Department Doctoral Committee (see Appendix C), which subsequently endorsed the criteria as presented, constituting achievement of Goal 1. Departmental sanction of the criteria and relevant data collection is reflected in cover letters accompanying several of the forms presented elsewhere in this paper (Appendix D; Appendix F).

The ratings applied to the various criteria by the Doctoral Practicum Committee were later converted to another numerical system covered under Goal 3 in this chapter. The results relating to Goal 3 will provide a complete (but somewhat abridged) listing of the criteria and their relative weights as approved by the Doctoral Practicum Committee.

Goal 2

The ten-step practicum site evaluation system proposed earlier (pp. 51-53) was adopted and field tested across all sites rather than four as proposed. All sites were inspected by this researcher who completed a site application form for all but one site; the latter site's supervisor completed the form prior to site visitation. Further, this researcher completed an evaluation form (see Goal 3 results) during interviews with each site supervisor for all but one site; the latter site was one directed by this researcher, and in order to promote objectivity, a masters-level graduate student who had previously taken a practicum course at the site was interviewed in lieu of the supervisor.

An attempt was made to identify doctoral-level practicum students who might have taken practica at the various sites from the fall of 1980 through the summer of 1982, as required by Step 4 of the site evaluation system. No site reported serving such students during this period, and careful subsequent inspection of the student

files maintained by the Department Doctoral Committee verified that no applied behavior analysis students had enrolled in Psychology 599/699 at an approved site during this period. As a result, Step 5 (student questionnaire data collection) could not be completed.

This researcher has tabulated the results of the site evaluations, which are provided in this chapter, and has also provided these results to the Doctoral Practicum Committee for consideration along with individual site evaluation reports (see Appendix H). Thus, Steps 6 and 7 have been completed.

The remaining steps of the system are continuing, long-term functions of the Department, should it desire to adopt the model system provided. However, it should be noted that the Doctoral Practicum Committee has already completed Step 8 by approving/disapproving the various sites for accreditation and forwarding recommendations to each site from this researcher regarding ways in which the sites should improve; these recommendations carry the endorsement of the entire committee.

Goal 3

As indicated earlier, the ABA Doctoral Practicum Site Evaluation Form served a critical function in the evaluation of each site, since it represents the vehicle through which the Department's criteria are applied to measure site performance. This

document may be found in its entirety in Appendix E. Provisions are made in the instrument to enable the long-term follow-up of site performance.

The instrument was developed based on the criteria generated by the Practicum Site Evaluation Subcommittee as approved by the Doctoral Practicum Committee and Department Doctoral Committee. It reflects the ratings previously obtained by the first two committees, but required a transformation of the data from ratings to relative weightings.

The determination of weightings (i.e., point values) was made as follows. First, the number of items (components and subcomponents) under each of the five dimensions was calculated and summed across dimensions. The number of items in a given dimension was then divided by the number of all items in all dimensions and multiplied by 100, thereby resulting in the percentage of all items contained within each dimension. The percentage points obtained within a given dimension were then distributed to the items in that dimension in proportion to the individual ratings of those items. Thus, if 12% of the points were allocated to dimension "A", and that dimension contained 5 components with ratings of 3, 3, 4 and 5, respectively, then those components would assume weightings (or point values) proportionately, viz., 2.4, 2.4, 3.2 and 4, respectively. As a result of this procedure,

the values of all items sum to 100 (in other words, each item's value is expressed as a percentage of the total number of points available for all dimensions of that evaluation). This weighting process simplified computations subsequent to each site evaluation, while still preserving to some extent the relative ratings of each of the items comprising the evaluation.

Although nine sites were evaluated, the scores obtained from one site were so discrepant from the scores obtained from other sites that they were not included in the data base provided in this chapter; their inclusion would have negatively skewed any aggregated data and thereby misrepresented the performance of the vast majority of other sites. The data indicate that this site had little previous experience with practicum students, and although desirous of developing whatever systems might be required to gain accreditation, did not have such systems in operation at the time of this evaluation.

Table 3 lists the five dimensions comprised of thirty-five items. The weightings based on the ratings obtained from the Doctoral Practicum Committee appear in the third column across from each item. Sub-totals have been computed for each of the five dimensions and each of the subcomponents of Dimensions III and IV. To the right of each sub-total are data obtained from implementation of the practicum evaluation system. Provided in

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

Dimensions	Description and Components	Weight	MEAN SCORE	% OF TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	% OF ALL SITES EARNING FULL CREDIT
I	Entry level competencies: criterion & check				
	A. minimum competencies stated	3			88
	B. entry level skills assessed by site	3			88
	sub-total	6	5.63	94	88
II	Goal & objective setting and evaluation				
	A. Proposed skill repertoires to be acquired through the practicum established	3			88
	B. Mechanism for evaluating skill acquisition and exit level skills established	4			88
	C. Mechanism for identifying and executing new or unique tasks, jobs, etc., established	2			75
	D. Mechanism for evaluating and/or recycling any aspect of the practicum by either site or student prior to practicum end established	3			88
	sub-total	12	10.3	86	63

Table 3

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA (continued)

Dimensions	Description and Components	Weight	MEAN SCORE	% OF TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	% OF ALL SITES EARNING FULL CREDIT
III	Evidence of training in four core skill areas				
	A. Behavior analysis				
	1. Functional analysis of behavior and its controlling variables				
	a. Historical analyses of problem behavior & its antecedents and consequences	3.1			88
	b. Preliminary ID of current motivating operations & deprivation states	3.1			88
	2. Measurement systems				
	a. Target behaviors operationally defined	3.1			100
	b. Data recording techniques used appropriate to situation	2.6			100
	c. Data collection reliable & valid	2.6			88

Table 3 (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA (continued)

Dimensions	Description and Components	Weight	MEAN SCORE	% OF TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	% OF ALL SITES EARNING FULL CREDIT
III cont.	d. Procedure for displaying and analyzing data developed and followed	2.6			75
	Sub-total A	17.1	15.4	90	75
	B. Behavior Change				
	1. Evidence of brief behavior change proposals	2.6			75
	2. Recognition/evaluation of alternative interventions, including ehtical-legal implications	3.1			50
	3. Proficiency in applying many behavior change techniques	3.1			50
	4. Evidence of brief written reports of results	2.6			88
	Sub-total B	11.4	7.3	64	13

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA (continued)

Dimensions	Description and Components	Weight	MEAN SCORE	% OF TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	% OF ALL SITES EARNING FULL CREDIT
III cont.	C. Public Relations/Professional Skills				
	1. Training in proper protocol, rules, regulations, procedures, administrative hierarchy and lines of communication pertaining to site	3.1			100
	2. Training in professional modes and styles of oral and written communication, including grammar, conservation of words, eye contact and clear articulation, neatness and legibility of written work, listening with demonsrated understanding, use of lay or technical language appropriate to situation, proper affect.	3.1			100
	Sub-total C	6.2	6.2	100	100

Table 3 (continued)

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA (continued)

Dimensions	Description and Components	Weight	MEAN SCORE	% OF TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	% OF ALL SITES EARNING FULL CREDIT
III cont.	D. Specialty or unique feature of site and target population				
	a. Basis terminology, procedures, etc., relevant to area, plus proper application	2.6			100
	2. Behavior analysis of concerns or problems in the specialty area(s)	2.6			88
	3. Formulating goals, objectives and/or strategies potentially useful in ameliorating unique problems and concerns	3.1			88
	Sub-total D	8.3	7.6	92	88
	Sub-Total	43.0	36.5	85	13

Table 3 (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA (continued)

Dimensions	Description and Components	Weight	MEAN SCORE	% OF TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	% OF ALL SITES EARNING FULL CREDIT
IV	Adequacy of supervision of practicum students				
	A. Supervisor's background and competency in applied behavior analysis; graduate or post M.A./Ph.D. training in applied behavior analysis, or equivalent experience, verified by relevant university ABA faculty or post M.A./Ph.D. training site supervisor(s) Sub-total A	3.1	3.1	100	100
	B. Supervisory methods. Evidence of:				
	1. direct observation of students	3.1			88
	2. analysis of permanent products (e.g., treatment plans, reports, graphs, etc.)	3.1			100
	3. peer or staff reviews of student performance	1.8			88

Table 3 (continued)

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA (continued)

Dimensions	Description and Components	Weight	MEAN SCORE	% OF TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	% OF ALL SITES EARNING FULL CREDIT
IV cont.	B. 4. receiving system feedback from, for example, clients, patients, pupils, staff, etc., where feasible (severely language impaired respondents excluded)	2.5			63
	5. weekly meetings with practicum students to discuss and plan practicum activities of a length appropriate to the number of credit hours undertaken	3.1			100
	Sub-total B	13.6	12.1	89	50
	C. Supervisor's evaluation of practicum student's performance				
	1. Latency (period from practicum student's performance to "feedback" from supervisor) averages less than 1 week	3.1			100

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA (continued)

Dimensions	Description and Components	Weight	MEAN SCORE	% OF TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	% OF ALL SITES EARNING FULL CREDIT
IV cont.	C. 2. Frequency averages no less than 1 per week.	3.1			100
	3. Documentation of negotiation of revised training objectives contingent upon supervisor's, student's, and faculty's evaluation of progress, interest, and student's needs	2.5			50
	4. Documentation of systematic follow-up on revised training objectives	2.5			63
	5. Documentation of written specification and validation of what skills were acquired by the student during the practicum	3.1			13
	Sub-total C	14.3	9.4	66	13
	Sub-Total	31.0	24.7	80	0

Table 3 (continued)

Table 3 (continued)

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA (continued)

Dimensions	Description and Components	Weight	MEAN SCORE	% OF TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	% OF ALL SITES EARNING FULL CREDIT
V	Provision of a practicum environment conducive to the acquisition of new skills.				
	A. Students participate in direct intervention with clients to the extent specified within a written contract completed by student, supervisor and faculty prior to the practicum (e.g., "Permission to elect Psy 599/699" form, etc.	2.5			50
	B. Shaping of skill repertoires through appropriate supervisory methods and consequation of student performance	3.0			88
	C. Documentation and provision of a training manual, packet, or other materials containing organizational charts, forms, procedures, and/or				

SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA (continued)

Dimensions	Description and Components	Weight	MEAN SCORE	% OF TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	% OF ALL SITES EARNING FULL CREDIT
V cont.	C. (cont.) other information pertinent to the development of the student's skills in functioning as part of the agency, and carrying out the activities of the practicum.	2.5			88
	Sub-Total	8.0	6.1	76	38
	TOTAL	100.0	83.1	XX	0
	ADDENDUM				
III	NON-CORE SKILL TRAINING AREAS: SCORE SUMMARIES		N Score		
	E. Systems design, development and/or resource management systems	100.0	2 100		
	F. Staff ( ) Parent ( ) training, and/or ( ) consultation	100.0	5 100 1 89 1 46		
	G. Research	100.0	1 100		

Table 3 (continued)

the fourth column are mean scores for the various dimensions and subcomponents of Dimensions III and IV. In the fifth column, the percentage of total possible points reflected by each mean score is noted. Finally, the last column provides the percentage of all sites earning full credit for each item, subcomponent, and dimension.

For example, Dimension I relates to practicum student entry level skills. The first component required a statement by the site of any minimum competencies or prerequisites required in order for a student to enroll in practica at that site. The third column in Table 3 indicates that this item has a value of 3, that is, 3% of the total site evaluation score will depend upon this item. The score in the last column to the right indicates that 88% of all sites earned full credit for this item (i.e., seven out of eight sites met criterion). The next item provides similar data for site assessment of entry level skills. The sub-total summaries indicate a mean score of 5.63, or 94% of the 6.00 total points available within this dimension. Again, 88% of all sites earned full credit on this Dimension.

The data in Table 3 indicate that all sites met criterion in ten of the thirty-five items contained within the primary evaluation, or approximately 29% of the items assessed. In addition, several sites scored favorably in the supplemental non-core skill training areas (e.g., systems, training/consultation, and research),

representing the secondary evaluation. In this latter group, both sites seeking accreditation in systems training obtained scores of 100%, as did five sites seeking accreditation in training/consultation. Of the two additional sites seeking the latter accreditation, one site obtained a score of 89% and the other scored 46%. The sole site seeking research accreditation scored 100% in that area.

While most sites were successful in meeting most of the remaining criteria in the primary evaluation, some discrepancies between desired and actual site performance were obtained. Some of these discrepancies were minor, however. For example, while only 63% of the sites received full credit under Dimension II, the average scores (10.3, or 86%) were considered acceptable. Similarly, while only one site (i.e., 13% of the sites) received full credit for the four components of Dimension III, the average scores for the sites were satisfactory (26.5, or 85%). Other examples of such minor discrepancies can be observed in the sub-totals for component IV and sub-component IV.B., and the sub-total for component V. While no site received a perfect score on the entire evaluation, the average total score was 83.1%.

Certain other discrepancies indicate possible areas of major deficiencies across a relatively large number of sites. For example, the behavior change sub-component (Dimension III.B.) shows only one site as meeting all the criteria in this sub-component, with sites

producing average scores of 64%, which reflects only marginal performance. Closer inspection of the data show that only half the sites received credit for training practicum students to recognize and evaluate alternative behavior change interventions and their respective ethical-legal implications. Similarly, only half the sites trained practicum students to be proficient in applying many behavior change techniques.

Marginal performance (63%) was also obtained in relation to item IV.B.4. which determines whether sites attempt to obtain information concerning practicum student performance from individuals receiving such services. However, other items within this sub-component were satisfactory, reflecting adequate supervisory methods. While all sites appear to be supervised by individuals with adequate behavioral training (IV.A.), and the latency and frequency of student evaluations by the supervisor are excellent (IV.C.1-2.), half the sites failed to provide documentation of any process for negotiating revised training objectives for practicum students. Three sites also failed to provide documentation of any process for following up on revised training objectives.

Perhaps the most dramatic discrepancy between desired performance and reported performance is in the area of the documentation of skills acquired by practicum students during the course of the practica (IV.C.5.), where only one site met criterion. In general,

most sites completed the open-ended form provided by the Department without articulating in detail the nature and extent of the behaviors learned by the practicum student while on site.

Finally, only half the sites reported specifying in writing the extent to which practicum students would directly intervene with the relevant service population (V.A.).

Since no site served doctoral practicum students in the past 1½ years, only temporary accreditation could be recommended for the eight sites reported above. Contingent upon supportive documentation from practicum students, six of the eight sites received recommendations for advancement to full accreditation. This recommendation was provided to sites obtaining total scores equal to or greater than 80% on the evaluation. For the two sites receiving scores in the 60 - 79% range, a recommendation was offered for partial accreditation contingent upon supportive documentation from practicum students, until certain deficiencies were remediated.

No appeals were executed by the sites; no requests for re-examination were received by the Doctoral Practicum Committee. All sites indicated in writing that they would strive to remove any deficiencies noted (see Appendix H).

The above results indicate the attainment of Goal 3.

Goal 4

This goal provided for the monitoring of site performance through site visitations and practicum student responses on a questionnaire. In relation to the former, data presented earlier in this chapter have articulated the outcomes of site visitation. In addition, an exit interview was held at each site during which the preliminary results of the evaluation were presented to the site supervisor. The intent of these interviews was to verify the information previously conveyed, and amplify and clarify the results of the evaluation as well as the suggestions for improvement contained within the site evaluation report to be forwarded to the Doctoral Practicum Committee.

Although no doctoral-level practicum students could be identified that had completed Psychology 599/699 at an approved ABA site over the past 1½ years, and therefore no completed questionnaires could be obtained, a questionnaire was nevertheless developed for this purpose (see Appendix F). The ABA Practicum Questionnaire was designed to closely follow the ABA Practicum Site Evaluation Form in relation to both content and format, and was field tested on several masters-level psychology students and modified accordingly. Further refinement of the questionnaire will be at the discretion of the Department.

Another facet of the present paper is the generation of a

Practicum Site Manual (see Appendix G) for distribution and utilization by the various sites. This manual provides all the information sites need to have in order for them to develop systems leading to accreditation. Among the areas covered are sections on accreditation, site evaluation procedures, internal (program) audit hints and checksheets, appeal procedures, and a suggested format and content for "practicum students handbooks" tailored to meet the needs of both the sites and the Department. Several appendices are provided, including suggested forms and procedures. These Practicum Site Manuals were delivered following accreditation.

In relation to the provision of technical assistance to sites requesting help in the accreditation process, all but one site requested such assistance. The assistance required in most cases was minimal. In these instances, the provision of the Practicum Site Manual and continued informal follow-up is likely to resolve any substantive problems which some of the sites have experienced. Several other sites do require continued assistance in order to provide quality practicum experiences.

The data reported under this goal indicate that substantial portions of goal 4 were achieved.

Goal 5

The Site Capability Matrix is found in Table 4. This matrix describes various features of practica on the left side, and indicates the accredited practicum sites along the top. For purposes of the present paper, the site names have been replaced by numbers corresponding to the site evaluations found in Appendix H. Provision is made in the matrix for additional accredited sites.

As indicated earlier, either a P, T, or F was inserted in the appropriate matrix block depending on whether the site provided evidence of the feature represented by that block, and whether the site obtained partial, temporary, or full accreditation, respectively.

The determination of whether a given site provided evidence of the features described along the left side of the matrix was made in different ways according to the nature of the feature. For example, although one clinically-oriented site might occasionally serve a child, it was not indicated that services to children was a "feature" of this site. To do so would misrepresent the typical population served by this site to faculty and potential students. Since the intent of this matrix is to guide faculty and students in the selection of appropriate training resources to meet the needs and interests of the student, it was critical that the matrix represent the typical experiences and training features that a student would receive at each site.

SITE CAPABILITY MATRIX: August, 1982, No. 1

Feature	Sites									
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII		
1. Faculty contact person	FUQUA	MTJY	FUQUA	FUQUA	FUQUA	FUQUA	FARRIS	PETTY		
2. Check prerequisite listing		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
3. Entry skills assessed	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T		
4. Lic. Psychologist Supr.	LIM.									
5. Normal or mildly impaired population						T	T			
6. Behaviorally (emotionally) impaired				T				T		
7. Mentally impaired	T	T	T		T					
8. Multiply impaired		T	T							
9. Physically impaired	T	T	T							
10. Children										
a. pre-school		T	T							
b. elem. (K-6)		T	T	T			T	T		
c. adoles. (7-12)		T	T	Early			T	T		
11. Adults	T				T	T				
12. Special training in nos. 6-11	T	T	T	T		T	T	T		
13. Behavior analysis		T	T	T	T	T	T	T		
14. Behavior change			T	T	T		T	T		
15. Public relations trng	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T		
16. Research								T		
17. Systems/management		T		T						
18. Staff training										
19. Parent training	T							T		
20. Consultation		T		T	T		T			

Table 4

Features related to the evaluation criteria (e.g., behavior analysis, behavior change, public relations training, etc.) were determined to be characteristic of a site if that site scored at least 60% on the relevant dimension or component of a dimension. Thus, for example, practicum sites that received credit for only two of the four items under the behavior change component could never receive more than 54.4% on this component, regardless of the combination of any two items within it. As a result, no F, T, or P was placed in the relevant matrix block for such a site.

Inspection of the matrix reveals a comprehensive array of training experiences available to practicum students, with many different service populations evident. Children are the most frequently served population.

Of interest is the paucity of sites having a licensed psychologist who might provide supervision; only one site reported such staff, who had a limited rather than full license.

Also noted is a similar lack of sites that could provide training in applied research, with only one site reporting this capability. Most sites reported a willingness to serve students wishing to carry out theses or dissertations at their sites, but indicated that their sites would not be able to provide training in relation to research skills.

Although both the Department and the Doctoral Practicum Evaluation Sub-Committee have indicated that it would be desirable

for students to receive training in how to effectively train staff, no such opportunities are provided by the practicum sites.

