



**College of Psychology**

**Doctoral Program in School Psychology**

**DIRECTED STUDY  
GUIDELINES**

*Rev. August 2015*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
	What is Psy.D. Research?.....	1
	The Directed Study Committee.....	1
	Faculty Research Interests.....	3
<b>II.</b>	<b>DIRECTED STUDY OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>5</b>
	Guidelines and Requirements.....	5
	Types of Directed Studies .....	5
	Resource Materials .....	6
<b>III.</b>	<b>RESEARCH ASSISTANTSHIP.....</b>	<b>7</b>
	Area of Special Interest .....	7
	Seminars .....	7
	Directed Study Projects .....	8
<b>IV.</b>	<b>TIMELINE .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>CONDUCTING THE DIRECTED STUDY RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>13</b>
	Getting Started.....	13
	Writing the Directed Study.....	13
	Sections of the Directed Study .....	14
	Format of the Directed Study .....	15
	APA Style Resources .....	16
<b>VI.</b>	<b>COMPLETION OF THE DIRECTED STUDY .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>SAMPLE FORMS AND PAGES .....</b>	<b>23</b>
	Directed Study Prospectus.....	25
	Acknowledgement of Specifications.....	27
	Research Completion Form.....	29
	Sample Title Page.....	20
	Sample Table of Contents .....	31
	Sample Abstract .....	33
	Sample of the Format .....	34
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>CURRENT RESEARCH PROJECTS.....</b>	<b>35</b>



# I. Introduction

---

## What is Psy.D. Research?

The Psy.D. program in School Psychology is committed to a practitioner-informed-by-science training model. Candidates are prepared as highly competent problem-solvers who draw upon a strong foundation in core knowledge areas of school psychology to promote the educational and social-emotional competence of children. Moreover, candidates are prepared to offer a full continuum of empirically-supported services, including prevention, assessment, consultation, and intervention.

The Directed Study, the capstone research project within the Psy.D. program, helps to prepare the candidate to be a lifelong consumer, evaluator, and utilizer of research to guide clinical/school practice. It is conducted under the supervision of faculty but is to be the candidate's independent, original work, properly citing ideas, results, and/or quotes from other sources. Like all published studies, it can answer only certain questions but can demonstrate the candidate's scholarship, research interpretive acumen, and writing skills.

The Directed Study should serve as a mechanism for the graduate candidate to develop an area of special interest and expertise under the mentorship of a faculty advisor. This project, and the resulting document, should be conceptualized as having a significant impact on clinical knowledge and practice and should be disseminated at state/national conferences and/or submitted for publication.

## The Directed Study Committee

A Directed Study committee will consist of two members who must be full-time academic or clinical faculty of the Center. Directed Study committees must be chaired by an eligible, full-time College of Psychology faculty member. Each member is reviewed by the Director of the School Psychology Program, based on information provided in his or her updated curriculum vitae and periodic surveys conducted on faculty research activities. Eligible faculty members are those who possess expertise in the Directed Study's content and have a record of scholarly research. Each member must possess an earned doctorate from a regionally accredited institution and be an active scholar with demonstrated capabilities for research/scholarship and for directing independent research.

A member from outside the full-time faculty may be a member of the Directed Study committee, pending endorsement by the *Committee Chair* and approval by the Director of the School Psychology Program. When a candidate requests a committee member who is not a full-time faculty member at the College of Psychology, that candidate must submit the proposed member's curriculum vitae outlining qualifications and recent publications and/or research pertinent to the proposed Directed Study. The Director of the School Psychology Program reviews these credentials for approval to serve as a member of the Directed Study committee. Eligibility for participation on candidate Directed Study committees includes:

- Research and/or clinical practice related to the proposed project
- Publication(s) within the last five years
- Previous experience directing research activities
- Previous experience serving on Directed Study/Student Research committees

Any changes to the members of the Directed Study committee while the Directed Study is in progress must be approved by the Director of the School Psychology Program. **There are no exceptions to these policies.** The candidates should discuss first with the chair and then with committee members procedures to be followed.

By February of the first year of study, candidates should select a faculty mentor for their project. Prior to selecting a faculty mentor, candidates should consider how well they would work in collaboration with the faculty member as well as the level of expertise he or she has in their area of interest. This information can be obtained by meeting individually with the school psychology faculty members, by reading their areas of interest, which are provided below, and by talking with other candidates who have worked under the guidance of prospective mentors.

After gathering this information, the candidate is advised to meet with the faculty member(s) he or she is considering to work with as a chair. The candidate should ask questions that will help him or her decide whether the faculty member would be a good chair for the project, particularly with regard to expectations and roles. Establishing clear, direct communication with a chair is very important. Candidates should not necessarily expect a faculty member to agree to chair their committee, especially if they do not have a clear area of specialization and research interest.

The duties of the chair are to provide guidance, to check on progress, and to supervise the preparation of the document. Selecting a chair is one of the most important decisions made in the early stages of planning the Directed Study. A candidate will work closely with his or her chair in selecting the area of specialization and developing a Directed Study research idea and methodology. The chair provides expertise in the candidate's area of research, specific feedback on work, and support. The chair similarly approves the proposal prior to submitting the document to the second reader. This frequently involves reading and critiquing multiple drafts of each section of the Directed Study before final submission.

After obtaining a commitment from a faculty member to chair the Directed Study project, the candidate should then discuss a second reader with their chair prior to making a request. The chair may have specific recommendations for the other committee member.

## **Faculty Research Interests**

The following is a list of the full-time faculty who may serve as a first or second reader of the Directed Study:

**Peter M. Caproni, Ph.D.**, Adelphi University, assistant professor. Therapeutic/collaborative assessment; school-based consultation; psychological services within schools; emotional/behavioral issues with children and adolescents.

**Ralph E. (Gene) Cash, Ph.D., NCSP, ABPP**, New York University, professor. School psychology; psychoeducational assessment, diagnosis, and treatment; depression; anxiety disorders; suicide prevention; forensics, including child custody, wrongful death effects, and disabilities; stress management; and psychology and public policy.

**Kristen Jones, Psy.D.**, Nova Southeastern University, assistant clinical professor. School psychology; psychoeducational assessment and intervention planning, implementation, and monitoring; preschool and school mental health; assessment of autism spectrum disorders; parent-mediated interventions; and developmental-behavioral pediatrics

**Scott Poland, Ed.D.**, Ball State University, professor. Professional experience has included leading national crisis teams and primary interests are suicide intervention, crisis intervention, youth violence, self-injury, school safety and delivery of psychological and counseling services in schools.

**Sarah Valley-Gray, Psy.D., ABPP**, Nova University, professor. Neuropsychological, psychological, and psychoeducational assessment; pediatric neuropsychological disorders; psychological services within the schools; infancy and child development (interaction with caregiver); issues of professional development including training and supervision.

**Angela Waguespack, Ph.D.**, Louisiana State University, associate professor. Psychological, psychoeducational and functional behavior assessment; school-based consultation; service delivery models within schools; multi-tiered systems of supports, including prevention for at-risk populations, as well as academic, behavioral, and social skills intervention for children and adolescents.



## II. Directed Study Overview

---

### General Guidelines and Requirements

A scholarly paper, which is the product of the Directed Study, may be in one of several formats including: a) a literature review with recommendations for practice; b) an empirical study with practice implications; c) a comprehensive case study; d) a treatment/intervention manual; or e) some other format approved by the faculty advisor (e.g., designing a novel intervention or systemic problem-solution with a literature basis). The Directed Study is an independent project conducted under the direction/supervision of a two-member faculty committee: the primary faculty advisor (chair of the committee); and a second faculty member who also serves as an advisor to the project (committee member). A prospectus form signed by the candidate and relevant faculty members must be filed with the Program Office for School Psychology by September 1<sup>st</sup> of the candidate's second year of academic study or the candidate's registration for Directed Study may be retracted. It is strongly recommended that the candidate consult closely with the faculty committee (particularly the chair) to develop and to adhere to a structured timeline for completion of this project.

The Directed Study document must be prepared in accordance with the most recently published APA style manual. A recommended time line is presented on the prospectus form as well as within this document below. The final Directed Study document is due in the program office no later than October 1<sup>st</sup> of the third year of study. The candidate must submit one hard copy of the document to each committee member. In the event that the two committee members do not agree on the final (pass/fail) grade, a third reader will be assigned by the Director of the School Psychology Program to assist in grade determination.