Included in the Site Capability Matrix is a listing of each faculty contact person sponsoring each site, as well as a listing of those sites that require specific courses or skills as prerequisites for course enrollment at that site.

Future updating of this matrix will be at the discretion of the Department.

The production and dissemination of the matrix prior to the beginning of fall semester, 1982, satisfies Goal 5.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The five goals which this study was to have achieved have been met. First, a set of ABA practicum site evaluation criteria have been developed with input from the field and Department of Psychology, and have been approved by the Department for use in the evaluation and accreditation of practicum sites. Although the evaluation criteria represent a cross section of judgements from multiple sources regarding the appropriateness and relative importance of each item listed, no attempt was made to validate the criteria on a broad scale (e.g., state-wide, regionally, or nationally). The criteria were to represent the judgements of professional behavior analysts in the community at large, as well as the judgements of the faculty of the Department of Psychology at Western Michigan University. These judgements are presumably based on the needs of the community providing behavioral analysis and behavior change services, and therefore suggest the kinds of professional skills required of behavior analysts graduating from the Department. Although a case could be made for the generality of the criteria and their appropriateness within many contexts, extensive field testing on a broad geographic and demographic scale should be carried out as a

prelude to general acceptance of these criteria.

Second, a practicum site evaluation system has been developed and field tested to the extent possible. The ten-step process involved is easily administered, and ensures dialog between the Department, sites, and practicum students (when participating students can be identified). The provision of the Site Evaluation Report (see Appendix H) to each site is an important contribution to the development of the practicum sites, for it makes clear recommendations to each site on ways the site might improve its service delivery to practicum students. It also verifies for each site the particular areas of competencies the site displays, and provides a source of potential reinforcement to sites for improving practicum training. Further, it provides a written record to the Department Doctoral Committee and its Doctoral Practicum Committee regarding the performance of each site. For the first time, the Department is able to track not only what is being taught during practica, but who is in fact teaching it, and how it is being taught.

Unfortunately, although the mechanism for objectively assessing practicum site performance is provided by the present study, the degree of confidence one might have in the data must necessarily be limited. For in the absence of corroborating data from practicum students, any data reported in the present study must be considered tentative. It is possible that sites provided the

Department with data that each site thought the Department wished to hear, regardless of its authenticity. Since no site had served a doctoral-level practicum student over the past several years, it is conceivable that the site represented what it "probably" would do with a doctoral practicum student rather than what it typically does with such a student. Once again, only site-generated data verified by student responses on the ABA Practicum Questionnaire (see Appendix F) may be considered both reliable and valid.

The third goal achieved by the study was the actual implementation of the evaluation system and the development and field testing of the WMU ABA Practicum Site Evaluation Form (Appendix E). The form provides a standard vehicle for executing a fairly precise analysis of site performance. The use of five major dimensions and various sub-totals allows close inspection of both narrow and broad performance categories, enabling the evaluator to quickly identify areas of strengths and weaknesses. The provision of multiple columns across the form allows the results from each subsequent evaluation to be maintained on one form. The collocation of data should facilitate the tracking of site performance across all categories over time. Improvements as well as performance deteriorations should become immediately apparent across any item of any sub-component or component.

Although initial criteria of 60% and 80% were established for partial and full accreditation, these criteria may be altered over time as suggested by the data. For example, if most sites consistently scored in the 82% to 86% range, the criterion for full

accreditation could be shifted to 85% or 90%, in an effort to shape more satisfactory performance from the majority of sites. On the other hand, if the criteria prove too high, and sites can sufficiently support their contentions of unduly restrictive (or effortful) response requirements, the criteria may be reduced. The capability of such a flexible system to be sensitive to the data while still remaining under departmental control provides another advantage to this evaluation system.

The fact that there were no appeals or requests for re-examinations subsequent to reviewing the results of the evaluation suggests that the sites were satisfied with the validity of the evaluations, as well they should be; any results reported directly reflected site input.

The fourth goal accomplished was that of site performance monitoring and support services. Of course, initial monitoring was accomplished through the evaluation phase; however, the exit interview provided another opportunity to exchange information with the sites, answer any questions regarding procedure or Department requirements, etc.

Support services took the form of the production and dissemination of the Practicum Site Manual. A difficulty was encountered with the system as it relates to the distribution of these manuals. According to the system developed by this study, the distribution of manuals was to occur following accreditation. In one instance,

a site with limited experience with practicum students was not recommended for accreditation. A systemic "Catch-22" resulted: the site was not accredited, therefore no Practicum Site Manual was provided to the site; the site therefore had no means to develop systems required for accreditation since it was deprived of the manual, and was not able to gain accreditation, etc. In the future, all sites seeking accreditation should be provided with the manual in advance of the evaluation.

A major part of the fourth goal was not accomplished, viz., the collection of practicum student responses on the ABA Practicum Questionnaire. As indicated earlier, no doctoral students have participated in Psychology 599/699 in an approved site since before fall semester, 1980. Initially, the requirement that a potential questionnaire respondent must have undertaken practica at a site within the past 1½ years was meant to preclude the acquisition of data which might not be representative of current site practices. Since sites do experience staff turnover, and since systems may change from time to time, "old" data would seem to have little validity for the purposes of this study. As the study progressed, and it became evident that no eligible respondents would be identified, a search was made of the files maintained by the Department Doctoral Committee. The results of this search identified the data reported elsewhere in this paper (see Subjects and Setting, p. 45).

It appears from these data that a relatively large number of students are able to either petition successfully to have prior coursework or practica serve in lieu of Psychology 599/699, or are successful in obtaining a waiver of the practica due to prior work experience, etc. Although it seems reasonable for such mechanisms (i.e., petitions and waivers) to exist, it also seems reasonsble to require students and faculty to document the skills and experiences obtained as a function of these prior activities. Furthermore, it seems reasonable for documentation to be obtained by the previous site or job supervisor attesting to the alleged skill acquisition and experience.

It is also possible that some confusion by the faculty over the differences envisioned between Psychology 599, 699 and 712 might have resulted in students taking no courses under Psychology 599 or 699. It would seem advantageous if all faculty and students were reminded occasionally regarding the intent of the 599/699/712 sequence, and if tighter controls were adopted to prevent misuse of the sequence.

For example, a mandated course sequence conforming to the Psychology 599, 699 and 712 course descriptions should be conveyed to all faculty and students, with a mechanism for waivers and petitions which require the documentation of equivalent course or job content if taken elsewhere. Further, the graduate secretary at

the Department could dispense "control cards" which would have to be subsequently signed by the student's advisor before the cards could be functional in reserving a course for the student during registration. The secretary would dispense a Psychology 699 card only if documentation was in the student's file that the student had previously taken Psychology 599, or had been granted a waiver or petition. Thus, a "double check" would be effected: both the secretary and advisor would have to verify the appropriateness of the practicum or field experience requested by the student before the student could register.

However, the problem described above could likely be resolved if the Department would develop and implement a system similar to that reported by Maher (1980). As reported in the present paper's Introduction, Maher developed an "I.T.P." for his students. This Individualized Training Program (or I.T.P.) provided a sequence of training that met both the student's needs and his/her interests. The student and his/her advisor worked closely in developing the I.T.P. which, although designed to provide guidance to the student's program, was flexible and responsive to any changes in the student's program deemed necessary. If such a sequence of advance practicum planning could be systematized within the Department, it would be unlikely that students could by-pass or circumvent the practicum requirement.

In response to a general need to have informed decision-making by both faculty and students in relation to practicum selections, goal five was undertaken. The resulting Site Capability Matrix could be utilized during the planning of a student's I.T.P. For example, a student might wish to become a behavioral expert in the area of mental retardation. In concert with his advisor, the student could identify sites on the Site Capability Matrix that satisfy his interests, say, a practicum with mentally impaired adults in a sheltered workshop setting. Finally, the student might wish to have a field placement (Psychology 712) in a residential program for the mentally impaired. In this last case, such a program is not represented on the matrix, indicating to the student and advisor that special consideration should be given to locate such a site, and gain approval from the Doctoral Practicum Committee prior to arranging credit for work undertaken at that site. Then, the student and his advisor would determine in writing the skill repertoire that the student should develop at each site, culminating in a powerful battery of behavioral skills related specifically to the area of mentally impaired. Of course, it would be advisable to also have a secondary area of expertise; this, too, could be accomplished in a similar fashion.

The Site Capability Matrix also has a provision which refers students and advisors to a listing of prerequisite courses, skills,

or experiences required by nearly all sites. By careful attention to the prerequisites identified by sites, an appropriate match of site and student could be facilitated. Since all sites initially assess each student's skills, it should become readily apparent to a site when the student and/or advisor have failed to attend to the site's requirements. Under such circumstances, it becomes the site's prerogative to determine whether the student is retained by the site for training.

Due to recent interest in certification and licensing, it is crucial to indicate to students the advantages (and disadvantages) of procedures and practica which may lead to certification and/or licensing. To misinform a student, or to fail to inform a student regarding the relative importance of certification and licensing to his/her future employment, may result in potential lost income for the student, and a subsequent lawsuit against the advisor. For this reason, a specification of whether or not a licensed psychologist provides supervision at each site has become an important component of the Site Capability Matrix.

As indicated by the matrix, no site provides the opportunity to carry out site staff training. When probed regarding this issue, sites indicated that they believed that their staff would not have confidence in the practicum students, and because of such a lack of credibility, the students would likely be ineffective and the staff uncomfortable. Perhaps a better approach would be to once again emulate Maher (1980), by utilizing several dif-

ferent levels of practicum students at the same site. Advanced doctoral students might earn Psychology 712 credit by supervising and training other staff comprised of Psychology 599/699 students. It is likely that the sites would support such activity, since it might reduce the site supervisor's response effort in relation to practicum students. It appears as though such an arrangement would have multiple, mutually favorable consequences.

Fawcett and Miller (1975) suggested that site supervisors are in the best position to establish the work activities of a student when work is undertaken at an off-campus site. However, the present paper has suggested that the faculty are in the best position to determine and articulate the training needs of students. Therefore, dialog and cooperative planning must occur between site and faculty to ensure that the needs of students are met. The Site Capability Matrix should not be used in lieu of such dialog; it should merely supplement it.

Although many of the goals of the present research were accomplished, new questions are raised, for some of the results are curious. It was noted that half of the practicum sites failed to meet minimal standards for training in behavior change. Yet many of the sites failing to meet criteria have for many years demonstrated superior behavior change technology, and have in fact produced many publications in major psychological journals. It would seem as though two possibilities exist: first, the ABA

Practicum Site Evaluation Form was insensitive to the dimensions it purportedly measured, or second, the sites omitted training that the Department deemed necessary for accreditation. Further probing suggests the latter alternative, for several reasons. First, most sites that scored poorly on this section evidenced difficulty in training students in recognizing and evaluating alternative interventions, with specific attention given to the consideration of ethical-legal implications. In past years, not enough consideration may have been given to this area. It is very possible that many publications and various treatment techniques were developed during this period without the attention to ethical and legal issues which now are integral parts of "good" behavior treatment programming. Furthermore, it is not sufficient for an agency to provide ethical and legal guidelines to doctoral-level practicum students. Such guidelines might be more appropriately provided at the undergraduate and masters level. At the doctoral level, the Department requires the students to be trained to seek and evaluate ethical and legal ramifications of various treatment procedures in the absence of clear cut guidelines, for it is under similar conditions that these students will be called upon as doctoral-level psychologists to make difficult decisions involving professional liability and ethical safeguards. The emphasis on this desired skill level may also be seen by the weight attributed to it.

Another reason for this discrepancy between desired and documented site performance in behavior change is the difficulty sites have in teaching the application of many behavior change techniques, practicing them until mastery is observed or documented. Although there is much merit in such an approach, the Department has adopted the premise that more is to be gained through a broad exposure to many different behavior change techniques. Too often practitioners rely on only a few of their techniques, either because of favorable reinforcement histories or because of avoidance of new, unfamiliar strategies which might require considerable response effort to master. The various committees endorsing the present criterion wish to strengthen and extend the behavior intervention repertoire of its doctoral students in order to ensure a broad range of potentially effective treatments for the various service populations of the future.

In both these cases, the Department has placed new emphasis on these two areas. Such an emphasis will likely result in the adoption of this emphasis on the part of the sites, and a modification in their training programs to accomplish the intent of the Department.

Although the sites which participated in the Doctoral Practicum Evaluation Sub-Committee were instrumental in establishing many of the criteria used in the evaluation instrument, there seemed to be occasional discrepancies between the emphasis they

placed on certain items and their site's performance related to those items. Again, it is curious that such differences exist.

In one instance, the sub-committee enthusiastically supported the provision in criterion V.A. which specifies that the extent to which students will participate in direct client intervention will be specified within a written contract (or other document) prior to the practicum. However, four of the five sites failed to provide such documentation when evaluated.

Similarly, criteria calling for clear documentation of revised training objectives and written specification of what skills were acquired by the student during the practicum were both vigorously supported, but several of these sites could not document a process for revising training objectives, and none of the sites servin g on the sub-committee could document written specification of what skills their students learned during practica.

It appears that the sites serving on the sub-committee took a genuine interest in improving the quality of practicum training, and developed criteria in much the same way as one who develops the categorical imperative "I will it to be the case...", even though they may have been covertly responding "I wish it could be the case..." In fact, occasional comments were made during the various sub-committee meetings to the effect that "Well, we're not

going to come off looking good when we get evaluated, but I believe this particular item is very important", etc.

In relation to these discrepancies, it is generally easier to set a criterion level of performance than it is to perform at that level. Site supervisors have, as described earlier, multiple contingencies of reinforcement and punishment bearing on them at any given time during the normal work day, and the supervision of practicum students is only a minor part of their responsibilities. Unusual practicum-related response requirements, however small, may often be dismissed or postponed. The documentation of a minor change in the practicum student's training objective might be easily overlooked.

However, with differential consequences applied to both the site supervisor and the student for attending to such details, more appropriate responding might develop. The knowledge that the Department will evaluate the site and question the student about such details may suggest a set of rules which might come to govern subsequent behavior.

For the student, the practicum may often be synonymous with experience...an ethereal, time-intensive process of initiation. As Fuqua (1979) has indicated, the student is often expected to learn by just being there, perhaps by osmosis. But with the behaviorally-based system provided in the present paper, the student will be provided with a systematic training program which will be related back to the Department in detail, with particular regard

to the student's newly-acquired skill levels. Furthermore, the student must now attend to the details of his training, for he will understand that he will be required to complete an ABA Practicum Questionnaire at the end of the semester, which in turn, will be read by at least three faculty members of the Department (i.e., the Doctoral Practicum Committee) in addition to his advisor. Suddenly, the motivating operations are different.

The motivation for faculty to accept the model presented in this paper is difficult to identify, if it exists at all. The faculty will continue to be geographically and programatically distant from the field training sites, although the model does set the occasion for more frequent dialog between the Department and the sites. Perhaps with increased exposure to the sites, faculty will find the potential for applied research in the sites sufficiently appealing to increase their involvement.

But, it is not necessarily clear that what is needed is increased faculty involvement. Many sites indicated that they had never seen anyone from the Department in their halls, and, in fact, that was quite acceptable. But recurring comments on the "Application for Training Site Status" form indicate the sites' desires for more contact with the faculty at the outset of the student's practicum in order to pinpoint what is desired of both the site

and the student. These requests should be given full consideration by any faculty member placing a student at an accredited practicum site.

In general, the procedures implemented by this study and the resulting data support the contention that multiple complex organizations providing either on-campus or off-campus practica can interact with the university in an organized, coordinated manner in relation to the provision of practicum training. All sites were receptive to a more systematic approach to practicum training, and indicated a willingness to modify their systems accordingly.

In order to continue the model practicum program provided by this study, the model could be adopted by the Department with modest effort. For example, the Site Capability Form could be updated by each faculty contact person from time to time and disseminated to faculty. The Department could contract with a behavior analyst in the community, or an adjunct faculty, to provide site monitoring and annual evaluations. The graduate secretary in the Department could be given additional training to undertake some of the responsibilities inherent in the model.

Furthermore, the model could serve more than the ABA program; applications to clinical, industrial, and school psychology should not require substantive changes in the system. However, the content and various criteria would likely require modification by community and faculty experts in each of the relevant areas. For example,

the skills required by the clinician (e.g., desensitization, rational emotive threapy, behavior contracting, flooding, etc.) may require minor wording changes in some of the documents (e.g., in Dimension III of the Practicum Site Evaluation Form). But many of the other sections of the various documents could be utilized with no changes. The process for accreditation could also be similar, as could be the appeal process. The Practicum Site Manual would need to be revised to reflect the orientation and emphasis of each of the other specialties within psychology.

Other considerations must be given to validating and extending the present model. It is clear that students must be encouraged to meet their practicum requirements, and responses on student questionnaires must be evaluated and compared to the data obtained from the sites.

Rather than apply an "all or none" distribution of points on the site evaluation instrument for a given item, perhaps a partial point distribution could be employed in an attempt to differentially recognize small improvements within those items.

Due to the local effects of economic recession, several human service agencies have been eliminated, resulting in a void in certain service areas. Alternative placements for WMU practicum students should be actively sought. A closer relationship with the Kalamazoo County Community Mental Health Board as well as the various schools in the community might become increasingly important as resources dwindle.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTION FOR EXPLORING POSSIBLE SITE EVALUATION CRITERIA

WMU

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

Department of Psychology

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jim Cowart
Eric Hayes
Rich Lodge
Bill Redman
Bill Uhlman

RE: Doctoral Practicum Evaluation Sub-Committee

FROM: Jim Kaye

DATE: October 20, 1981

In preparation for our meeting on Monday, October 26, 1981, at 4:00 p.m. at BILBO's (in the Campus Theatre complex - 2628 W. Michigan), please review the enclosed information.

My intent is for us to discuss the material and related issues, and to cooperatively develop tentative criteria useful in evaluating ABA practicum sites with respect to the extent and quality of supervision and training at those sites.

Perhaps it would be well for me to put our mission in perspective. First, it is one role of The Doctoral Practicum Committee to review and approve Doctoral Practicum sites. Second, my personal role on the Committee is to develop and validate a practicum system that facilitates quality practicum experiences as well as the evaluation of practicum activities. Third, your role on The Doctoral Practicum Evaluation Sub-Committee is to assist in the development of practicum site evaluation criteria, as indicated elsewhere above.

There are many issues involved in this total process. However, we will attempt to limit ourselves (at least initially) to those issues related to site evaluation criteria.

I look forward to meeting with you, and anticipate that we will be through by 5:30, $\pm$ 30 minutes.

Have a nice day!

cc: Drs. Robertson and Peterson

INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXPLORING

POSSIBLE PRACTICUM SITE

EVALUATION CRITERIA

1. Please rate each evaluation dimension according to how important you believe it to be in relation to appropriate practicum training activities and experiences, which in turn produce skills useful to the practicing professional behavior analyst. Please circle the number, as appropriate.

2. Under each evaluation dimension is an array of sub-areas with a blank space to the left of each item. Please rate each item according to how important and useful you believe it to be, on a scale from 5 to 1 (5 = extremely important; 1 = extremely unimportant). You may assign the sub-areas under any dimension the same ratings, or different ratings; this is not a ranking task.

3. Feel free to cross out any sub-area of an evaluation dimension, or statements you feel are subsumed under the wrong dimension, and add other sub-areas you feel are needed, wherever you feel they should be represented.

1. Breadth of Possible Experiences

Sub-areas:

___ supervising
___ consulting
___ research planning, implementation and evaluation
___ program or systems development, testing and/or management
___ training of staff or parents
___ behavioral assessment
___ counseling & therapy
___ direct client/student contact (therapeutic interventions)
___ treatment planning and writing
___ behavior analysis
___ behavior change

How important is breadth of training experiences at one site?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Important				Very Important

2. Provision to the Doctoral Practicum Committee of clearly defined pre-requisite skill levels and/or course requirements to be documented prior to student enrollment at the practicum site.