In order to complete the project by the due date, candidates are encouraged to begin discussing their areas of interest and potential topics with their faculty advisor the Fall Semester of the first year of study. To assist candidates in structuring and developing their projects and to assist faculty in the evaluation process, several resource documents have been identified by project type.

### Types of Directed Studies

If the empirical study option is selected, a research report of publication quality is expected for the written product (see Bem, 1987 for guidelines on writing an empirical article). If the literature review option is chosen, it is expected that the review be comprehensive and include primary references and recommendations for practice (see Bem, 1995 and University of Washington, 2010 for guidelines on writing a review article). A comprehensive literature review is contrasted with reviews that only include a limited cross-section of the literature (e.g., highlighting 2-3 exemplary studies) or that focus exclusively on secondary texts. For the case study option, the project is expected to be prepared as a publication-quality report and/or include a comprehensive literature review to support the conceptual components of the case. The structure recommended to authors at the *Clinical Case Study* journal's website may be used as a framework from which to conceptualize some important elements of a formal written case study. Candidates can also consult the Reitman and Paserri (2007) article as an example of a published case study. Candidates should also ask faculty committee members to identify other relevant resources by content area (e.g., a meta-analysis or systematic review published in the area of school psychology).

## **Resource Materials**

- Bem, D. J. (1987). Writing the empirical journal article. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Darley (Eds.), *The complete academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist* (pp. 171-201). New York: Random House.
- Bem, D. (1995). Writing a review article for psychological bulletin. *Psychological Bulletin*, *118*(2), 172-177. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.118.2.172
- Patterson, G. R., DeBaryshe, B. D., & Ramey, E. (1989). A developmental perspective on antisocial behavior. *American Psychologist*, *44*(2), 329-335. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.2.329
- Richters, J., & Pellegrini, D. (1989). Depressed mothers' judgments about their children: An examination of the depression-distortion hypothesis. *Child Development*, *60*(5), 1068-1075. doi:10.2307/1130780
- Craske, M. G. & Barlow, D.H. (2007). *Mastery of your anxiety and panic: Therapist guide* (4th ed.), New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Milrod, B.L., Busch, F.N., Cooper, A.M., & Shapiro, T. (1997). *Manual of Panic-Focused Psychodynamic Psychotherapy*. Washington: American Psychiatric Press.
- Reitman, D., & Passeri, C. (2007). Use of stimulus fading and functional assessment to treat pill refusal with an 8-year-old boy diagnosed with ADHD. *Clinical Case Studies*, *7*(3), 224-237. doi:10.1177/1534650107307476
- University of Washington. (2010). Writing a psychology literature review. Retrieved from <http://web.psych.washington.edu/writingcenter/writingguides/pdf/litrev.pdf>

### **III. Research Assistantship**

---

To gain experience in research, Psy.D. candidates may choose to serve as an assistant to their advisors (or other mentors) in his or her program of research or other scholarly activities. During the first year of the apprenticeship, the candidate may spend his or her time engaging in a variety of activities that serve as the foundation for effective research (e.g., conducting reviews of literature, assisting in collecting data, and entering data into the computer). As their skills progress, however, candidates will begin to take more responsibility for their own scholarship and will become involved in planning, conducting, analyzing, presenting, and writing about research findings. This process will allow the candidates to progress from being assistants to becoming comfortable designing and conducting their own research as well as presenting it at conferences and in journals. Working closely with faculty members in this apprenticeship will make the candidates much better prepared to conduct their directed studies than the average school psychology candidate.

#### **Area of Special Interest**

Candidates are encouraged to develop an area of special interest and emerging expertise. This would be in an area of extensive study in which the candidate has a particular interest. A combination of practica, research, and elective coursework will support the development of a specialty area. The ideas for areas of specialization should be discussed with the research mentor and with other faculty as appropriate.

Candidates should begin exploring areas of special interest during their first semester in the program. While the Directed Study alone will not solidify a specialty area, it should support specialty development. Candidates will work with their mentors/chairs in developing their specialty areas.

For information regarding current Direct Study projects and faculty advisors, please refer to the list of the following page.