Sub-areas:

___ general statement of minimal competencies required at site for all practicum graduate students

___ specific statements of pre-requisite skills required for specified jobs or assignments to be undertaken at the site

How important is the specification of pre-requisites?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Important				Very Important

3. Goal and Objective Setting

Sub-areas:

___ establishment of proposed skill repertoires to be established through the practicum.

___ establishment of evaluation mechanism to be utilized to validate skill acquisition

___ articulation of the above in a contract signed by student, supervisor and faculty

How important is initial goal & objective setting?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Important				Very Important

4. Training: Content

Sub-Areas:

___ Behavior analysis

___ measurement systems

___ operational definitions of target behaviors

___ data recording techniques

___ reliability assessment methods

___ reliable & valid data collection (implementation)

___ application of procedures to display and analyze data

___ assessment of possible confounding of treatment effects

___ functional analyses of behavior and its controlling variables

___ Behavior change

___ written behavior change proposals (treatment plans)

___ evidence of all the essential steps in designing and conducting behavior change activities

___ written report of results

___ practice in applying basic behavior change techniques (e.g., DRO/DRI, shaping, response cost, fading, etc.)

___ specification of what techniques were mastered, by supervisor

___ recognition and evaluation of alternative procedures/techniques to achieve same goals

___ direct intervention with clients

___ few techniques taught, but high mastery level

___ many techniques taught at high mastery level

___ many techniques taught at low-to-moderate mastery level

___ Research

___ research designs appropriate to applied settings

___ analysis of research problems & formulation of research questions

___ design of experiments to investigate questions

___ consideration of relevant ethical issues & legal problems potentially associated with the proposed experiments

___ conduction of research

___ design, acquisition and/or use of research tools

___ critical evaluation and summary of research into permanent [written] product

___ Systems design, development and/or management

___ Design

___ application of principles to existing system(s)

___ analysis of existing system

___ generation of designs of possible alternative systems and comparative analysis

___ recommendation of most appropriate and efficient system

___ Management

- ___ application of principle to identified management problems
- ___ analysis of existing management system
- ___ specification of alternative management systems
- ___ application and evaluation of selected management system

___ Public Relation Skills

- ___ following proper protocol, conventions and site rules, regulation & procedures
- ___ professional modes and styles of oral and written communication
  - ___ grammar
  - ___ conservation of words
  - ___ eye contact and clear articulation (oral)
  - ___ neatness and legibility (written)
  - ___ timeliness, and appropriate to situation
- ___ professionally appropriate affect and emotional stability

___ Staff or Parent Training & Consultation

- ___ writing behavioral objective, study guides, test questions, concept analysis, etc.
- ___ behavioral analysis of the instructional setting, with particular regard to motivating operations, management systems, receiving population, etc.

___ synthesizing effective components of instruction into workshops, in/preservice programs, consultations, etc.

___ evaluating instructional/consultative effectiveness and impact

___ Specialty or Unique Features of the Site & Target Population (e.g., mental retardation, partial day services, educational technology, etc.)

___ basic terminology, procedures, etc. relevant to area, plus proper application

___ behavior analysis of concerns or problems in the specialty area(s)

___ formulating goals, objectives and/or strategies potentially useful in ameliorating unique problems & concerns

How important is the content of the practicum?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Important				Very Important

5. Training: Procedures

Sub-areas:

___ direct 1:1 instruction (supervision:practicum student)

___ shaping of skill repertoires through monitoring and consequation of therapy/instruction, etc.

___ modeling, from

- ___ peer (other graduate students)
- ___ advanced peers (graduate assistants, component coordinators, etc.)
- ___ supervisor
- ___ faculty

___ role playing

___ in relation to modeling or role playing,

- ___ live examples
- ___ video/audio tapes

___ written individualized prescriptions or direction provided by site (e.g., training manuals, prescriptive cook-books, step-by-step instructional plans, etc.)

How important are site training procedures used during the practicum?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Important				Very Important

6. Supervision

Sub-areas:

___ Supervisor's background and competency in behavior analysis

- ___ degrees & specialty areas or majors
- ___ certification or licensure
- ___ years of experience
- ___ professional accomplishments

___ publications

___ conference presentations

___ honors

___ other (specify):

___ reputation for excellence of program, or contributions to program development

___ previous student evaluations of performance as supervisor

___ college teaching experience

___ recommendations from university faculty

___ Supervisory methods

___ direct observation

___ video/audio tape recordings & analysis

___ time sampling

___ analysis of permanent products (e.g., treatment plans, reports, etc.)

___ peer/staff reviews

___ client/patient feedback

___ behavioral tests or role-playing probes

___ written tests

___ meetings between supervisor and practivum student to discuss & plan practicum activities

Optimum frequency/duration: _____/_____

Minimally acceptable frequency/duration: _____/_____

___ Supervisor's evaluation of practicum performance

___ latency (period from practicum student's performance to "feedback" from supervisor)

Optimal: _____

Acceptable range: _____ to _____

___ oral

___ written

___ frequency of feedback

Optimal: _____

Acceptable range: _____ to _____

___ duration of oral feedback per occasion appropriate to content

___ establishment of revised or relevant training objectives

___ systematic follow-up reviews on objectives

How important is supervision to the practicum experience?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Important				Very Important

APPENDIX B

REPORT OF THE DOCTORAL PRACTICUM EVALUATION SUB-COMMITTEE

Report of Doctoral Practicum Evaluation Sub-Committee:

ASSESSMENT OF POSSIBLE EVALUATION CRITERIA

December 3, 1981

Submitted By:

James Kaye
James Cowart
Eric Hayes
Rich Lodge
Bill Redmon
Bill Uhlman

Report of Doctoral Practicum Evaluation Sub-Committee:

ASSESSMENT OF POSSIBLE EVALUATION CRITERIA

On October 26 & 29, and on November 10 & 16, 1981, this sub-committee met either as a whole or as small groups to consider possible practicum site criteria. A 5-point rating instrument (1=not important, 5 = very important) was utilized to facilitate discussion, and the results of the sub-committee's deliberations are now provided for consideration by the Doctoral Practicum Committee. Categories receiving an overall mean rating less than 2.5 will be recommended for elimination. Items under any one category receiving a mean rating less than 2.5 were dropped from this report.

1. "Breadth of Possible Experience." Overall Mean Rating = 1.3

   This area was judged to be unimportant in relation to any given site. It was indicated that breadth of experiences could be derived from the selection of various sites appropriate to the interest and objectives of the student and faculty. This could be accomplished by 1) sites indicating what experiences could be provided and 2) matching site experience capability with the requirements of each student's program of study.

   Recommendation: Sites should not be evaluated on the basis of breadth of possible experiences.

2. "Provision of clearly defined pre-requisite skill levels and/or course requirements to be documented prior to student enrollment at the practicum site." Overall Mean Rating = 3.7

   Specification of pre-requisites did not seem very important or critical to a well-conceived practicum system (3.7) although it was generally conceded that it would be well for both student and site to know what minimal student competencies would be required to optimize the student's skill acquisition at the site.

   To this end, a general statement of minimal competencies required for all practicum graduate students on a site-by-site basis was judged very important (5) in relation to the specification of pre-requisite skill levels.

   Specific statements of pre-requisite skills required for specific site jobs was judged not important (1) to the practicum system. Such statements might be of more benefit to the sties as an initial screening device leading to increased efficiency in assigning students to various jobs within the site.

   Recommendation: Sites should be evaluated on their general statements of minimal competencies required of all students at that site. A modest weight or factor (e.g., 3.7) should be used.

3. "Goal and Objective Setting and Evaluation." Overall Mean Rating = 5

   While it was recognized that powerful learning experiences can be derived in the absence of goals or related learning objectives, it was agreed that the articulation of skill levels and their ongoing evaluation was crucial to a well-conceived practicum system.

Recommendation: The Sub-Committee suggests that the following sub-areas and weightings be used to evaluate sites.

a. 4 List or continuum of skills (or skill levels) expected to be derived from the practicum site and/or track; aimed at providing a self-evaluation instrument for both student and site.

b. 3.3 Site flexibility to allow site and/or student to identify new tracks, unique jobs or activities, of current relevance to the site and/or student.

c. 3 Establishment of proposed skill repertoires to be acquired through the practicum.

d. 5 Establishment of an evaluation mechanism to be utilized to validate skill acquisition.

e. 2.8 Articulation of the above in a written contract signed by student, supervisor and faculty.

f. 5 Assessment of student's entry level skills.

g. 5 Assessment of student's exit level skills.

h. 3.8 Evaluation and/or recycling by student and site of the practicum at various times throughout (and prior to the end of) the semester or term, as needed.

4. "Training: Content" Overall Mean Rating = 5

Of the various content areas considered, three were identified as very important: behavior analysis, behavior change, and public relations. Least important was research, which is typically viewed as a University function rather than a specific role of most practicum sites.

Since so many areas and sub-areas were considered, and since "content" must be considered a crucial site evaluation dimension, an item-by-item weighting analysis is presented below.

Recommendations: All sites should be evaluated on the basis of 4 core skill training areas -- behavior analysis, behavior change, public relations, and specialty or unique features of the site and its target (client) population. Furthermore, if sites are to be validated to provide practicum experiences in certain other areas, those non-core areas should also be evaluated according to the relevant criteria provided below; or, should such non-core areas not be provided below, criteria should be mutually developed and agreed upon by the Department and the site, and then subsequently utilized to evaluate the site prior to site approval.

CORE SKILL TRAINING AREAS

a. 5 Behavior Analysis

(1) 5 Functional analyses of behavior and its controlling variables.

(a) 4.8 Historical analysis of the problem behavior, event or situation in terms of a preliminary identification of the behavior and its possible antecedents and consequences.

(b) 5 Preliminary identification of current motivating (establishing) operations and deprivation state(s).

(2) 5 Measurement Systems

(a) 5 Operational definitions of target behaviors

(b) 3.8 Data recording techniques appropriate to situation

(c) 4 Reliable and valid data collection

(d) 3.5 Application of procedures to display and analyze data

b. 5 Behavior Change

(1) 3.3 Brief written behavior change proposals (treatment plans).

(2) 5 Recognition and evaluation of alternative procedures/techniques to achieve same goals, including consideration of ethical/legal implications for these alternatives.

(3) 5 proficiency in applying basic behavior change techniques (e.g., implementing establishing operations, DRO/DRI, shaping, response cost, fading, altering schedules of reinforcement/punishment resulting in response maintenance, etc.).

(4) 4 brief written reports of results.

c. 5 Public Relations/Professional Skills

(1) 5 Following proper protocol, conventions, site rules, regulations and procedures.

(2) 5 Professional modes and styles of oral and written communication

(a) 4.5 grammar

(b) 4.5 conservation of words

(c) 4.5 eye contact and clear articulation

(d) 4.5 neatness and legibility (written)

(e) 4.5 ability to listen with demonstrated understanding

(f) 4.5 uses lay or technical language appropriate to situation (e.g., reserves behavioral jargon for use with other behaviorists).

(g) 4.5 timeliness, and appropriate to situation (e.g., respects confidentiality, doesn't criticize staff in front of others, etc.).

(3) 5 professionally appropriate affect and emotional stability: courteous, pleasant, patient, tactful.

d. 4 Specialty or Unique Features of the Site & Target Population (e.g., mental retardation, partial day services, educational technology, etc.). That is, ways in which the site teaches students to relate behavior analysis/change principles to the sites specialty area(s) or unique population.

(1) 4 basic terminology, procedures, etc. relevant to area, plus proper application in behavioral terms.

(2) 4 behavior analysis of concerns or problems in the specialty area(s).

(3) 4.5 formulating goals, objectives and/or strategies potentially useful in ameliorating unique problems & concerns.

NOTE: The sub-committee recommends a requirement that the 9 graduate practicum hours be acquired in at least 2 different sites with at least 2 different target populations or specialties.

OTHER SKILL TRAINING AREAS

e. 4 Systems design, development and/or resource management systems.

(1) 5 analysis of existing system prior to (2-4) below.

(2) 5 generation and evaluation of possible alternative systems.

(3) 5 recommendation of most appropriate and efficient system.

(4) 5 recycling and modifications of recommended system as suggested by resulting data.

f. 4.5 Staff or parent training & consultation

(1) 5 behavioral analysis of the setting, with particular regard to the receiving population, management systems, motivating operations, service mission defined by site, etc.

(2) 3 writing behavioral objectives, study guides, test questions, concept analyses, etc.

(3) 4.8 development of service delivery plan & implementation.

(4) 3.8 evaluating instructional/consultative effectiveness and impact

(5) 3.8 recycling and modification of service delivery as suggested by resulting data

(6) 5 proficiency at starting/stopping service delivery without disrupting other ongoing site activities

g. 3 Research

(1) 5 research designs appropriate to applied settings

(2) 5 analysis of research problems and formulation of research questions

(3) 5 design of experiments to investigate those questions

(4) 5 consideration of relevant ethical & legal problems potentially associated with the proposed experiments

(5) 5 conduction of research

(6) 5 assessment of possible confounding of treatment effects

(7) 5 critical evaluation and summary of research into permanent (written) product.

5. "Training: Procedures" Overall Mean Rating = 5

Even if a practicum site's training content was of the highest caliber, its impact could well be attenuated through faulty training procedures. For this reason, the sub-committee provided "Training: Procedures" with the same high rating as "Training: Content". Emphasis was given to the supervisor's active shaping of many of the ABA skills required under "Training: Content".

Sub-areas receiving the lowest ratings were verbal instructions from supervisor (2), modeling from WMU faculty (1), and written individualized prescriptions or directions provided by site (1). Serious possible flaws were anticipated by the sub-committee for each of these 3 procedures: first, although verbal instructions may be useful in concert with other procedures (e.g., shaping), in isolation they might suffer the same limitations and liabilities as lectures; second, modeling from faculty shifts the responsibility for modeling from the site to faculty, obviating the need to evaluate the site on this item; third, prescriptive cook-books, step-by-step treatment plans provided to the student at the graduate level seem far less useful than such items provided by the student.

An attempt was made to determine if there was particular merit in the use of video/audio tape recordings of instructional models. No clear advantage of recordings over live modeling was revealed, and the sub-area was dropped.

Crucial to training procedures are supervisory methods used to observe, direct and evaluate students. These methods are broken out and treated separately in a subsequent sub-area under "Supervision".

Recommendations: Sites should be evaluated as to their ability to provide the following:

a. 5 shaping of skill repertoires through appropriate supervisory methods and consequation of therapy/instruction/consultation.

b. 4 Training manual, packet, or other materials containing organizational charts, forms, procedures, and/or other information pertinent to the development of the student's skills in functioning as part of the agency, and carrying out the activities of the practicum.

c. 3 Modeling, using:

(1) 4 supervisor

(2) 3 advanced peers (graduate assistants, component coordinators, etc.)

(3) 2 peers (other graduate students)

d. 3 role playing (behavioral rehearsals)

e. 4 ABA students apply direct intervention with clients

f. 5 many ABA techniques taught to ABA student at high mastery level

g. 4 many ABA techniques taught to ABA student at low-to moderate mastery level

h. 3 few ABA techniques taught to ABA student at high mastery level.

6. "Supervision" Overall Mean Rating = 5

Supervision was considered crucial to the success of a well-conceived practicum program. The supervisor's background, supervisory methods and evaluation systems were all given the highest ratings possible.

As with "Training: Content", many sub-areas were identified, and all items retained are presented below. Dropped was certification or licensure, which was considered not important for the provision of ABA supervision at this time. Degrees and years of experience both received mean values of 2.3, and were therefore dropped; neither of these items were clearly related to the quality of ABA supervision, and might unfairly penalize a site which had developed an outstanding practicum under a non-Ph.D. staff holding only a recent M.A.

Recommendations: The sub-committee suggests that all sites be evaluated on the following:

a. 5 Supervisor's background and competency in behavior analysis.

(1) 5 graduate training in behavior analysis, or equivalent experience

(2) 4.3 professional accomplishments

(a) 4 publications in behavior analysis

(b) 3 conference presentations in behavior analysis

(c) 4 grants awarded in behavior analysis or specialty area(s)

(3) 3 college teaching experience in ABA

(4) 4 recommendations from University ABA faculty

(5) 4 previous student evaluations of the supervisor's performance

b. 5 Supervisory methods

(1) 5 direct observation

(2) 3 analysis of video/audio tape recordings, given suitable equipment

(3) 5 analysis of permanent products (e.g., treatment plans, reports, graphs, etc.)

(4) 3 peer or staff reviews

(5) 4 receiving system feedback (e.g., clients, patients, pupils, parents, staff, etc.), where feasible*

(6) 5 weekly 30-min. - 1 hour meetings between supervisor and practicum student to discuss and plan practicum activities

* severely language impaired clients excluded.

c. 5 Supervisor's evaluation of practicum student's performance.

(1) 5 latency (period from practicum student's performance to "feedback" from supervisor) range from immediate to 1 week.

(2) 5 frequency range from after each observation to weekly.

(3) 4 negotiation of revised training objectives contingent upon supervisor's, student's, and faculty's evaluation of progress, interest, and student's needs.

(4) 4.3 systematic follow-up on revised training objectives.

(5) 5 written specification and validation of what skills were acquired by the student during the practicum.

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF THE DOCTORAL PRACTICUM COMMITTEE

WMU

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

Department of Psychology

TO: Drs. Robertson, Peterson, Petty
FROM: Jim Kaye
DATE: 1-13-82

Please find enclosed a proposed report to the Doctoral Program Committee regarding evaluation criteria to be used in validating practicum sites.

Since we will be discussing this report during our 1:30 Friday meeting, it would be very helpful if you could review the report prior to that meeting. I would anticipate coming to an understanding of the final form and content of the report by the conclusion of our meeting (at approx. 2:30), as well as an agreement as time of submittal of the report to the Doctoral Program Committee.

I will share with you at the time of our meeting the first draft of the proposed site evaluation instrument. This instrument will contain the various weightings for the several evaluation dimensions and sub-areas previously discussed.

I look forward to seeing you Friday.

REPORT OF THE DOCTORAL PRACTICUM COMMITTEE:

Proposed areas of ABA Practicum Site performance to be evaluated

The Doctoral Practicum Committee appointed a Practicum Evaluation Sub-Committee this fall to consider possible criteria for assessing the performance of ABA Practicum sites. The Doctoral Practicum Committee has now considered recommendations from the sub-committee pertaining to areas of site evaluation, and has modified, accepted, and/or rejected various elements as reflected within this report.

The Committee recommends to the Doctoral Program Committee the adoption of the following areas of site performance as the basis for ABA practicum site evaluation.

ABA PRACTICUM SITES SHALL BE EVALUATED PRIOR TO SITE APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL BY THE DOCTORAL PRACTICUM COMMITTEE, IN RELATION TO EACH SITE'S DEMONSTRATED ABILITY TO:

I. Provide general statements of minimal WMU student competencies required of all such students at that site. These competencies may be evaluated and/or documented through course work, practical examination, written examinations, or other means agreed upon by both the site and the Doctoral Practicum Committee (DPC). The site shall ensure that each student's entry level skills be assessed at the site at the beginning of each practicum.

II. Set goals and objectives for each practicum student, and establish ongoing evaluation mechanisms to track student progress. This area of site performance shall be comprised of the following components documenting the site's ability to:

   A. Establish proposed skill repertoires to be acquired through the practicum.

   B. Establish an evaluation mechanism to be utilized to validate skill acquisition as well as student's exit level skills.

   C. Allow for the identification and execution of new or unique tasks, jobs, activities, or responsibilities of current relevance and importance to the site and/or student.