#### **Seminars**

Doctoral candidates are expected to attend seminars on topics of scholarly interest. Topics for seminars may include faculty or candidate research or grant activities, presentations by visiting faculty, presentations of possible Directed Study topics, discussions of research that are of interest to faculty and students, or other topics. First year candidates will be expected to attend the seminars and to participate in the discussions. Your participation will help you become an intelligent consumer of research by making you feel comfortable evaluating research and integrating new studies into your previous knowledge of an area. Please note that such discussions are collegial in nature; only gentle, constructive feedback is encouraged. Second and third year candidates will not only attend and participate but will also serve as presenters at some of the seminars.

<b>PSY.D. IN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY – DIRECTED STUDY</b>		
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Research Project Title</b>	<b>Faculty Advisor</b>
FALL 2011	<i>Bullying and Suicide: What is the Relationship?</i>	Poland
	<i>Selection Criteria for Doctoral Level School Psychology Internships</i>	Caproni
	<i>Psychosexual Evaluation and Risk Assessment of Juvenile Sexual Offenders</i>	Cash
	<i>Emergent Literacy Using a Response to Intervention Model in Early Childhood</i>	Waguespack
	<i>Best Practices and Techniques in Art Therapy</i>	Caproni
	<i>Implementing Strength-Based Therapeutic Assessment in Children</i>	Caproni
	<i>Best Practices for Responding to Death in the School Community</i>	Poland
	<i>The Impact of School Reentry on Post-Traumatic Growth of Adolescents with a Traumatic Brain Injury</i>	Valley-Gray
	<i>Professional Competence of School Psychologists in Treating Students who have Sustained a Traumatic Brain Injury</i>	Valley-Gray
FALL 2012	<i>The Role of Treatment Integrity in Preventing Summer Learning Loss</i>	Waguespack
	<i>Grieving Children and the Role of the School Psychologist</i>	Poland
	<i>Social Skills Interventions with Children Who Have Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder</i>	Valley-Gray
	<i>Would the Social Adjustment of Haitian Immigrant Children Separated From Parents Improve with Social Skills Training?</i>	Waguespack
	<i>Using CBT to Reduce Maladaptive Behaviors</i>	Poland
	<i>Mindfulness in Schools: Effects on Student Outcomes</i>	Cash
	<i>Factors Contributing to Parent Engagement Resistance within Haitian and Hispanic Cultures</i>	Caproni
	<i>Dispositional and Environmental Contributions to Behavioral Difficulties and Interventions Designed to Promote Resilience</i>	Caproni
	<i>Pediatric Autoimmune Neuropsychiatric Disorders Associated with Streptococcus (PANDAS)</i>	Valley-Gray

<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Research Project Title</b>	<b>Faculty Advisor</b>
FALL 2013	<i>Physical and Sexual Abuse on School-Aged Children: Effects on School Performance</i>	Cash
	<i>The Transition to Kindergarten: Strategies and Practices Over Time</i>	Waguespack
	<i>Analysis of Measures Used to Gauge Reading Skills in Young Children Participating in Out of School Programs</i>	Waguespack
	<i>Use of Can't Do/Won't Do Assessment in Out of School Programs</i>	Waguespack
FALL 2014	<i>Are Early Childhood Reading Scores Correlated with Parental Involvement in their Child's Education?</i>	Caproni
	<i>Implementing Individual and Group Educational Sessions for Parents of Children on the Autism Spectrum: Effects of Parental Self-Efficacy and Implementation of the Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS)</i>	Jones
	<i>Maximizing the Potential of Children with High Functioning Autism: Linking Assessment and Intervention</i>	Cash
	<i>Self-Regulation and Difficult Behaviors in Young Children Developing in Urban Summer Camp Settings</i>	Waguespack
	<i>Incorporating Positive Psychology and Mindfulness into Academic Settings</i>	Caproni
	<i>Analysis of the Relationship Between Locus of Control and IQ, Achievement, and Other Psychoeducational Factors</i>	Caproni
	<i>Best Practices in Peer Interventions and Prevention of Suicide</i>	Cash