   D. Provide a mechanism for evaluating and/or recycling any aspect of the practicum by either site or student at various times throughout (and prior to the end of) the semester or term as needed.

III. Provide training in 4 core skill areas -- behavior analysis, behavior change, public relations, and specialty or unique features of the site and its target (client) population. Furthermore, if sites are to be validated to provide practicum experiences in certain other areas, those non-core skill areas shall also be evaluated according to the relevant criteria provided below; or, should such non-core skill areas not be provided below, criteria shall be mutually developed and agreed upon by the DPC and the site, and then subsequently utilized to evaluate the site prior to site approval.

The content of these skill training areas is presented below.

First, all sites must be evaluated as to their ability to provide training in these CORE SKILL TRAINING AREAS:

A. Behavior Analysis

1. Functional analyses of behavior and its controlling variables.

a. Historical analysis of the problem behavior, event or situation in terms of a preliminary identification of the behavior and its possible antecedents and consequences.

b. Preliminary identification of current motivating (establishing) operations and deprivation state(s).

2. Measurement Systems

a. Operational definitions of target behaviors.

b. Data recording techniques appropriate to situation.

c. Reliable and valid data collection.

d. Application of procedures to display and analyze data.

B. Behavior Change

1. Developing brief written behavior change proposals (treatment plans).

2. The recognition and evaluation of alternative procedures and techniques to achieve the same treatment goals, including the consideration of ethical and legal implications for these alternatives.

3. Proficiency in applying many basic behavior change techniques (e.g., implementing established operations, DRO/DRI, shaping, response cost, fading, altering schedules of reinforcement/punishment resulting in response maintenance, etc.).

4. Developing brief written reports of results.

C. Public Relations/Professional Skills

1. Proper protocol, conventions, rules, regulations, procedures, administrative hierarchy and lines of communication directly pertaining to the site.

2. Professional modes and styles of oral and written communication.

   a. grammar

   b. conservation of words

   c. eye contact and clear articulation

   d. neatness and legibility (written)

   e. ability to listen with demonstrated understanding

   f. use of lay or technical language appropriate to situation (e.g., reserves behavioral jargon for use with other behaviorists, etc.).

   g. professionally appropriate affect and emotional stability: behavior characterized as courteous, pleasant, patient, tactful, and/or training in the Dale Carnagie method, with specific applications to professional situations.

D. Specialty or Unique Features of the Site and Target Population (e.g., mental retardation, partial day services, educational technology, etc.). That is, ways in which the site teaches students to relate behavior analysis/change principles to the sites specialty area(s) or unique population, including

   1. Basic terminology, procedures, etc. relevant to area, plus proper application.

   2. Behavior analysis of concerns or problems in the specialty area(s).

   3. Formulating goals, objectives and/or strategies potentially useful in ameliorating unique problems and concerns.

In addition, sites wishing to be approved as training sites for systems design & management, resource management systems, staff or parent training, consultation, or research, must also be evaluated in relation to their ability to provide training in the following NON-CORE SKILL TRAINING AREAS:

E. Systems Design, Development and/or Resource Management Systems.

1. Analysis of existing system prior to 2-thru-4 below.

2. Generating and evaluating possible alternative systems.

3. Determining and recommending the most appropriate and efficient systems.

4. Recycling and modifying the recommended system as suggested by the resulting data.

F. Staff or Parent Training, and Consultation.

1. Behavioral analysis of the setting, with particular regard to the receiving population, management systems, motivating operations, service mission defined by site, etc.

2. Writing behavioral objectives, study guides, test questions, concept analyses, etc.

3. Developing service delivery plan and implementation.

4. Evaluating instructional/consultative effectiveness and impact.

5. Recycling and modifying service delivery as suggested by resulting data.

6. Starting/stopping service delivery without disrupting other ongoing site activities.

G. Research

1. Research designs appropriate to applied settings.

2. Analyzing research problems and formulating research questions.

3. Designing experiments to investigate those questions.

4. Identifying and considering relevant ethical and legal problems potentially associated with the proposed experiments.

5. Actual conduct of research.

6. Assessing possible confounding treatment effects.

7. Critically evaluating and summarizing research into permanent (written) products.

IV. Provide adequate supervision of practicum students. The adequacy of supervision shall be determined through the evaluation of each site in relation to:

A. Supervisor's background and competency in applied behavior analysis.

1. Graduate or post M.A./Ph.D. training in applied behavior analysis, or equivalent experience, verified by relevant university ABA faculty or post M.A./Ph.D. training site supervisor(s).

B. Supervisory methods. As a minimum, sites will be evaluated on provision of

1. direct observation of practicum students

2. analysis of permanent products (e.g., treatment plans, reports, graphs)

3. peer or staff reviews of student performance

4. receiving system feedback form, for example, clients, patients, pupils, parents, staff, etc.; where feasible (severely language impaired respondents excluded)

5. weekly meetings with practicum students to discuss and plan practicum activities, of a length appropriate to the number of credit hours undertaken.

C. Supervisor's evaluation of practicum student's performance. Such evaluation shall be assessed as to

1. the extent of its latency in relation to the student's performance

2. its frequency throughout the semester or term

3. documentation of negotiation of revised training objectives contingent upon supervisor's, student's, and faculty's evaluation of progress, interest, and student's needs

4. documentation of systematic follow-up on revised training objectives

5. documentation of written specification and validation of what skills were acquired by the student during the practicum.

V. Provide a practicum environment conducive to the acquisition of new skills. Such an environment is fostered through

A. An opportunity for students to participate in direct intervention with clients to the extent specified within a written contract completed by student, supervisor and faculty prior to the practicum (e.g., within the "Permission to Elect Psychology 599/699" form)

B. Shaping of skill repertoires through appropriate supervisory methods and consequation of therapy/instruction/consultation

C. Provision of a training manual, packet, or other materials containing organizational charts, forms, procedures, and/or other information pertinent to the development of the student's skills in functioning as part of the agency, and carrying out the activities of the practicum.

The Doctoral Practicum Committee also recommends that James Kaye, a doctoral student, be assigned the responsibility to develop for the department a model ABA practicum program which incorporates the recommendations of this report. As a member of the Doctoral Practicum Committee and as chairperson of the ABA Practicum Evaluation Sub-Committee, Kaye will undertake the task of developing, implementing, refining and validating the proposed model as part of his dissertation. The resulting model should be field tested with a select number of sites,and if successful, should be given consideration for trial implementation across all ABA sites. Finally, should the resulting model hold promise for other practica (e.g., clinical, industrial, school, etc.), consideration should be given for possible trial applications in these areas as well.

Submitted in April , 1982 by:

MALCOLM ROBERTSON, Chairperson
Doctoral Practicum Committee

NORMAN PETERSON

JAMES KAYE

Addendum to Doctoral Practicum

Committee Report

Dr. Nancy Petty joined the committee subsequent to much of the work in developing the preceeding evaluation criteria. She has requested that it be noted in the written product resulting from site evaluation whether each site reviewed could provide practicum supervision from a licensed psychologist. Such information will be obtained from Kaye's dissertation, and will be distributed to the Department's faculty.

APPENDIX D

APPLICATION FOR TRAINING SITE STATUS

WMU

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

Department of Psychology

April 29, 1982

Dear

As you know, the Department of Psychology offers two practica in applied behavior analysis - Psy 599 and Psy 699, as well as a professional field experience (internship) course - Psy 712. The Department is now reviewing practicum sites which have been or may be approved for doctoral level students.

Our records indicate that you have previously served our practicum graduate students. Should you wish to continue to do so, please complete the enclosed "Application for Training Site Status" form and return it to the Doctoral Practicum Committee for review. Upon inspecting this form, you will notice that it requires a more extensive description of your program and services, and therefore will require more response effort to complete. In order to reduce further responding, we will return this completed form to you at about this time next year, and ask that you merely update it in red ink. Upon receipt, we will type an updated version for our files, which will be recycled to you the next year for your next revision. A continuation of this process will ensure current information in our files with minimum response effort on your part.

One of the major differences between Psy 599/699 and Psy 712 is that the latter course is aimed at those students ready to assume a pre-professional and professional role within an organization, under less supervision than what might be required for a practicum student. It is at this level that you and your organization might reap a return on your investment of time with Psy 599/699 students. The Department recognizes the training role that practicum sites play in relation to Psy 599/699 practicum students, and wishes to aid you in the development of systems to provide such training. For a limited time this spring and summer, the Doctoral Practicum Committee is offering consultation and assistance to you in the development of training systems which will lead to at least temporary training site accreditation. Since graduate students wishing to pursue a doctorate in

applied behavior analysis may only apply practicum credit earned at approved (i.e., accredited) practicum sites toward their practicum requirements, site accreditation will be crucial if you wish to obtain high-level graduate students.

Should you wish to obtain the consultation and assistance offered above, merely so indicate on the short form attached to your application. Jim Kaye, a member of the Doctoral Practicum Committee, will then contact you to set up an appointment to visit your site. At this time he will obtain additional information from you and will identify areas which will need strengthening through your collaborative efforts.

We hope that you will take advantage of our offer of assistance, and look forward to continuing our mutual efforts at upgrading the quality of graduate training in applied behavior analysis and improving community services.

Sincerely,

Norman Peterson

Norman Peterson, Ph.D.
Acting Chair,
Department Doctoral Committee

Malcolm Robertson

Malcolm Robertson, Ph.D.
Chair,
Doctoral Practicum Committee

NP/MR:cb

( ) Yes, I would like assistance and consultation in developing training systems leading to the accreditation of our site.

( ) No, our site does not wish to become accredited. Please remove our site from your listing of approved sites.

( ) We would like to become accredited, but do not wish assistance or consultation in this process.

NAME OF AGENCY _____

PERSON COMPLETING FORM _____ DATE _____
(Signature)

TELEPHONE NO. _____ - _____ - _____
(Area Code) - (Number) - (Extension)

APPLICATION FOR TRAINING SITE STATUS
in Applied Behavior Analysis

Department of Psychology
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Agency Name _____ Phone _____
Address _____
Street City State Zip

Agency Contact Person _____ Title _____

Faculty Contact Person _____ Phone _____

1. Populations served (age range; number; disability types, if any) _____

2. General description of agency functions and operations: _____

3. Other information WMU students might need to know about the agency: _____

4. Please list those duties or tasks that WMU practicum students could perform at your site or attach job description: _____

5. In order to initially undertake these duties and tasks, please indicate what prerequisite skills practicum students should have: _____

Will your site assess each practicum student's entry skills? ____yes _____no

DIPC0981

The department would like its students to develop both behavior analysis and behavior change skills during field placements. Typically behavior analysis involves careful study of specific behaviors and their relationship to the environment in which they occur. The primary thrust of behavior analysis is identification of controlling features of the environment which generate specific forms or rates of behavior. Behavior change technology provides the means by which specific behaviors can be systematically modified. By carefully defining target behaviors, identifying appropriate reinforcers/punishers as consequences for certain behaviors, and arranging contingencies and schedules for delivery of these consequences, functional and adaptive behavior can be established and maintained.

6. Do the activities in which the WMU practicum students would be engaging include behavior analysis? _____ yes _____ no (if no, go to #8)

7. If yes, please specify the following:

   A. What behavior analysis skills could be taught? Please include a description of any behavior measurement and/or data analysis skills which could be taught.

   B. In general terms, how would these skills be taught? For example, perhaps you would employ peer or staff modeling, video tape recordings, 1:1 direct instruction utilizing shaping & immediate corrective feedback, written checksheets, etc.

C. Please name your supervisory personnel who are skilled in this area, and who would be providing the above instruction:

8. Do the activities in which the WMU practicum students would be engaging include behavior change techniques? _____ yes _____ no (if no, go to #10)

9. If yes, please specify the following:

A. What behavior change skills could be taught? For example, shaping, fading, chaining, DRO/DRI, DRL, schedules of reinforcement. over-correction, restitution, etc.

B. In general terms, how would these skills be taught (if different than 7.B., above)?

C. Please name your supervisory personnel who are skilled in this area, and who would be providing the above instruction (if different than 7.C., above):

10. If you answered "no" to either #6 or #8 above, please indicate how your site relates to the ABA program: _____

_____

_____

_____

11. PLEASE COMPLETE THE ATTACHED SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL FORM FOR EACH STAFF TO PROVIDE SUPERVISION OF PRACTICUM STUDENTS.

12. Each student is expected to develop skills in at least two of the following areas while on site. They are: (please circle competencies students will develop) a) supervising b) consulting c) program or systems development/ testing d) training e) assessment f) counseling & therapy
Please explain how the student will develop these skills: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Indicate days/nights and times students could become involved: _____

_____

14. Indicate hours/week and/or special times WMU students should plan to be involved (range): _____

15. In what way(s) can the Department of Psychology and its faculty contact person assist you during a student's practicum: _____

_____

_____

_____

16. Please find attached a contract form useful in articulating mutually agreeable minimal performance levels for all primary participants in a practicum. Would your site be willing to negotiate such a contract with each student?
_____ yes _____ no.

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS APPLICATION

11. SITE SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL LISTING

NAME _____

Highest Degree _____ from _____ discipline _____
(University/College)

Next highest degree _____ from _____ discipline _____
(University/College)

Check if applicable: ( ) licensed psychologist ( ) limited license [Psy.]
( ) approved school psychologist ( ) temporary approval [sch. psy.]
( ) certified social worker ( ) other license, certification or approval - please specify: _____

_____

List this person's publications, conference presentations, honors, post-graduate training and/or graduate-level courses in the area of ABA or the experimental analysis of behavior. If none, please indicate how documentation may be obtained in support of this person's ABA skills, or attach such documentation.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

List behaviorally-based programs in which this person has worked, developed, or made contribution, and include the name of each supervisor.

_____

_____

_____

List any other qualifications of this person in the area of applied behavior analysis:

_____

_____

_____

_____

How many hours/week will each practicum student be directly monitored and observed by this person? _____

How many hours/week will each student meet directly with the above supervisory person to discuss, evaluate and plan their practicum activities? _____

APPENDIX E

WMU ABA PRACTICUM SITE EVALUATION FORM

WMU ABA PRACTICUM SITE EVALUATION FORM

SITE_____ SUPERVISORS_____ FACULTY_____

ITEM	DESCRIPTION AND COMPONENTS	POINTS AVAILABLE	POINTS OBTAINED PER EVALUATION 1	2	3	4	5	6
			date / sup.	date / sup.	date / sup.	date / sup.	date / sup.	date / sup.
I	Entry level competencies: criterion & check							
	- minimum competencies stated	3						
	- entry level skills assessed by site	3						
	sub-total	6						
II	Goal & objective setting and evaluation							
	A. Proposed skill repertoires to be acquired through the practicum established	3						
	B. Mechanism for evaluating skill acquisition and exit level skills established	4						
	C. Mechanism for identifying and executing new or unique tasks, jobs, etc., established	2						
	D. Mechanism for evaluating and/or recycling any aspect of the practicum by either site or student prior to practicum end established	3						
	sub-total	12						
III	Evidence of training in four core skill areas							
	A. Behavior analysis							
	1. Functional analysis of behavior and its controlling variables							
	a. Historical analyses of problem behavior & its antecedents and consequences	3.1						
	b. Preliminary ID of current motivating operations & deprivation states	3.1						

WMU ABA PRACTICUM SITE EVALUATION FORM

ITEM	DESCRIPTION AND COMPONENTS	POINTS AVAILABLE	POINTS OBTAINED PER EVALUATION 1	2	3	4	5	6
III cont.	A. 2. Measurement systems							
	a. Target behaviors operationally defined	3.1						
	b. Data recording techniques used appropriate to situation	2.6						
	c. Data collection reliable & valid	2.6						
	d. Procedure for displaying and analyzing data developed and followed	2.6						
	Sub-total A	17.1						
	B. Behavior Change							
	1. Evidence of brief behavior change proposals	2.6						
	2. Recognition/evaluation of alternative interventions, including ethical-legal implications	3.1						
	3. Proficiency in applying many behavior change techniques	3.1						
	4. Evidence of brief written reports of results	2.6						
	Sub-total B	11.4						
	C. Public Relations/professional Skills							
	1. Training in proper protocol, rules, regulations, procedures, administrative hierarch and lines of communication pertaining to site	3.1						
	2. Training in professional modes and styles of oral and written communication, including grammar, conservation of words, eye contact and clear articulation, neatness and legibility of written work, listening with demonstrated understanding, use of lay or technical language appropriate to situation, proper affect.	3.1						
	Sub-total C	6.2						

WMU ABA PRACTICUM SITE EVALUATION FORM

ITEM	DESCRIPTION AND COMPONENTS	POINTS AVAILABLE	POINTS OBTAINED PER EVALUATION 1	2	3	4	5	6
III cont.	D. Specialty or Unique Feature of Site and Target Population							
	1. Basic terminology, procedures, etc., relevant to area, plus proper application	2.6						
	2. Behavior analysis of concerns or problems in the specialty area(s)	2.6						
	3. Formulating goals, objectives and/or strategies potentially useful in ameliorating unique problems and concerns	3.1						
	Sub-total D	8.3						
	Sub-Total	43.3						
IV	Adequacy of supervision of practicum students							
	A. Supervisor's background and competency in applied behavior analysis: graduate or post M.A./Ph.D. training in applied behavior analysis, or equivalent experience, verified by relevant university ABA faculty or post M.A./Ph.D. training site supervisor(s) Sub-total A	3.1						
	B. Supervisory methods. Evidence of:							
	1. direct observation of ABA students	3.1						
	2. analysis of permanent products (e.g., treatment plans, reports, graphs, etc.)	3.1						
	3. peer or staff reviews of student performance	1.8						
	4. receiving system feedback from, for example, clients, patients, pupils, staff, etc., where feasible (severely language impaired responents excluded)	2.5						
	5. Weekly meetings with practicum students to discuss and plan practicum activities of a length appropriate to the number of credit hours undertaken	3.1						
	Sub-total B	13.6						

WMU ABA PRACTICUM SITE EVALUATION FORM

page four SITE ,

ITEM	DESCRIPTION AND COMPONENTS	POINTS AVAILABLE	POINTS OBTAINED PER EVALUATION 1	2	3	4	5	6
IV cont.	C. Supervisor's evaluation of practicum student's performance							
	1. Latency (period from practicum student's performance to "feedback" from supervisor) averages less than 1 week	3.1						
	2. Frequency averages no less than 1 per week	3.1						
	3. Documentation of negotiation of revised training objectives contingent upon supervisor's, student's, and faculty's evaluation of progress, interest, and student's needs	2.5						
	4. Documentation of systematic follow-up on revised training objectives	2.5						
	5. Documentation of written specification and validation of what skills were acquired by the student during the practicum	3.1						
	Sub-total C	14.3						
	Sub-Total	31.0						
V	Provision of a practicum environment conducive to the acquisition of new skills.							
	A. Students participate in direct intervention with clients to the extent specified within a written contract completed by student, supervisor and faculty prior to the practicum (e.g., "Permission to elect Psy. 599/699" form, etc.)	2.5						
	B. Shaping of skill repertoires through appropriate supervisory methods and consequation of student performance	3.0						

WMU ABA PRACTICUM SITE EVALUATION FORM

SITE: _____

ITEM	DESCRIPTION AND COMPONENTS	POINTS AVAILABLE	POINTS OBTAINED PER EVALUATION 1	2	3	4	5	6
V cont.	C. Documentation and provision of a training manual, packet, or other materials containing organizational charts, forms, procedures, and/or other information pertinent to the development of the student's skills in functioning as part of the agency, and carrying out the activities of the practicum	2.5						
	Sub-total	3.0						
	TOTAL	100.0						
	ADDENDUM							
III	NON-CORE SKILL TRAINING AREAS: SCORE SUMMARIES							
	D. Systems design, development and/or resource management systems	100.0						
	F. Staff ( ) Parent ( ) training, and/or Consultation ( )	100.0						
	G. Research	100.0						
	H. _____	100.0						
	I. _____	100.0						
	J. _____	100.0						

VERIFICATION SIGNATURES

EVALUATION	EVALUATOR	SEAL LEADER	PRACTICUM COMMITTEE CHAIR &	DATE
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				

DPC011582

WMU ABA PRACTICUM SITE EVALUATION FORM

ADDENDUM **Page six**

NON-CORE SKILL TRAINING AREAS

SITE_____ SUPERVISORS_____ FACULTY_____

ITEM	DESCRIPTION AND COMPONENTS	POINTS AVAILABLE	POINTS OBTAINED PER EVALUATION 1	2	3	4	5	6
	Complete only those sections for which approval is sought.		date / Sup.	date / sup.	date / sup.	date / sup.	date / sup.	date / sup.
III	Evidence of training in non-core skill training areas: E, F, G and others							
	E. Systems Design ( ) Systems Development ( ) Resource Management Systems ( )							
	For each of the items checked above, there is evidence of training in							
	1. analysis of existing system prior to 2 - 4 below	25						
	2. generating and evaluating possible alternative systems	25						
	3. determining and recommending the most appropriate and efficient systems	25						
	4. recycling and modifying the recommended system as suggested by the resulting data.	25						
	Total	100						
	F. Staff ( ) Parent ( ) training, and/or Consultation ( )							
	For each of the items checked above, there is evidence of training in							
	1. behavioral analysis of the setting, with particular regard to the receiving population, management systems, motivating operations, service mission, etc.	20						

WMU ABA PRACTICUM SITE EVALUATION FORM

ADDENDUM . page seven. . SITE_____

ITEM		DESCRIPTION AND COMPONENTS	POINTS AVAILABLE	POINTS OBTAINED PER EVALUATION 1	2	3	4	5	6
III cont.	F.	2. writing behavioral objectives, study guides, test questions, concept analyses	11						
		3. developing service delivery plans and implementation	19						
		4. evaluating instructional/consultative effectiveness and impact	15						
		5. recycling and modifying service delivery as suggested by resulting data	15						
		6. starting/stopping service delivery without disrupting other ongoing site activities	20						
		Total	100						
	G.	Research. Evidence of training in:							
		1. research designs appropriate to applied settings	14.3						
		2. analyzing research problems and formulating research questions	14.3						
		3. designing experiments to investigate those questions	14.3						
		4. identifying and considering relevant ethical and legal problems potentially associated with the proposed experiments	14.3						
		5. actual conduct of research	14.2						
		6. assessing possible confounding treatment effects	14.3						
		7. critically evaluating and summarizing research into permanent (written) products.	14.3						
		Total	100.0						

WMU ABA PRACTICUM SITE EVALUATION FORM

ADDENDUM X - Page_____

NON-CORE SKILL TRAINING AREAS

SITE_____SUPERVISOR_____FACULTY_____

ITEM	DESCRIPTION AND COMPONENTS	POINTS AVAILABLE	POINTS OBTAINED PER EVALUATION 1	2	3	4	5	6
	INSTRUCTIONS: Complete this page prior to initial evaluation, assigning points available according to a distribution agreed to by the site, faculty, and Doctoral Practicum Committee. Use separate pages for each skill training area.		date / sup.	date / sup.	date / sup.	date / sup.	date / sup.	date / sup.

APPENDIX F

ABA PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE

WMU

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

Department of Psychology

Dear

The Department of Psychology is in the process of reviewing approved practicum sites, particularly those relating to the doctoral program in applied behavior analysis. It is the intent of the Department to evaluate each participating site in relation to criteria adopted by the Doctoral Practicum Committee and the Department Doctoral Committee. In order to carry out this evaluation, it becomes necessary to request that you complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to the Doctoral Practicum Committee in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided, within one week of your receipt of this letter.

Our records indicate that you have completed the following practica since the fall of 1980:

If our records are inaccurate, or fail to indicate practica which you have completed, please return this letter with your corrections indicated.

Best Regards,

Norman Peterson

Norman Peterson, Ph.D.
Acting Chair,
Department Doctoral Committee

Malcolm Robertson

Malcolm Robertson, Ph.D.
Chair,
Doctoral Practicum Committee

Code:
Type: __INT.
__MAIL
__Ph.
Date: _____

ABA PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____ Date _____ Phone _____

Agency in which practicum was taken: _____

Please indicate duties or tasks you performed at this practicum site:

To your knowledge, what skills were required by the site as prerequisite skills (which you should possess prior to this practicum)?

A. Behavior Analysis skills: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Behavior Change skills: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Other: _____

_____

In your opinion, what prerequisite skills should be required of WMU ABA practicum students prior to the enrollment at this site?

A. Behavior Analysis skills: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. Behavior Change skills: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Other: _____

_____

Practicum date(s)	Field Supervisor	Faculty Sponsor
A.		
B.		
C.		

Due to numerous management responsibilities placed on many field supervisors, they often must delegate actual training responsibilities to other subordinate staff. For each of the practica listed above, please indicate the name(s) of the person(s) who actually supervised (trained) you, and provide the approximate percentage of on-site training each offered. For example, during your practicum at this site, you might have received 80% of your training from Ed Spinner (an assistant component coordinator) and 20% from Diane Lunken (the program coordinator - Field Supervisor).

Example: Ed Spinner/D. Lunken % 80/20 Approx. hrs/wk 2.6/.4

Practicum A. _____ % _____ Approx. hrs/wk _____

Practicum B. _____ % _____ Approx. hrs/wk _____

Practicum C. _____ % _____ Approx. hrs/wk _____

Practicum D. _____ % _____ Approx. hrs/wk _____

SECTION I

Please check whether or not the following were features of this practicum:

	Yes	No
1. Goals and objectives were set in relation to skills which you were to acquire.	___	___
2. * Mechanism was in place for evaluating your skills during and at the conclusion of the practicum.	___	___
3. Mechanism was in place for identifying and executing new or unique tasks, jobs, or roles for you during the practicum.	___	___

* "Mechanism" refers to any process, procedure, or system.

	Yes	No
4. Mechanism was in place for evaluating and/or recycling any aspect of the practicum by either you or your supervisor at any time during the practicum and prior to the end of the practicum.	___	___
5. On-site training in behavior analysis:		
a. Were you trained at this site in carrying out a functional analysis of behavior and its controlling variables through		
(1) historical analyses of problem behavior and its antecedents and consequences	___	___
(2) preliminary identification of current motivating operations and deprivation states	___	___
b. Were you trained at the site in measuring behavior by		
(1) operationally defining target behaviors	___	___
(2) selecting data recording techniques appropriate to the presenting situations	___	___
(3) calculating reliability of data and/or validating data collection systems	___	___
(4) graphing and analyzing data	___	___
6. On-site training in behavior change - were you trained at this site to:		
a. write brief behavior change proposals	___	___
b. recognize and evaluate alternative interventions and their ethical and legal implications	___	___
c. apply many behavior change techniques.	___	___

Please specify what techniques you learned at this site:

(1) _____

_____

(2) _____

_____

(3) _____

_____

(4) _____

_____

(5) _____

_____

(6) _____

_____

(7) _____

_____

(8) _____

_____

(9) _____

_____

d. Write brief written reports of results

About how many such reports did you write? _____

	(Yes)	(No)
7. On-site training in public relations and professional communications. Did you receive information and/or training at this site in:	Yes	No
a. proper protocol, administrative hierarchy and lines of communication relative to site personnel and functions	___	___
b. rules, regulations and procedures relative to site	___	___
c. professional modes of communication		
(1) grammar	___	___
(2) conservation of words	___	___
(3) eye contact	___	___
(4) clear articulation	___	___
(5) neatness & legibility of written work	___	___
(6) listening with demonstrated understanding	___	___
(7) use of lay or technical language appropriate to situation	___	___
(8) proper affect (e.g., situationally appropriate smiling, laughing, seriousness, voice volume, etc.)	___	___
8. On-site training relative to unique features of site and target population. Did you receive training at this site in:		
a. basic terminology, procedures, etc. relevant to the site and its target (service) population	___	___

	Yes	No
b. behavior analysis of concerns or problems specific to this site and its target population	___	___
c. formulating goals, objectives and/or strategies potentially useful in ameliorating unique problems and concerns of this site	___	___

SECTION II

In this section, we would appreciate some information relative to the adequacy of supervision you received at this site. This information will be confidential, and will be aggregated with information from other practicum students. Your individual responses will not be shared with the site, your site supervisor, or sponsoring faculty. The intent of this section is to identify any weakness that might be corrected through adequate site supervisor in-service training which might be provided through the University.

1. In your estimation, how competent was the person providing the majority of your on-site training in applied behavior analysis (NOTE: Circle only one of the six sets of descriptors you feel is most appropriate. The groupings are not provided in any particular order):

Incompetent; no understanding of ABA.	Somewhat familiar with general principles; generally supports ABA activities.	Extremely competent; broad & deep knowledge base; can speak on a variety of experimental theoretical and applied issues; possibly has published in some area(s) of ABA, or taught University courses, or presented at ABA or other major conferences or meetings.
Extensive behavioral background; has applied ABA principles throughout program, with clients/patients/ students & staff.	Superficial verbal behavior regarding ABA; only slight familiarity with principles.	Some basic understanding of ABA; has many ABA activities in place for clients/patients/ students.

2. Supervisory and training methods.

   a. Did your site supervisor directly observe your work? ( ) Yes ( ) No - If no, go to b.

      (1) How often? _____ per ( ) day ( ) week ( ) mo. ( ) semester/term

      (2) What was the approximate average duration of each period of observation or monitoring of your performance? _____

      (3) What was the usual latency from your performance during the observation to "feedback" from your supervisor? less than ( ) an hour ( ) a day ( ) a week ( ) 2 weeks ( ) month ( ) other: _____

b. Did your site supervisor analyze your permanent products (e.g., treatment plans, graphs, reports, etc.)? ( ) Yes ( ) No

c. Were any of your peers asked by your site supervisor to review your performance? ( ) Yes ( ) No

d. Were any non-supervisory site personnel asked by your site supervisor to review your performance? ( ) Yes ( ) No

e. To your knowledge did you or your site supervisor obtain any "feedback" or information regarding your performance from clients, patients, pupils, staff, etc., where feasible (severely language impaired respondents excluded). ( ) Yes ( ) No

f. Did you meet with your site supervisor to plan your practicum activities? ( ) Yes ( ) No - If no, go to 3.
How long were these planning meetings, usually? ____ : ____ (hrs.:mins.)
How frequent were these planning meetings? ( ) Daily ( ) Weekly ( ) Bi-weekly ( ) Monthly ( ) Mid-semester/term ( ) End of semester/term ( ) Other - Specify: _____

3. Supervisor's Evaluation procedures

a. How often did your site supervisor actually evaluate your performance (not just monitor or observe it)? ( ) Daily ( ) Weekly ( ) Bi-weekly ( ) Monthly ( ) Every 6 weeks ( ) Bi-monthly ( ) Mid-semester or term ( ) End of semester or term ( ) Other: _____

b. Were any of your training objectives for this practicum changed or revised during the practicum? ( ) Yes ( ) No - If no, go to d.
(1) If yes, at whose request? ( ) Yours ( ) Site Supervisor ( ) WMU Faculty ( ) Other: _____
(2) If yes, why? _____

c. Was your progress on changed or revised training objectives monitored and evaluated by your site supervisor? ( ) Yes ( ) No

d. Was there any written specification by or at the end of this practicum of what skills you acquired during the course of this practicum? ( ) Yes ( ) No.

SECTION III

In this section, we would like to know how conducive this site was to your learning new skills.

1. Did you participate in direct intervention with the clients, pupils, or patients at this site? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If yes, was the extent of your proposed participation stated in writing prior to initiating such activities? ( ) Yes ( ) No.

2. In your opinion, did the skills you acquired result from
   a. appropriate supervisory and training methods ( ) Yes ( ) No
   b. the consequation of your performance via social reinforcement, points, or other types of reinforcers or punishers? ( ) Yes ( ) No.
3. Were you provided with a training manual, packet, or other materials containing organizational charts, forms, procedures, and/or other information pertinent to the development of your skills in functioning as part of the agency or site, and carry out the activities of the practicum? ( ) Yes ( ) No.
   If yes, how would you rate the usefulness of these materials to you. (Check one only.)
   ( ) Very helpful
   ( ) Somewhat useful
   ( ) Not helpful
4. Please indicate if you developed skills in any of the following areas during this practicum, by circling each of the appropriate skill areas:
   a) supervising b) consulting c) program or systems development/testing
   d) training e) assessment f) counseling & therapy
   What strengths or positive attributes characterize this practicum site?

5. What weaknesses or problems are associated with this site? (For example, transportation/time required to get there, scheduling hours around jobs or classes, supervision, etc.). Your articulation and amplification of these problems would be very helpful here.

( ) This site has indicated that you participated in the above practicum, and that you received additional training by the site in _____.
Please see the attached addendum for additional information required.

( ) This site has not indicated any further training you received at this site.

Thank you for completing this Questionnaire. Please return it in the enclosed envelope within one week of receipt to:

Doctoral Practicum Committee
Department of Psychology
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008

ADA PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE: ADDENDUM A

NAME _____ Date _____ SITE _____

Instructions: Please complete each section checked (✓) below. "Systems Design" represents practicum activities aimed at designing & implementing new systems to resolve identified problems. "Systems Development" is similar except it is aimed at refining or modifying existing systems. "Resource Management Systems" incorporates the actual design and implementation of systems managing personnel, budgets, support services, and/or other human or organizational resources and material.

Did you receive on-site training in:	( ) Systems Design		( ) Systems Development		( ) Resource Management Systems	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. analyzing existing systems prior to initiating items 2-4 below?	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. generating and evaluating possible alternative systems?	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. determinating and recommending the most appropriate and efficient system, in the judgement of you & your supervisor?	___	___	___	___	___	___
4. recycling and modifying the recommended system as suggested by the data resulting from implementation of the recommended system?	___	___	___	___	___	___
	___ no recycle or modification was suggested by the data.		___ no recycle or modification was suggested by the data.		___ no recycle or modification was suggested by the data.	

ABA PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE: ADDENDUM B

NAME _____ Date _____ SITE _____

Instructions: Please complete each section checked (✓) below. "Staff" or "Parent" training represents the actual training of staff or parents, by you during this practicum. "Consultation" represents advice, direction, supportive services, analytical or descriptive services, or other ancillary professional service rendered by you at the request of the primary service provider or recipient of services.

Did you receive on-site training in:	( ) Staff Training		( ) Parent Training		( ) Consultation: (to whom?)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. carrying out behavioral analyses of the setting, with particular regard to the population receiving services, management systems, motivating (establishing) operations, service mission, etc.	___	___	___	___	___	___
2. writing (check as appropriate) ( ) behavioral objectives ( ) study guides, ( ) test questions, ( ) concept analyses, ( ) other: _____	___	___	___	___	___	___
3. developing and implementing service delivery plans	___	___	___	___	___	___
4. evaluating instructional/consultative effectiveness and impact	___	___	___	___	___	___
5. recycling and modifying service delivery as suggested by resulting data	___	___	___	___	___	___
6. starting/stopping service delivery without disrupting other onging site activities.	___	___	___	___	___	___

ABA PRACTICUM QUESTIONNAIRE: ADDENDUM C

NAME _____ Date _____ SITE _____

Did you receive on-site training in:	Yes	No
1. developing research designs appropriate to applied settings?	___	___
2. analyzing research problems and formulating research questions?	___	___
3. designing experiments to investigate those questions?	___	___
4. identifying and considering relevant ethical and legal problems potentially associated with the proposed experiments?	___	___
5. the actual conduct of research?	___	___
6. assessing possible confounding treatment effects?	___	___
7. critically evaluating and summarizing research results into permanent (written) products?	___	___

APPENDIX G

PRACTICUM SITE MANUAL

W E S T E R N M I C H I G A N U N I V E R S I T Y

Department of Psychology

Doctoral Practicum Committee's

PRACTICUM SITE MANUAL

CONTENTS

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this practicum site manual is to provide information to potential practicum sites crucial to the awarding and maintenance of accreditation of the site as an approved training site for Western Michigan University's doctoral students in applied behavior analysis. Adherance to the procedures and routines articulated in this document, along with implementation of site-developed procedures aimed at meeting the criteria provided in this document, will ensure continued accreditation.

Accreditation is important for several reasons. First, accreditation represents the confidence of the Psychology Department that its students will receive appropriate field training at your site critical to the development of applied behavior analysts. In order for such training to be provided, it must be demonstrated that a site has competent staff and effective training systems. The Department, by accrediting a site, verifies that competent personnel and systems may be found at that site.

Second, a process of accreditation allows potentially beneficial interfacing between the University and field training sites in the community. It provides the occasion for direct contact, dialog, information exchange, and mutual assistance. The communication which results should be beneficial to all parties involved,

particularly in the development of new, more effective systems for both the provision of human services and the training of potential service providers.

Third, the articulation of specific site competencies and specialty features which result from the careful scrutiny that accreditation requires will be helpful in matching practicum student's needs with specific site features. By matching each student's interest, skill levels, and training requirements with specific client populations, service configurations, location, etc., training sites will be more likely to obtain students who are enthusiastic about their involvement with the site.

Fourth, many of the procedures and services required by the practicum sites will facilitate the development of both service continuity within the site, and training continuity within the Department. Furthermore, without the systemized approach that accreditation requires, it would be difficult for the Department to identify important dimensions and parameters of the applied behavior analysis skills demonstrated in "the real world" by the Department's graduate students.

Your willingness to participate in the process of accreditation demonstrates your desire to develop and implement systems which will be useful to not only the practicum students and the Psychology Department, but also useful to your site and other

sites as well. The Department recognized the important role that field training sites provide in the education of advanced graduate students. It is further recognized that Psychology 599/699 practicum students require supervision which can only be accomplished through the redirection of human resources within each site. It is difficult to redistribute personnel whose primary functions are to either administer programs or directly serve clients, in order to meet the needs of practicum students. The intent of this manual is to direct (and possibly reduce) response effort by site personnel by providing both a structure and a system for managing practicum students. Such a system should reduce uncertainties, role confusion, and needless duplications or omissions in training experiences.

It is clear that students would both benefit from and support a more systemized approach to their field-based education. Similarly, the Department would profit from knowing exactly what training experiences and training procedures were provided to its students. But what are the consequences which might develop or maintain agency interest in providing practicum field placements for students? In theory, Psychology 599 students would require close supervision at the outset of their course work on site. As these students acquire basic competencies, the density of supervision might be lessened across time. However, in Psychology 699, more complex issues and problems (often of a theoretical nature)

should be presented to practicum students, also requiring initially dense supervision and support from site personnel. Eventually, Psychology 699 students would also require less supervision. As practicum students build preprofessional and professional skill repertoires, they should become more useful as service providers to agencies providing practicum experiences. Finally, students enrolling in Psychology 712 should have a well-developed behavioral repertoire of therapeutic intervention techniques, allowing such students to have extensive and effective impact on clients of the various field training agencies. It is at the Psychology 712 level that agencies begin to profit from their response efforts with Psychology 599/699 practica.

The sequence described above is unlikely to occur in the absence of a systematic and comprehensive practicum program incorporating many of the features of an accreditation program.

As the Department seeks to move toward full accreditation of all practicum sites, your support and assistance in this process would be most valuable. As you review this manual, and as you proceed through the accreditation process, please make note of areas, procedures, or language that is unclear, superficial, unnecessary, or otherwise undesirable. Your feedback to the site evaluator, the Doctoral Practicum Committee, and your faculty contact person would be most helpful in correcting problems you observe.