## IV. Timeline

<b>FIRST YEAR OF STUDY</b>	
<b>Fall Semester</b>	PSY 8190 Practicum in School Psychology: Foundations I <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Candidates complete CITI certification</li> </ul>
	December 1: Meet with one of more faculty members to discuss area(s) of mutual interest
<b>Winter Semester</b>	PSY 8140 Statistical Foundations for Educational Research PSY 8195 Practicum in School Psychology: Foundations II <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Discuss directed studies of senior-level candidates</li> <li>▪ Faculty present their research interests and areas of expertise</li> </ul>
	February 28: Select a faculty member to be the Directed Study chair and present the <i>Prospectus for the Directed Study</i> form to the Director of the School Psychology Program.
	March 1– August 1: Meet on a monthly basis (minimally) to discuss progress on the project and choose second reader (committee member).
<b>SECOND YEAR OF STUDY</b>	
<b>Fall Semester</b>	PSY 8145 Issues & Techniques in Research Design and Program Evaluation
	September 1: Finalize topic
	October 1: Create a detailed outline summarizing the literature on your topic
	December 1: Research and analyze a mutually agreed upon number of articles
<b>Winter Semester</b>	January 1– May 31: Meet regularly with chair based upon a mutual agreement and degree of progress
<b>THIRD OR FOURTH YEAR OF STUDY (Prior to applying for Doctoral Internship)</b>	
<b>Fall Semester</b>	September 1: Submit the final document to second reader
	October 1: Submit the final document to the School Psychology Program Office



## V. Conducting the Directed Study Research

---

### Getting Started

The total Directed Study process takes approximately two years to complete from the initial exploration of an idea to the successful completion of the project. The following are guidelines that are intended to assist candidates in the planning and completion of their Directed Study:

1. The first step is to begin talking to professors and upper-level candidates regarding possible Directed Study topics. Investigate the research interests of each professor as described above to assist in the generation of ideas. Papers and presentations for courses, as well as practicum experiences, can provide opportunities to explore different areas of interest. In many cases, the Directed Study is an opportunity to develop an area of expertise, which can provide direction for internship or applied experiences.
2. Choosing a chair: Before committing to a Directed Study topic, candidates should select a faculty member to serve as a mentor, or Directed Study chairperson, in the completion of the project. (See *The Directed Study Committee* on page 1 for guidelines)
3. After the Directed Study committee is formed, the candidate will schedule regular meetings as indicated by his or her chair and choose a topic to pursue, as well as a second reader for the project.

### Writing the Directed Study

All candidates must complete CITI training (See <http://www.nova.edu/irb/training.html> for guidelines regarding how to complete CITI training). If conducting an empirical study, this must be done prior to submitting the proposal study to the Institutional Research Board for approval. See <http://www.nova.edu/irb/manual/forms.html> for IRB guidelines. The candidate should allow sufficient time for IRB approval before beginning the research.

Following a successful IRB approval, if applicable, the candidate may begin the research. The candidate must write in the style specified by the American Psychological Association (APA) as described in the most current edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. The candidate should adhere to the following guidelines when typing the Directed Study:

## **Sections of the Directed Study**

### **1. *Title Page***

The title of the Directed Study should describe the study and contain the appropriate key words. The number of words in the title should not exceed 15.

### **2. *Approval Page***

### **3. *Acknowledgements***

This section should note anyone who has contributed to the formulation and conduct of the Directed Study, including faculty members and other students. It also should acknowledge any permission granted to quote from published works or to use unpublished measures or protocols. Note that CPS follows the APA guideline of requiring permission to quote 500 words or more (cumulative words if more than one quote from a single source). In such cases, the candidate must secure and show to the Directed Study chair letter(s) of permission received from the copyright holder(s) (publisher or author).

### **4. *Table of Contents***

### **5. *List of Tables***

If tables and figures are used, these are to be placed at the appropriate point in the text within the body of the Directed Study (not at the end). Short tables may appear on a page with some text. Each long table and each figure are to be placed on a separate page immediately following the first reference to them. Large tables should be typed on larger paper and reduced to the proper size by photocopying. Figure captions are typed below the figure, or in some cases, on the preceding or facing page (it is preferable to have captions on the same page).