SECTION 2

SITE EVALUATION PROCESS

Should a site indicate to the Department of Psychology that it wishes to become accredited or to obtain doctoral-level practicum students, a site evaluator will phone the site to provide basic information and to determine whether the site would like to proceed with accreditation. Should the site indicate its desire to proceed, a ten-step process will be initiated:

1. The site evaluator will make an appointment to visit the site and relevant site personnel.
2. The evaluator will interview site personnel and complete a site application form, describing the features and capability of the site and supervising personnel (See Appendix D).
3. The evaluator will complete an initial evaluation form utilizing site evaluation criteria approved by the Department. This will be accomplished during an interview with site personnel.
4. The students who have earned practica credits at the site over the past 1½ years will be identified, as will students currently earning practicum credit at the site.
5. Questionnaires will be submitted to these students requesting information relevant to the site eval-

uation criteria.

6. The evaluator will tabulate results.
7. The evaluator will provide a summary of the results to the Doctoral Practicum Committee.
8. The Doctoral Practicum Committee will approve/disapprove the site according to criteria developed by the committee, and make recommendations for improving site training activities. These recommendations will be transmitted to the faculty site sponsor, the site supervisor and the site administrator.
9. On the anniversary date of initial approval, the original site application form will be recycled back to the site, which in turn will pen in (in red) any changes it deems necessary and appropriate. The site will then return the form to the Doctoral Practicum Committee for re-accreditation.
10. Student feedback from data systems to be described below will be analyzed. These data will relate to site performance from the previous evaluation to the current reapplication. Recycle back to Step 6.

SECTION 3

INTERNAL AUDIT PROCEDURES

From time to time, all sites are encouraged to carry out an internal audit of their practicum training systems in order to ensure conformance with the Department's accreditation criteria. In order to accomplish this, review the criteria adopted by the Doctoral Practicum Committee and the Departmental Doctoral Committee provided in this section. To the left of each item provided below is a space in which a check mark may be placed signifying documentation of criterion performance. Many of the items appear within a suggested student handbook format (Section V). You are encouraged to copy or modify and portion of this handbook in order to utilize it with practicum students.

ABA PRACTICUM SITES SHALL BE EVALUATED PRIOR TO SITE APPROVAL/DISAPPROVAL BY THE DOCTORAL PRACTICUM COMMITTEE, IN RELATION TO EACH SITE'S DEMONSTRATED ABILITY TO:

___ I. Provide general statements of minimal WMU student competencies requires of all such students at that site. These competencies may be evaluated and/or documented through course work, practical examination, written examinations, or other means agreed upon by both the site and the Doctoral Practicum Committee (DPC). The site shall ensure that each student's entry level skills be assessed at the site at the beginning of each practicum.

___ II. Set goals and objectives for each practicum student, and establish ongoing evaluation mechanisms to track student progress. This area of site performance shall be comprised of the following components documenting the site's ability to:

___ A. Establish proposed skill repertoires to be acquired through the practicum.

___ B. Establish an evaluation mechanism to be utilized to validate skill acquisition as well as student's exit level skills.

___ C. Allow for the identification and execution of new or unique tasks, jobs, activities, or responsibilities of current relevance and importance to the site and/or student.

___ D. Provide a mechanism for evaluating and/or recycling any aspect of the practicum by either site or student at various times throughout (and prior to the end of) the semester or term as needed.

___ III. Provide training in 4 core skill areas -- behavior analysis, behavior change, public relations, and specialty or unique features of the site and its target (client) population. Furthermore, if sites are to be validated to provide practicum experiences in certain other areas, those non-core skill areas shall also be evaluated according to the relevant criteria provided below; or, should such non-core skill areas not be provided below, criteria shall be mutually developed and agreed upon by the DPC and the site, and then subsequently utilized to evaluate the site prior to site approval.

The content of these skill training areas is presented below.

First, all sites much be evaluated as to their ability to provide training in these CORE SKILL TRAINING AREAS:

___ A. Behavior Analysis

___ 1. Functional analyses of behavior and its controlling variables.

___ a. Historical analysis of the problem behavior, event or situation in terms of a preliminary identification of the behavior and its possible antecedents and consequences.

___ b. Preliminary identification of current motivating (establishing) operations and deprivation state(s).

___ 2. Measurement Systems

___ a. Operational definitions of target behaviors.

___ b. Data recording techniques appropriate to situation.

___ c. Reliable and valid data collection.

___ d. Application of procedures to display and analyze data.

___ B. Behavior Change

___ 1. Development brief written behavior change proposals (treatment plans).

___ 2. The recognition and evaluation of alternative procedures and techniques to achieve the same treatment goals, including the consideration of ethical and legal implications for these alternatives.

___ 3. Proficiency in applying many basic behavior change techniques (e.g., implementing established operations, DRO/DRI, shaping, response cost, fading, altering schedules of reinforcement/punishment resulting in response maintenance, etc.).

___ 4. Developing brief written reports of results.

___ C. Public Relations/Professional Skills

___ 1. Proper protocol, conventions, rules, regulations, procedures, administrative hierarchy and lines of communication directly pertaining to the site.

___ 2. Professional modes and styles of oral and written communication.

___ a. grammar

___ b. conservation of words

___ c. eye contact and clear articulation

___ d. neatness and legibility (written)

___ e. ability to listen with demonstrated understanding

___ f. use of lay or technical language appropriate to situation (e.g., reserves behavioral jargon for use with other behaviorists, etc.).

___ g. professionally appropriate affect and emotional stability: behavior characterized as courteous, pleasant, patient, tactful, and/or training in the Dale Carnagie method, with specific applications to professional situations.

___ D. Specialty or unique features of the site and target population (e.g., mental retardation, partial day services, educational technology, etc.). That is, ways in which the site teaches students to relate behavior analysis/change principles to the sites specialty area(s) or unique population, including

___ 1. Basic terminology, procedures, etc. relevant to area, plus proper application.

___ 2. Behavior analysis of concerns or problems in the specialty area(s).

___ 3. Formulating goals, objectives and/or strategies potentially useful in ameliorating unique problems and concerns.

In addition, sites wishing to be approved as training sites for systems design & management, resource management systems, staff or parent training, consultation, or research, must also be evaluated in relation to their ability to provide training in the following NON-CORE SKILL TRAINING AREAS:

___ E. Systems Design, Development and/or Resource Management Systems.

___ 1. Analysis of existing system prior to 2-thru-4 below.

___ 2. Generating and evaluating possible alternative systems.

___ 3. Determining and recommending the most appropriate and efficient systems.

___ 4. Recycling and modifying the recommended system as suggested by the resulting data.

___ F. Staff or Parent Training, and Consultation.

___ 1. Behavioral analysis of the setting, with particular regard to the receiving population, management systems, motivating operations, service mission defined by site, etc.

___ 2. Writing behavioral objectives, study guides, test questions, concept analyses, etc.

___ 3. Developing service delivery plan and implementation.

___ 4. Evaluating instructional/consultative effectiveness and impact.

___ 5. Recycling and modifying service delivery as suggested by resulting data.

___ 6. Starting/stopping service delivery without disrupting other ongoing site activities.

___ G. Research

___ 1. Research designs appropriate to applied settings.

___ 2. Analyzing research problems and formulating research questions.

___ 3. Designing experiments to investigate those questions.

___ 4. Identifying and considering relevant ethical and legal problems potentially associated with the proposed experiments.

___ 5. Actual conduct of research.

___ 6. Assessing possible confounding treatment effects.

___ 7. Critically evaluating and summarizing research into permanent (written) products.

___ IV. Provide adequate supervision of practicum students. The adequacy of supervision shall be determined through the evaluation of each site in relation to:

___ A. Supervisor's background and competency in applied behavior analysis.

___ 1. Graduate or pst M.A./Ph.D. training in applied behavior analysis, or equivalent experience, verified by relevant university ABA faculty or post M.A./Ph.D. training site supervisor(s).

___ B. Supervisory methods. As a minimum, sites will be evaluated on provision of

___ 1. direct observation of practicum students

___ 2. analysis of permanent products (e.g., treatment plans, reports, graphs)

___ 3. peer or staff reviews of student performance

___ 4. receiving system feedback form, for example, clients patients, pupils, parents, staff, etc., where feasible (severely language impaired respondents excluded)

___ 5. weekly meetings with practicum students to discuss and plan practicum activities, of a length appropriate to the number of credit hours undertaken.

___ C. Supervisor's evaluation of practicum student's performance. Such evaluation shall be assessed as to

___ 1. the extent of its latency in relation to the student's performance

___ 2. its frequency throughout the semester or term

___ 3. documentation of negotiation of revised training objectives contingent upon supervisor's, student's, and faculty's evaluation of progress, interest, and student's needs

___ 4. documentation of systematic follow-up on revised training objectives

___ 5. documentation of written specification and validation of what skills were acquired by the student during the practicum.

___ V. Provide a practicum environment conducive to the acquisition of new skills. Such an environment is fostered through

___ A. An opportunity for students to participate in direct intervention with clients to the extent specified within a written contract completed by student, supervisor and faculty prior to the practicum (e.g., within the "Per-

mission to Elect Psychology 599/699" form)

___ B. Shaping of skill repertoires through appropriate supervisory methods and consequation of therapy/ instruction/consultation

___ C. Provision of a training manual, packet, or other materials containing organizational charts, forms, procedures, and/or other information pertinent to the development of the student's skills in functioning as part of the agency, and carrying out the activities of the practicum.

SECTION IV

ACCREDITATION AND APPEAL PROCESS

Accreditation ratings will be of three types: full, partial, and temporary. The latter type will be awarded by the Doctoral Practicum Committee should the site meet minimally acceptable standards prior to the actual enrollment of students. Once student questionnaires are obtained and evaluated, the site could be awarded full or partial accreditation (or, of course, be rejected).

Full accreditation will result from the site meeting minimally acceptable standards supported by student feedback.

Partial accreditation could be awarded should major portions of the evaluation criteria be met and verified through student feedback, although the total site performance might fall below minimally acceptable standards. Partial accreditation would be offered to a site contingent upon its willingness to work toward full accreditation, which in turn must be achieved by the site within one year from the partial approval. As indicated earlier, accreditation would hold for one year, and would be renewable annually.

The appeal of accreditation ratings may occur at any time, contingent upon the site requesting a re-examination by the Doctoral Practicum Committee. A form will thereupon be sent to the site,

which will require the site to articulate the basis for their appeal. Supportive documentation will also be requested.

SECTION 5

SUGGESTED STUDENT PRACTICUM HANDBOOK FORMAT

Sites should provide to all doctoral practicum students a "Student Practicum Handbook" appropriate to each site. This satisfies requirement V.C. Each site should tailor the handbook to meet the site's own needs, while also meeting those of the Department's and its students'.

Handbooks could contain the following sections.

A. General Information

Sites should include a

___ description of the program and its services

___ administrative hierarchy, with a listing of all key personnel

___ important features or limitations of the service population

___ hours and days of operation, and phone numbers.

B. Site Rules, Regulations & Routines

Sites should provide a listing of all procedures and rules you wish students to follow while on site. It might be well to include:

___ procedures for ensuring confidentiality of information pertaining to service population

___ any special instructions for handling or interacting with the service population

___ any health requirements (e.g., negative T.B. test)

___ dress regulations, if any

___ procedures for reporting early or late arrivals or absences

___ parking areas

___ policies regarding aversive control procedures

___ fire, tornado and snow day procedures

___ unusual incident (or accident) report forms

C. General Practicum Routines for Doctoral Students

The following (or its equivalent) should be incorporated into each site's student practicum handbook, thereby meeting the Department's requirements.

1. "All students will demonstrate their current (entry) skill levels in behavior analysis and behavior change through any or all of the following:

___ documentation of specific competencies through previous practica or relevant employment (Site: see Appendix A for suggested documentation)

___ written examination

___ demonstration through in vivo work with service population or role-playing."

"The purpose of establishing skill levels is to ensure the proper sequencing of practicum activities for both you and our service population. In general, your knowledge and skill in the following areas will be assessed" (each site should construct their own list of techniques appropriate to the site):

a. reinforcement (RMT) & punishment (PMT)

b. schedules of RMT/PMT (e.g., DRL, DRO/DRI, VI, FR, etc.)

c. shaping

d. chaining

e. prompting and other forms of instructional control

f. fading

g. time out from positive RMT

h. overcorrection

i. restitution

j. behavior (performance) contracting

k. tentative analysis of antecedents and consequences potentially affecting behavior

l. preliminary identification of motivating (establishing) operations & deprivation states

m. operational definition of behaviors

n. various data recording techniques (e.g., interval, time-sampling, event, duration, latency, etc.)

o. inter-observer-reliability computations

p. data portrayal systems (e.g., frequency polygons, histograms/bar graphs, cumulative records, etc.)

q. etc.

2. "Based upon your initial evaluation, your interest, faculty guidance, and site needs, you and your practicum supervisor will negotiate goals & objectives for you to accomplish by the

end of this practicum. Furthermore, you and your supervisor will agree to some mechanism through which your skills will be assessed during the practicum." (Site: please see Appendix B for a suggested form.)

3. "Practicum students or supervisor may identify new or unique tasks, jobs, concerns or problems which might be interesting and timely to work on. Should this occur, dialog should immediately begin between all parties (student, supervisor, and faculty) and an understanding reached in relation to whether the student's goals and objectives should be modified. Measurement mechanisms should also be altered or designed to evaluate student output and outcome."
4. "If at any time during the practicum, either the student or supervisor develop concerns regarding the practicum activities or the performance of either party, the individual having such concerns shall arrange a meeting with the other party, in order to evaluate and/or recycle the practicum activities. Such an evaluation or recycling may result in a modification of practicum activities, response requirements, or consequences of student performance, at the discretion of the site supervisor and/or faculty."

5. "Each practicum student is expected to develop skills in behavior analysis and behavior change technology, as well as in public relations/professional communication and specialty features of the site. If you believe that you are not receiving suitable training in these areas, please see your supervisor and so inform him/her." (Site: see Appendix B for suggested partial documentation.)
6. "Each practicum student is expected to meet at least once/week with their supervisor to discuss and plan practicum activities. Your supervisor will indicate when and where you are to meet." (Site: see Appendix C.)
7. "Your performance will be evaluated at least weekly, and the results provided to you at least weekly, perhaps in the same meeting indicated above. See your supervisor for details." (Site: see Appendix C.)
8. "Students are expected to conform to the written specification of number of hours of direct client/patient/pupil contact negotiated between all parties at the outset of the practicum." (Site: see Appendix B.)

D. "Special Practicum Routines for students receiving training in:

1. Systems design, development and/or resource management systems."
   a. Students will be expected to analyze the existing system prior to subsequent steps, below.
   b. Students will be expected to generate and evaluate

possible alternative systems.

c. Students will determine and recommend the most appropriate and efficient system.

d. If such a system is implemented, the student will be expected to recycle the procedures, and modify the recommended system as suggested by the data.

e. The student will submit a written report to the site describing the results of steps a. - d. One copy whall be forwarded to the Doctoral Practicum Committee by the site."

2. "Staff or parent training, and/or consultation."

a. "Students are expected to perform a behavior analysis of the setting and service population.

b. Students will develop behavioral objectives, study guides, test questions, concept analyses, etc., as appropriate to the task.

c. Students will develop a service delivery plan, and if appropriate, implement it.

d. Students will evaluate the effectiveness of the plan.

e. Students will recycle and modify service delivery as suggested by the data, and as approved by the site supervisor.

f. Students shall begin and end service delivery without substantially disrupting other ongoing site activities. Further, students and supervisor shall plan for training continuity, should the site desire to continue the training/consultation service after the student's participation has ceased.

g. The student will submit a written report to the site describing the results of steps a. - f.

3. "Research"

a. Students should develop research designs appropriate to the setting, taking special note of the purpose, scope, and needs of the practicum site.

b. Students must analyze research problems and formulate research questions.

c. Students must design experiments to investigate the identified questions.

d. Students must document consideration of ethical & legal problems potentially associated with the proposed experiments.

e. Students shall be responsible to the site supervisor for the actual conduct of research.

f. Students shall assess possible confounding variables and treatment effects.

g. Students must critically evaluate the research, and provide a full written report of their findings.

h. The student will submit a written report to the site describing the results of steps a. - g.

E. Final Performance Appraisal and Grade Recommendation

Sites should provide some information to the students regarding the ways in which the student's total practicum performance will be assessed, and recommended grades determined. In general, most doctoral-level students will perform reasonably well with social RMT/PMT, and can be expected to follow rules established by the Department and the site. If the site feels that certain students cannot respond toward weak, evasive goals by following appropriate rules, then the site supervisor should contact the appropriate faculty to arrange a meeting with that person, the student, and the supervisor, to plan appropriate action.

The final performance appraisal should take into account the data resulting from the mechansim for evaluating skill acquisition. (See Appendix B.)

APPENDIX A

Student Competency Documentation

_____ ( ) 599 ( ) 699 _____
Student's Name Credits

_____ _____ _____
Site Date Faculty

A. Written Exam Results: _____

Specify areas tested: _____

_____

_____

B. In Vivo Demonstration Results (include areas tested):

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. Through Previous Practica: Current supervisor initials each specific skill block when skill has been verified with previous supervisor, unless the latter has initialed that block.

Sites	Supervisors	Date	Specify Skills:				
			1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
			6. ____	7. ____	8. ____	9. ____	10. ____

I hereby verify the accuracy of the above information.

_____
(Site Supervisor)

Site: Please submit completed to: WMU Psychology Department
Doctoral Practicum Committee

APPENDIX B

PRACTICUM GOALS & OBJECTIVES

_____, by the end of ( ) fall ( ) winter
Student's Name
semester, or ( ) spring ( ) summer term, 19 __, will:

Goal 1: _____

_____

_____ by,

Objective 1A: _____

_____

_____

as measured by _____

_____

Objective 1B: _____

_____

_____

as measured by _____

_____

Goal 2: _____

_____

_____ by,

Objective 2A: _____

_____

_____

as measured by _____

_____

Objective 2B: _____

_____

_____

as measured by _____

_____

Goal 3: _____

_____

_____ by,

Objective 3A: _____

_____

_____

as measured by _____

_____

Objective 3B: _____

_____

_____

as measured by _____

_____

Goal 4: _____

_____

_____ by,

Objective 4A: _____

_____

_____

as measured by _____

_____

Objective 4B: _____

_____

_____

as measured by _____

_____

In addition, this practicum student will spend at least _____% of his time (or _____ hrs/week) in direct client (patient, pupil, etc.) contact.

_____ _____ _____ _____

(Student Signature) (Date) (Supervisor Signature) (Date

APPENDIX C

Schedule of Meetings

To: _____ (Student) Date: _____

From: _____ (Supervisor) _____ (Site)

A. You are expected to meet with me on _____s (day), _____ (time) ( )am ( )pm, in _____ (Room Number), for approximately _____ ( ) hrs ( ) mins each week to discuss and plan your practicum activities.

B. You are expected to meet with me on ( ) the above dates and times, or on ( ) _____s (day), _____ (time) ( ) am ( ) pm, in _____ (Room Number), in order for me to provide you with feedback concerning the quality/quantity of your work.

If you become unable to meet with me on the above dates and times, you must provide at least 24-hour notice.

APPENDIX D

Appeal Form

Site _____ Date _____

Person completing this form _____

Title _____ Phone _____

Please indicate those items in the evaluation which you are appealing, and for each item, indicate the basis of your appeal. Attach documentation and data, wherever possible. You may use additional pages, if you wish. Submit four copies to: WMU, Department of Psychology, Doctoral Practicum Committee, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008.

APPENDIX H

SITE EVALUATION REPORTS

NOTE: Identifying information has been deleted in order to ensure confidentiality.

SITE EVALUATION REPORT: I

July 23, 1982

Evaluation Format:

The evaluator met with XXX, Director, at the offices of XXX. Materials were provided by the XXX in support of their application.

General Impressions:

This site has been in operation with clients for _____. Nevertheless, a surprising array of services are provided in a well-orchestrated multi-disciplinary team approach. The site utilizes a variety of treatment modalities, of which behavior analysis/behavior change is a part.

Strengths:

Item I: The site specifically states that no minimum competencies are required; rather, students receive training appropriate to their current level of functioning. Each student goes on a rotation between various staff. Students observe staff rendering services, and are also called upon to interact directly with clients. Student responses to clients are thereby observed, entry skill levels assessed, and site resources matched to the student's needs.

Item III: The site scored well in relation to public relations/ professional skills training, and specialty features of the site. The rotational system affords each student with exposure to a variety of disciplines in which behavior analysis might have impact.

In relation to behavior analysis, the site fulfills requirements of training in operationally defining behavior, and training in data recording techniques appropriate to the situation. Regarding behavior change, written proposals take the form of treatment plans, or more extensive written documents should aversive control procedures be included. The latter go to local case managers, parents, and foster care providers (where appropriate). The site trains students in a variety of behavior change techniques.

Item IV: This site scored well in all subcomponents of this tiem, with one exception (see below). The duration of weekly supervisory meetings (IV.B.5.) varies according to the unique needs of the practicum student, not the number of credit hours taken. Feedback latencies vary

from immediate to 2 days. Revised training objectives require revised contracts (if the latter are used). Not all students necessarily are placed on performance contract.

Item V: Full credit was received for this item. Social reinforcement and final evaluation are the consequences employed for student performance. The site does disseminate an Information and Policies handout to all students (see attached).

Supplemental Item III.F.: This site wishes to become accredited in parent training (with regard to natural or foster parents). All criteria for such accreditation seem to be met.

Areas for Improvement:

Item II: This site needs to develop systems for evaluating ongoing skill acquisition and exit level skills. Also needed are mechanisms for identifying and executing new or unique tasks, and recycling any aspect of the practicum by either student or site prior to the end of the practicum.

Item III: In relation to behavior analysis, XXX needs to ensure that students receive training in the functional analysis of behavior and its controlling variables, as well as in reliable data recording and procedures for displaying and analyzing data.

Regarding behavior change, it is recognized that the Director carefully scrutinizes the students' work in order to provide ethical and legal safeguards. However, XXX needs to train each ABA doctoral student to provide such scrutiny, with the Director serving as a back-up. In addition, all students should be required to produce a brief written report of the results of their interventions for each client.

Item IV: In order to facilitate evaluation of student performance, it is suggested that a contract specifying skills to be achieved during the course of the practcum be negotiated at the outset. This contract should be reviewed at the end of the practicum, whereupon a document should be prepared specifying what skills were acquired by the student during the practicum.

Student Feedback:

The site reported serving no ABA doctoral students enrolled in Psy 599/699 for the past 1.5 years. A check of Departmental files verified these data. Therefore, no student data were obtained.

Summary:

This site achieved a total score of 62.8%, with a supplemental non-core skill training score of 100%. This indicates a fairly high level of achievement.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that this site be awarded TEMPORARY accreditation until student feedback can be obtained; that PARTIAL accreditation be awarded contingent upon corroborating data from student feedback; and that FULL accreditation be considered when the areas needing improvement are ameliorated and verified.

It is further recommended that this evaluator continue to work with XXX in order to expedite full accreditation.

_____
(Evaluator)

I have reviewed the above report and find that it fairly reflects the discussions between the evaluator and this site. Further, this site will (X) strive to improve in the areas noted
( ) file an appeal objecting to any or all sections of this report
( ) attach clarifying information to this report

X
_____
(Site Representative)

SITE EVALUATION REPORT: II

April 30, 1982

Evaluation Format:

This evaluator met with XXX at XXX. Materials were provided by the XXXXXX in support of their application.

General Impressions:

This site appears to be well systematized, with clearly defined procedures and expectations for students. Behavioral methods are applied to parents, staff, and children, and are evaluated through systematic data collection and analysis. The services provided by the XXX are typically consultative in nature.

Strengths:

Item I: This site carefully scrutinizes prospective students through interviews, review of past experiences and courses completed.

Item II: With one exception, full credit was provided for components within this item. Various possible new or unique tasks are related to students at the outset of the practicum.

Item III: With one exception (see below) all other criteria in both behavior analysis and behavior change were judged to be met.

Particular strengths for this site lie in public relations/professional skill development and specialty features of the site; full credit was awarded in each of these areas.

Item IV: With three exceptions (see below) all criteria in this item were met. The supervisor is close to finishing his Ph.D. in ABA, and his supervisory and evaluation methods are very good, as measured by the relevant criteria.

Item V: An excellent procedure seems to be in place for generating appropriate student behavior. No aversive consequences have been employed to date. Differential praise is extensively used, and students can obtain additional reinforcement by presenting their work to staff during team meetings.

A student information/training manual is provided to students.

Areas for Improvement:

Item II: This site needs to establish (with the student) in writing proposed skill repertoires to be acquired through the practicum activities.

Item III: Although this site obtains and uses behavioral data wherever possible in its service rendition, written procedures for displaying and analyzing data should be developed for students. The site should give consideration to increasing the number of behavior change techniques it provides training in. It is recognized that the consultative nature of program services does not lend itself to direct contact with children; nevertheless, various behavioral techniques can still be developed and recommended to staff and parents. Written documentation of such activity undertaken by students should fulfill this requirement.

Item IV: Again, due to the service configuration of this site, it is difficult to directly observe ABA students while they are performing all of their tasks. However, systems should be developed to optimize direct observation of students by their supervisors wherever possible.

Although informal negotiation leading to revised training objectives for ABA students is undertaken from time to time, the site should develop a system documenting such negotiation.

Similarly, the site needs to develop written documentation specfying what skills were acquired by the student as a result of the practicum. Although this is done to some extent already in general terms, the language involved should reflect specific skill acquisition.

Item V: It will be important for the site to specify within a written contract (or other appropriate document) the extent to which ABA students will participate in direct intervention with clients through the course of the semester or term. The clients may be children, parents or staff.

Supplemental Item III.F.: This site wishes to become accredited in staff/parent training and consultation. To this end, it must ensure that all ABA students receive training in carrying out behavior analysis of the setting in which training or consultation occurs. Further, written service delivery plans* should be developed by all ABA students. Training in recycling and modifying service delivery* as suggested by the data should also be provided.

*related to staff/parent behavior

Student Feedback:

The site reported serving no ABA doctoral students enrolled in Psy 599/699 for the past 1.5 years. A check of Departmental files verified these data. Therefore, no student data were obtained.

Summary:

This site achieved a score of 80.1% on the primary evaluation, which reflects very good performance. The score of 46% on the Supplemental Non-Core Skill Training section indicates room for improvement in staff/parent training & consultation areas. However, any deficiencies noted would likely be removed prior to serving any students in the Non-Core area.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that XXX be awarded TEMPORARY accreditation until such time as corroborating data can be obtained from students; that XXX be awarded FULL accreditation contingent upon corroborating data; and, that areas for improvement be reviewed at the time of the next re-evaluation.

_____
(Evaluator)

I have reviewed the above report and find that it fairly reflects the discussions between the Evaluator and this site. Further, this site will (X) strive to improve in the areas noted
( ) file an appeal objecting to any or all sections of this report
( ) attach clarifying information to this report

X
_____
(Site Representative)

SITE EVALUATION REPORT: III

July 26, 1982

Evaluation Format:

This evaluator met with XXX at XXX.

General Impressions:

XXX has a long history of providing practicum experiences to psychology students from Western Michigan University. The systems and routines for effectively monitoring Western students are well developed. These systems were tailored to meet the needs of psychology students at the undergraduate and masters degree level. It may become necessary to alter some of these systems if they are to be optimally effective as training devices for doctoral level students.

Strengths:

Item I: As can be seen by reviewing the site application form, minimum competencies are clearly stated. The inclusion of a course sequence or competency examination provides an effective screening device for potential practicum students. In addition, entry level skills are assessed by the site.

Item II: Full credit was awarded to each of the components within this item, with one exception (see below).

Item III: Full credit was achieved in relation to evidence of training and behavior analysis. However, one subcomponent under this part may need additional attention (see below).

In relation to behavior change, this site requires proficiency in three or four behavior change techniques, considered to be a minimal amount for doctoral level practicum work. This site often requires, in addition to brief written reports of results, narrative recorded on audio cassettes reporting in detail the results of therapeutic interventions.

Full credit was obtained for evidence of training in public relations/professional skills and training in the specialty features of the site. This site utilizes a training package which orients the

student to the total service array within the site, and how to function effectively within it. If problems exist in relation to professional modes and styles in oral or written communication, those problems are dealt with through appropriate supervisory methods. Practicum students are exposed to a variety of ancillary services within the site, which should result in an increased awareness of health care systems appropriate to the severely impaired.

Item IV: With one exception, adequacy of supervision of practicum students was verified. Site supervisors have excellent backgrounds in applied behavior analysis. Their supervisory methods look quite satisfactory. The weekly meetings with practicum students vary in length according to the needs of the student, rather than the number of credit hours carried by that student. Average latencies range from immediate feedback to twenty minutes. Frequency of feedback varies from daily at the outset of the semester, to weekly as the students require less intensive supervision.

Item V: With one exception, full credit was obtained toward this item. Consequences for student performance are primarily social. No token economies have been established for graduate level students at the site. It is generally known that superior performance often results in paid positions, constituting a fairly effective reinforcer for most practicum students. The site does provide a training manual to all students.

Supplemental Item III.E.: This site wishes to become accredited to provide training in systems design and development, and staff consultation. The site satisfies all requirements for systems design and development, and with one exception, also satisfies the requirements for staff consultation.

Areas for Improvement:

Item II: Although an informal mechanism for identifying and executing new or unique tasks exists at XXX, it is not identified to the practicum students at the outset of the practicum experience. It is recommended that such a mechanism be included in the training manual provided to students.

Item III: Reflecting a history of providing practicum experiences at the undergraduate level, XXX provides detailed prescriptive plans to students which in turn are implemented with the clients. Similarly, ethical or legal guidelines are provided to students, with practicum work expected to abide by such guidelines. Any additional feedback is reactive and corrective in nature. However, practicum students

at the doctoral level should be responsible for generating their own brief behavioral change proposals and to independently discuss alternative interventions, particularly with regard to ethical/legal implications of such alternatives. Although it is recognized that such a responsibility for generating intervention rests ultimately with the classroom teachers, a mechanism needs to be developed which both complies with PL94-142 and Public Act 451, while meeting the training needs of the doctoral practicum students.

Item IV: This site needs to provide written specification of skills acquired by each student during the practicum. The language used in such a report should be unambiguous ("John learned to apply DRO/DRI, extenction, fading, chaining, and shaping techniques.").

Item V: XXX needs to specify in writing the extent to which practicum students will engage in direct intervention with clients during the course of the semester. This might be accomplished in a contract negotiated with the students at the outset, or on the "permission to elect Psy 599/699" form.

Supplemental III.F.: In relation to staff consultation, practicum students will need to be required to write behavioral objectives in relation to the outcomes desired from their consultative activities.

Student Feedback:

This site reported serving no ABA doctoral students enrolled in Psy 599/699 for the past 1.5 years. A check of Departmental files verified these data. Therefore, no student data were obtained.

Summary:

This site obtained a score of 86.7% for the primary evaluation, 100% on the systems design/development section, and 89% on the staff consultation section. These scores represent very satisfactory performance on the part of this site.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that this site be awarded TEMPORARY accreditation until student feedback can be obtained; that FULL accreditation be awarded contingent upon corroborating data from student feedback; and that the areas needing improvement be carefully reviewed upon the next re-evaluation.

_____

(Evaluator)

I have reviewed the above report and find that it fairly reflects the discussions between the Evaluator and this site. Further, this site will (X) strive to improve in the areas noted
( ) file an appeal objecting to any or all sections of this report
( ) attach clarifying information to this report

X
(Site Representative)

SITE EVALUATION REPORT: IV

July 23, 1982

Evaluation Format:

The evaluator met with XXX, Program Supervisor, at XXX.

General Impressions:

Site IV is a behaviorally-based treatment facility for _____. A tightly-controlled therapeutic environment is provided, incorporating classrooms, recreation/activity therapy, adjunctive therapies, and a variety of professional services. XXX's systems are fairly well developed, and provide for the monitoring of outcomes as well as treatment processes.

Strengths:

Item II: Performance contracting facilitates goal/objective setting at XXX. The identification of new tasks, or the recycling of any aspect of the practicum would be accomplished through the re-negotiation of the relevant contract. Full credit was received for subcomponents under this item.

Item III: Full credit was obtained for all subcomponents of this item. Many behavior change techniques would be taught. The site requires recommendations for future treatment to be included in each written report of treatment results. In relation to public relations/ professional skill development, the site requires students to meet key people during the initial orientation of new students. Students work in several of XXX's components in order to gain a better understanding of the integration of services. A full range of training in professional modes of communication can be provided, when necessary.

Item IV: With two exceptions (see below), all subcomponents of this item were judged to be satisfactory. The documentation of skill acquired by each student will appear in a summary report, which will relate outcomes to results anticipated in the initial proposal.

Item V: Two of the components of this item were judged satisfactory, while the remaining component is currently being developed (see below).

Supplemental Item III.E. & F.: This site wishes to gain accreditation in both systems development and staff consultation. The site scored well in these areas, reflecting a strong behaviorally-based systems approach characteristic of this site.

Areas for Improvement:

Item I: The site must develop a mechanism whereby it assesses the entry level skills of practicum students.

Item IV: Although XXX maintains an informal system invoked in response to problems, this site needs to develop a recurring process for accomplishment staff/peer reviews and receiving system feedback, even when problems are not evident.

NOTE: Both items I & IV may be improved sufficiently by implementation of procedures and systems suggested in the Practicum Site Manual.

Item V: XXX is currently in the process of developing training materials useful to practicum students. These materials will include readings and tests on general issues and procedures, as well as a sequence of written material, video tape examples, modeling, role-playing practice, and finally actual placement in the treatment milieu. The evelopment of these resources will satisfy the requirements of V.C.

Student Feedback:

The site reported serving no ABA doctoral students enrolled in Psy 599/699 for the past 1.5 years. A check of Departmental files verified these data. Therefore, no student data were obtained.

Summary:

This site scored very high on the evaluation criteria, receiving a score of 90.2% on the primary evaluation, and scores of 100% on both supplemental areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that XXX be awarded TEMPORARY accreditation until such time as corroborating data can be obtained from students; that XXX be awarded FULL accreditation contingent upon corroborating data; and, that areas for improvement be reviewed at the time of the next re-evaluation.

_____

(Evaluator)

I have reviewed the above report and find that it fairly reflects the discussions between the Evaluator and this site. Further, this site will (X) strive to improve in the areas noted
( ) file an appeal objecting to any or all sections of this report
( ) attach clarifying information to this report

X
(Site Representative)

SITE EVALUATION REPORT: V

May 10, 1982

Evaluation Format:

This evaluator met with XXX, Program Director, at XXX's central office.

General Impressions:

Although at one point XXX had a fairly well-developed system of utilizing practicum students, staff turn-over coupled with new demands on the organization have reduced the active solicitation of practicum students by XXX. As a result, some systems related to managing practicum students effectively may need to be redesigned and instituted.

Nevertheless, XXX remains a behaviorally-based rehabilitation center, administered by a ABA-knowledgeable program director. It should continue to serve as a viable source of ABA training in the area of rehabilitation of the developmentally disabled.

Strengths:

Item II: All components of the goal & objective setting area were judged to be satisfactory, although the validation of skill acquisition could be somewhat improved (see below).

Item III: Except for three subcomponents (see below), all four core skill areas were satisfactory. Special note is made of an excellent procedure for communicating the results of behavior change projects: in addition to a written report, the student is expected to make an oral presentation to the staff. In relation to public relations skill building, much of the training occurs during interviews or didactic sessions with students. The system is primarily reactive in nature, correcting errors as they occur. Basic specialty terminology is provided during initial orientation sessions.

Item IV: All sections were considered satisfactory, except the last three subcomponents (see below). The quality and quantity of supervision is seen as a particular strength of XXX. Short latencies and frequent feedback were reported.

Supplemental Item III.F.: This site wishes to become accredited to provide training in staff consultation. To that end, a preliminary review indicates that all relevant criteria are met.

Areas for Improvement:

Items I & II: This site will need to develop a means whereby entry level skills will be assessed. Currently, an interview with the prospective student serves this purpose. Perhaps a checksheet or some other kind of permanent record of entry skills could supplement the informal interview. This system also could be used to establish exit level skills.

Item III: The number of behavior change techniques taught seems to vary with the nature of the presenting problems of the clients with whom the student will work. However, to the extent that a variety of approaches might have equivalent results, students should apply such varied approaches within and between clients in order to maximize their exposures to a larger number of behavior change techniques. In relation to specialty features of the site, students should be encouraged to carry out behavior analyses of concerns or issues in the rehabilitation of XXX's population, and to formulate goals and strategies potentially useful in resolving these problems.

Item IV: XXX needs to develop a system for documenting the negotiation of revised training objectives for practicum students, including procedures for following up on such revised objectives. Furthermore, this site needs to develop a means of communicating to faculty the skills acquired by each student as a result of the practicum.

Item V: This site needs to define in writing the extent of direct intervention with clients expected of the student. A specification of differential consequences for student performance needs to be developed. Finally, a training manual (as described in V.C.) should be made available to all students.

Student Feedback:

The site reported serving no ABA doctoral students enrolled in Psy 599/699 for the past 1.5 years. A check of Departmental files verified these data. Therefore, no student data were obtained.

Summary:

This site obtained a score of 71.6% for the primary evaluation, and 100% on the Non-Core Skill Training section.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that this site be awarded TEMPORARY accreditation until student feedback can be obtained; that PARTIAL accreditation be awarded contingent upon corroborating data from student feedback; and that FULL accreditation be considered when the areas needing improvement are ameliorated and verified.

It is further recommended that this evaluator continue to work with XXX in order to expedite full accreditation.

_____
(Evaluator)

I have reviewed the above report and find that it fairly reflects the discussions between the Evaluator and this site. Further, this site will (X) strive to improve in the areas noted
( ) file an appeal objecting to any or all sections of this report
( ) attach clarifying information to this report

X
_____
(Site Representative)

SITE EVALUATION REPORT: VI

June 22, 1982

Evaluation Format:

This evaluator met with XXX, Assistant Director, at XXX. XXX provided a number of materials in support of their application.

General Impressions:

A review of the materials provided by XXX reveals a well organized agency. Numerous flow charts, data collection forms, procedures, job descriptions and definitions provide a clear articulation of the procedures and operation of XXX. The proximity to the Department, and continuing relationship with Dr. XXX have obviously resulted in a well systematized and useful human service agency and training site.

Strengths:

Item I: During the first two weeks of participation, each practicum student is carefully observed in order to establish entry level skills. Students are assessed in relation to their knowledge of principles of behavior and behavior change techniques. Prerequisite skills are clearly stated by the program.

Item II: Full credit was awarded to this item. A variety of relevant therapeutic behaviors are monitored through checksheets and discussed during weekly meetings. These weekly meetings also enable staff and students to identify new or unique tasks which may subsequently then be undertaken. This same process if useful for evaluating or recycling any aspect of the practicum. This process is an ongoing one throughout the course of the practicum.

Item III: Full credit was given to behavior analysis, public relations/professional skill training, and specialty features of the site. In relation to measurement systems, students study Jon Bailey's work describing various measurement systems. Students are tested over these readings. All cases for which quantifiable data can be obtained have such data graphed regularly. Graphing of data is required during case presentation.

Public relations and professional skills receive adequate coverage in the course of practica at XXX.

Specialty features include a wide variety of treatment modalities and procedures utilized at this site. Behavior analysis of concerns in the specialty area is encouraged, and publications that have resulted from such analyses provide relevant documentation of compliance with this criterion.

Regarding behavior change, all clients must submit service plans in writing, indicating the anticipated treatment of each client. Furthermore, agenda are prepared prior to each therapeutic contact and progress notes are maintained. Upon termination of services at the end of the semester, students file termination letters and final progress reports related to specific clients.

Item IV: Due to the relationship of XXX to Western Michigan University's Psychology Department, the programs director is a faculty member of the Department. The Assistant Director providing daily supervision is a M.A. level service provider pursuing his Ph.D. within the Department. Therefore, the background and competency of the various supervisors is most satisfactory.

Supervisory methods are quite adequate and full credit was given. Receiving system feedback is somewhat automatic, since clients and practicum students mutually agree upon treatment plans. The negotiation of these plans provides the opportunity for feedback from clients.

Supervisor's evaluations are adequate in relation to latency and frequency.

Item V: Full credit was obtained for this item. Consequation of student performance is accomplished through social reinforcement provided from supervisors and peers during weekly meetings. In addition, course grades are directly related to performance at this site.

The internship training manual provided by XXX is exemplary of a well developed informational package, and clearly meets the criteria established by the Doctoral Practicum Committee.

Areas for Improvement:

Item III: This site needs to develop a systematic process whereby students regularly consider treatment alternatives and the ethical/legal implications of each during their service planning. Currently, alternative interventions might be reviewed through reviewing relevant research literature. Such literature might not necessarily include ethical/legal implecations.

A clear demonstration was not obtained of the training of students in proficiency in applying many behavior change techniques. The number

of techniques taught may depend on the number of credit hours carried by the student. Although it is recognized that each student may come into contact with various other therapeutic techniques by virtue of weekly discussions with other students and staff, such information sharing does not necessarily lead to the acquisition of behavior change skills, therefore, this site needs to develop a process for ensuring the acquisition of numerous behavior change techniques by doctoral practicum students. This may be documented by the use of relevant checksheets, curricula, performance contract, etc.

Item IV: In relation to section C (Supervisor's Evaluation of Practicum Student's Performance) needs to be improved. No documentation was found of negotiation of revised training objectives, systematic follow-up on those objectives, and written specification and validation of skills that were acquired by the practicum student during the practicum. The site should therefore include in its training manual a mechanism for negotiating revised training objectives contingent upon supervisor's, student's and faculty's evaluation of progress, interest, and student's needs. Furthermore, the manual should document procedures for systematically following up on such revised training objectives. Finally, the site needs to develop a system for documenting what specific skills were acquired by each student at XXX.

Student Feedback:

This site reported serving no ABA doctoral students enrolled in Psy 599/699 for the past 1.5 years. A check of Departmental files verified these data. Therefore, no student data were obtained.

Summary:

This site obtained a score of 85.7% on this initial evaluation. This score represents a very well conceived program which should provide superior training to doctoral practicum students.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that this site be awarded TEMPORARY accreditation until student feedback can be obtained; that FULL accreditation be awarded contingent upon corroborating data from student feedback; and that the areas needing improvement be carefully reviewed upon the next re-evaluation.

_____

(Evaluator)

I have reviewed the above report and find that it fairly reflects the discussions between the Evaluator and this site. Further, this site will ( ) strive to improve in the areas noted
( ) file an appeal objecting to any or all sections of this report
( ) attach clarifying information to this report

_____
(Site Representative)

SITE EVALUATION REPORT: VII

June 9, 1982

Evaluation Format:

This evaluator met with Drs. XXX and XXX at XXX offices. Some forms used by the XXX were made available for inspection.

General Impressions:

Due to the intensive involvement of Dr. XXX with this site, including required seminars concurrent with Psy 599/699 enrollment, this site provided excellent practicum services to participating students. A system of instruction has developed which produces an exposure to a wide range of professional issues within education.

Strengths:

Item I: All students are initially screened through verification of prior enrollment in Psy 517. All students are directly observed to ensure at least minimal entry level competencies.

Item II: An understanding is reached between students and site that all students will observe behavior, start data collection, develop prescriptive (intervention) programs, and implement said programs. Weekly progress notes and on-site observations evaluate skill acquisition. Although no formal (i.e., written) mechanism exists for identifying and executing new or unique tasks, this may be accomplished at the discretion of the site supervisor and Dr. XXX. Recycling mechanisms appear to be in place.

Item III: With one exception (see below), all the components of all four core skill areas were judged to be in place, evidencing a superior training function in behavior analysis, behavior change, public relations, and specialty features of the site. Especially impressive was the site's training in appropriate interfacing with personnel located within a public school building (see Public Relations/Professional Skills).

Item IV: With two exceptions (see below), all the components of all three supervision areas were judged as being satisfactory. Latency of feedback from supervisors ranged from 1-to-4 days. One of the site's strong points is the frequency of feedback (at least once/week from both supervisor and Dr. XXX, plus feedback during weekly seminars). The

negotiation of revised training objectives (see Iv.C.3) may be undertaken only when competencies in direct service and consultation are demonstrated. Follow-up on these objectives is accomplished through direct communication with the student's advisor.

Item V: The extent to which students participate in direct client intervention is not specified within a contract; however, it is stipulated within the course requirements. Consequation of student performance is accomplished through course grade (in addition to the usual social reinforcement/punishment). Finally, although training material is currently available to students, Drs. XXX and XXX indicated that a revised student manual will be available by fall semester, 1982.

Supplemental Item III: This site wishes to become accredited in staff training and consultation, for which it meets all of the criteria listed under Non-Core Skill Training area III.F. It also has requested similar accreditation in the same area in relation to parents, for which it meets all requirements with the possible exception of III.F.1. In relation to the latter, this site indicated that the extent to which it might demand and obtain student performance related to carrying out a behavior analysis of the home environment (when working with parents) might depend on variables beyond site control (e.g., willingness of parents to allow students to make home visits, observe and interview siblings, spouses, etc.). Therefore, no guarantees can be made that such an analysis could always be made. Nevertheless, the site should continue requiring all students carrying out parent training to attempt to perform such an analysis to the extent possible.

Areas for Improvement:

Item III: Students may develop proficiency in only one or two behavior change techniques; however, they are exposed to many more, which they might directly observe or hear about during weekly seminar sessions. In addition, numerous skills are acquired in the consultation area. This site should give consideration to expanding the minimum number of techniques taught to all students.

Item IV: Receiving system feedback from educators, pupils and parents should be sought by this site (see IV.B.4.). Although each student's final report is carefully evaluated, this site should develop a written report specifying the skills acquired by the student as a result of the practicum (see IV.C.5.).

Student Feedback:

The site reported serving no ABA doctoral students enrolled in Psy 599/699 for the past 1.5 years. A check of Departmental files verified these data. Therefore, no student data were obtained.

Summary:

This site obtained very high scores, totaling 91.3% for the primary evaluation, and 100% on the Non-Core Skill Training section.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that this site be awarded TEMPORARY accreditation until student feedback can be obtained; that FULL accreditation be awarded contingent upon corroborating data from student feedback; and that the site be commended for its excellent quality of service rendition available to WMU doctoral students.

_____
(Evaluator)

I have reviewed the above report and find that it fairly reflects the discussions between the Evaluator and this site. Further, this site will (X) strive to improve in the areas noted
( ) file an appeal objecting to any or all sections of this report
( ) attach clarifying information to this report

X
_____
(Site Representative)

SITE EVALUATION REPORT: VIII

July 30, 1982

Evaluation Format:

This site is coordinated by the present researcher. In order to reduce or eliminate bias, this evaluation was accomplished by a graduate student who previously had taken a practicum at XXX. If the evaluating graduate student required clarification on any criteria, this researcher attempted to re-word the criterion in a way as to amplify the intent of the Doctoral Practicum Committee. No example of prior work by the student or the site were provided or prompted. The remaining portion of this evaluation summarizes the content of the interview.

General Impressions:

XXX serves XXX and XXX through tightly-structured classrooms which incorporate token economies and a very behavioral approach. In addition, XXX employs mental health workers who provide outreach mental health services to the service population and their families through a variety of treatment approaches, and including behavior therapy and performance contracting.

Strengths:

Item I: In addition to specifying minimum competencies, this site provides each ABA practicum student with a written examination at the outset of the semester, thereby assessing entry level skills.

Item II: This site got full credit for each of the four sub-components involving goal nad objective setting and skill evaluation.

Item III: With two exceptions, this site received full credit for all criteria relating to training in the four core skill areas of behavior analysis, behavior change, public relations/professional skills and specialty features of the site.

Item IV: With one exception (see below), the supervisor's background and methods met all criteria.

The average latency of feedback from the supervisor was about two days, such feedback occuring at least once per week. While this met two of the five criteria under supervisor's evaluation of practicum

student's performance, three criteria were not met (see below).

Item V: Social consequences were provided for practicum student performance, and students are provided an inservice training manual meeting the criteria listed in V.C.

Supplemental Item III.F. & G.: This site met all criteria for both parent training and research non-core skill training areas.

Areas for Improvement:

Item III: This site needs to require brief behavior change proposals from students prior to treatment intervention. Such proposals should provide alternative interventions including ethical-legal implications.

Item IV: This site needs to develop a system for obtaining client feedback regarding each practicum student's performance. Clients may be pupils and their parents.

In addition, this site needs to develop a system for negotiating revised training objectives, as necessary, as well as systems for documenting systematic follow-up of those objectives. This site also needs to develop documentation of written specification and validation of what skills were acquired by the student during the practicum.

Item V: The extent to which practicum students participate in direct intervention with clients should be specified in a written contract completed by student, supervisor and faculty prior to the practicum.

Student Feedback:

This site reported serving no ABA doctoral students enrolled in Psy 599/699 for the past 1.5 years. A check of Departmental files verified these data. Therefore, no student data were obtained.

Summary:

This site achieved a total score of 81.2% for the primary evaluation, with a supplemental non-core skill training score of 100% for parent training and 100% for research training.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that this site be awarded TEMPORARY accreditation until student feedback can be obtained; and that FULL accreditation be considered when corroborating data are obtained from students. In addition, areas needing improvement should be carefully reviewed at the time of the next re-evaluation.

_____
(Evaluator)

I have reviewed the above report and find that it fairly reflects the discussions between the evaluator and this site. Further, this site will ( ) strive to improve in the areas noted
( ) file an appeal objecting to any or all sections of this report
( ) attach clarifying information to this report

_____
(Site Representative)

SITE EVALUATION REPORT: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

April 29, 1982

Evaluation Format:

This evaluator met with XXX, Executive Director of XXX, at XXX's main office.

General Impressions:

XXX is one of the community mental health service providers in Kalamazoo County. Only one graduate student from the psychology department (a masters level student) has received credit to date while at XXX. Due to limited experience with student interns or practicum students, few systems are currently in place for managing doctoral practicum students.

XXX has demonstrated a very behavioral, data-based system of service delivery. Its product-oriented management has the confidence of local and state mental health administrators, ensuring continued fiscal support.

Although certain logistical problems will be difficult to resolve, it seems likely that the implementation of the procedures and routines provided in the ABA Practicum Site Manual will result in effective practica for participating students. XXX has expressed interest in pursuing accreditation through this process.

Strengths:

Item I: Any student being considered by XXX for practicum would be reviewed by the Executive Director. University faculty and field placement supervisors would be contacted in order to ascertain entry level skills. Rather than a limiting set of prerequisites, XXX will tailor tasks to fit the needs of each practicum student.

Item III: Prior to manipulating any environmental contingencies, all students are required to provide a written behavior change proposal which should also provide consideration of ethical/legal issues related to implementation.

Item IV: Students undertaking work in systems or staff training would work closely under the Executive Director, and thus would receive direct supervision from a doctoral-level ABA practitioner. However, similar supervision of other students may be more difficult (see below). As a function of supervision, permanent products from the students would be analyzed.

Areas for Improvement:

All areas not covered above require improvement. The systems provided in the ABA Practicum Site Manual will need to be adopted by XXX.

A problem unique to XXX is the distribution of adequate supervision to students engaged in practica. The normal administrative routines undertaken by the Executive Director preclude daily travel. The problem of adequate supervision must be resolved in order for XXX to become a viable placement for doctoral psychology 599/699 students.

Student Feedback:

The site reported serving no ABA doctoral students enrolled in Psy 599/699 for the past 1.5 years. A check of Departmental files verified these data. Therefore, no student data were obtained.

Summary:

This site obtained very low scores, totaling 17.9% for the primary evaluation, and 0% on the two Non-Core Skill Training sections (III.E. & F.). However, its previous lack of interface with the Department as a practicum site explain such scores.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that this evaluator work closely with this site in producing a system at the site compatible with or comparable to that provided in the ABA Practicum Site Manual. When such systems are in place, a re-evaluation should occur, with the results presented to the Doctoral Practicum Committee, with appropriate recommendations.

_____
(Evaluator)

I have reviewed the above report and find that it fairly reflects the discussions between the Evaluator and this site. Further, this site will (X) strive to improve in the areas noted
( ) file an appeal objecting to any or all sections of this report
( ) attach clarifying information to this report

X
_____
(Site Representative)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alessi, G. J., Lascurettes-Alessi, K., & Leys, W. Internships in school psychology: supervision issues. School Psychology Review, 1981, 10, 461-469.

Allen, R. A resident's view of an ideal psychiatric training program. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1970, 1, 323-324.

Belar, C. D. Training the clinical psychology student in behavioral medicine. Professional Psychology, 1980, 11, 620-627.

Benassi, V., & Lawson, R. A. A survey of the teaching of behavior modification in colleges and universities. American Psychologist, 1972, 27, 1063-1069.

Bornstein, P. H., & Wollenshein, J. P. Scientist-practitioner activities among psychologists of behavioral and non-behavioral orientations. Professional Psychology, 1978, 9, 659-664.

Brehony, K. A., Benson, B.A., Solomon, L. J., & Luscomb, R. L. Parents as behavior modifiers: intervention for three problem behaviors in a severely retarded child. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 1980, 9, 213-216.

Burkhart, B. R., Behles, M. W., & Stumphauzer, J. S. Training juvenile probation officers in behavior modification: knowledge, attitude change, or behavioral competence? Behavior Therapy, 1976, 7, 47-53.

Carmody, T. P., & Zohn, J. APA-approved group treatment internship training opportunities: present status and future directions. Professional Psychology, 1980, 11, 213-219.

Dana, R., Gilliam, M., & Dana, J. Adequacy of academic-clinical preparation for internship. Professional Psychology, 1976, 7, 112-116.

Evans, D. R. A systematized introduction to behavior therapy training. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1976, 7, 23-26.

Evans, I. M., & Nelson, R. O. A curriculum for the teaching of behavior assessment. American Psychologist, 1974, 29, 598-604.

Fawcett, S. B., & Miller, L. K. The use of personalized instruction in a university field-work course. In J. M. Johnston. (Ed.), Behavior Research and Technology in Higher Education, Springfield, Illinois: C. C. Thomas, 1975.

Fuqua, W. The ABA field experience competency: problems and possible solutions. Unpublished manuscript, Western Michigan University, 1979.

Glickman, H., & DiSipio, W. J. Training the clinical psychologist as a scientist-professional. Professional Psychology, 1975, 6, 257-260.

Gormally, J. & Brodsky, S. L. Utilization and training of psychologists for the criminal justice system. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 926-928.

Hanson, J. C. & Moore, G. D. The off-campus practicum. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966, 32-39.

Hedlund, C. S., Hayden, III, B. S., & Mordock, J. B. Psychologists access their internship. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 1979, 8, 48-51.

Johnson, J. H. & Bornstein, P. H. A survey of behavior modification training opportunities in APA-approved internship facilities. American Psychologist, 1974, 29, 342-348.

Johnston, J. M. (Ed.) Behavior Research and Technology in Higher Education. Springfield, Illinois: C. C. Thomas, 1975.

Keller, F. S. A programmed system of instruction. Educational Technology Monographs, 1969, 2, 1-27.

L'Abate, L., Berger, M., Wright, L., & O'Shea, M. Training family psychologists: the family studies program at Georgia State University. Professional Psychology, 1979, 10, 58-65.

Langston, R. D. A use for the monrotational internship. Professional Psychology, 1979, 10, 666-669.

Lloyd, M. E., & Whitehead, J. S. Development and evaluation of behaviorally taught practica. In S. Yen and R. W. McIntire (Eds.), Teaching Behavior Modification, Kalamazoo, Michigan: Behaviordelia, 1976.

Lombard, T. J. Family-oriented emphasis for school psychologist: a needed orientation for training and professional practice. Professional Psychology, 1979, 10, 687-696.

Lowe, Jr., J. D., & Ritzler, B. A. Private practice practica and graduate training in clinical psychology: a survey of APA-approved programs. Professional Psychology, 1980, 11, 925-929.

Lunneborg, P. W. Undergraduate psychology field work: the unwashed take over. American Psychologist, 1970, 25, 1062-1064.

Maher, C. A systems framework for field training in school psychological services. Professional Psychology, 1980, 11, 550-560.

Mazza, J., & Pumroy, D. K. A review of evaluation of behavior modification programs. Psychological Record, 1975, 25, 111-121.

McKeachie, W. J. Psychology at age 75: the psychology teacher comes into his own. American Psychologist, 1968, 23, 551-557.

Michael, J., Bailey, J., Born, D., Day, W., Hawkins, R. P., Sloane, H., & Wood, W. S. Panel discussion: training behavior modifiers. In G. Semb (Ed.), Behavior Analysis & Education. Lawrence, Kansas: The University of Kansas, 1972.

Ottinger, D. R., & Roberts, M. C. A university-based predoctoral practicum in pediatric psychology. Professional Psychology, 1980, 11, 707-713.

Pascal, C. E. Using principles of behavior modification to teach behavior modification. Exceptional Children, 1976, 42, 426-430.

Perry, Jr., N. W. Why clinical psychology does not need alternative training models. American Psychologist, 1979, 34, 603-611.

Rinn, R. C., Vernon, J. C., & Wise, M. J. Training parents of behaviorally-disordered children in groups: a three years' program evaluation. Behavior Therapy, 1975, 6, 378-387.

Sanson-Fisher, R. W., & Seymour, F. W. Training institutional staff to alter delinquents' conversation. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1976, 7, 243-247.

Schmidt, J. P. Psychotherapy supervision: a cognitive-behavioral model. Professional Psychology, 1979, 10, 278-184.

Serafica, F. C., & Harway, J. I. The psychology department clinic: its organization and development. Professional Psychology, 1980, 11, 741-747.

(Shapiro) Polonsky, I., Fox, R. E., Wiens, A. N., Dixon, T. R., Freedman, M. B., & Shapiro, Jr., D. H. Models, modes, and standards of professional training: an invited interaction. American Psychologist, 1979, 34, 339-349.

Stout, A. L., Holmes, G. R., & Rothstein, W. Responses by graduates to memory of their internship in clinical psychology. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1977, 45, 863-870.

Sulzer-Azaroff, B., Thaw, J., & Thomas, C. Behavioral competencies for the evaluation of behavior modifiers. In W. S. Wood (Ed.), Issues in Evaluating Behavior Modification. Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, 1975.

Swan, G. E., Piccione, A., & Anderson, D. C. Internship training in behavioral medicine: program description, issues, and guidelines. Professional Psychology, 1980, 11, 339-346.

Weiss, S. L. The clinical psychology intern evaluates the training experience. Professional Psychology, 1975, 4, 435-441.

Wisocki, P. A., & Sedney, M. A. Toward the development of behavioral clinicians. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Psychiatry, 1978, 9, 141-147.

Young, R. K., & Morrow, H. An internship program in experimental psychology. American Psychologist, 1980, 35, 122-124.