### **6. *List of Figures***

(See description for *List of Tables*)

### **7. *Abstract***

The maximum length for a Directed Study abstract is 350 words, in keeping with the guidelines of *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Abstracts should adequately summarize the problem, methods, results, and conclusions.

### **8. *Directed Study Text***

### **9. *References***

### **10. *Appendices***

Although space generally limits the use of appendices in journal articles, the need for complete documentation often dictates their inclusion in a Directed Study. The following materials are appropriate for appendices: verbatim instructions to subjects, consent forms, and instruments, scales, or questionnaires developed for the study (not previously published ones). Other materials may be included as necessary to explain the study and to permit independent replications. If possible, merge word-processed files for these documents into the Directed Study; if original materials are used, page numbers must be typed onto them.

## **Format of the Directed Study**

### ***Margins:***

The left-hand margin must be one and one-half inches; the top, side, and bottom margins must be a minimum of one inch. The top margin on the first page of a new chapter may be larger than other margins. It is essential that the margin requirements be carefully observed, because some of each margin is trimmed in the binding process.

### ***Fonts:***

Do not use script or other unusual font types; these do not reproduce properly. Use Times New Roman, 12-point font. Use italics instead of underlining for book titles, etc. Use bolding for all headings. No corrections are permitted on the printed pages. Any pages requiring corrections must be retyped and reprinted. The final appearance must be clean and professional.

### ***Spacing and Justification:***

According to the *APA Publication Manual* guidelines, double-spacing is required throughout the final document. Long quotations should be indented five spaces. Full justification should be used to provide a professional-looking document. Single-spacing can be used for table titles and headings, figure captions, references (double-spacing is required between references), footnotes, and long quotations.

### ***Pagination:***

Two sets of page numbers are to be used in the Directed Study. The preliminary pages (from the title page up to the body of the study) should be numbered with lower case Roman numerals (as is common in books). The second set of numbers begins with the first page of Chapter I and continues throughout the study, references, and appendices. These numbers are Arabic. Every page of the study must be assigned a number, even though that number may be suppressed on some pages. In the set of Roman numerals, the title page is assigned a number, but the numeral does not appear. Thereafter, each preliminary page must show Roman numerals centered at the bottom of the page. In the set of Arabic numerals, no number appears on the Abstract, but each subsequent numeral is printed on all following pages in the upper right corner.

### ***Headings:***

There are five levels of headings. **All headings should be bolded. (See sample p. 23):**

Upper-case: centered

Upper and lower-case: centered

Upper and lower-case: italic, centered

Upper and lower-case: italic, left-justified

Upper and lower-case: italic, indented paragraph heading followed by period

### ***Footnotes:***

Footnotes to the text are typed at the bottom of the page on which they are referenced; footnotes should be used sparingly, if at all (see *Publication Manual*).

### ***Printing:***

Laser-jet quality printing is required.

## **APA Style Resources**

American Psychological Association (2009). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6<sup>th</sup> edition). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

American Psychological Association (2009). *Mastering APA style: Student's workbook and training guide* (6<sup>th</sup> edition). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

For a quick reference guide on APA style and formatting, visit the online tutorials found on Alvin Sherman's website: <http://www.nova.edu/library/help/styleguides/cite.html#apa> and the Fischler School of Education Applied Research Center's website: <http://www.fischlerschool.nova.edu/applied-research/writing-and-preparing-the-dissertation>.

\*The following website can be used as an additional reference guide to APA style. <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

## VI. Completion of the Directed Study

It is advisable that the candidate maintains frequent contact with the committee chairperson and with committee members throughout the completion of the Directed Study. This will allow for ongoing feedback. The completed document must be submitted to the second reader by August 1 of the second year of study. The final document will be due on September 1 at the beginning of the third year of study. The Directed Study will receive a pass/fail grade based on the following rubric criteria:

<b>DIRECTED STUDY (LITERATURE REVIEW) RUBRIC (28 points)</b>				
<b>Rating (1-4)</b>				
<b>Note: To obtain a total percentage, divide total score by 28 and multiple by 100. Minimum level of achievement (MLA) is 80%.</b>				
	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Literature base</b>	The literature review is exhaustive given the context of the review.	The literature review is sound but not exhaustive.	The literature review is lacking in significant ways.	The literature review is unacceptable.
<b>Written structure-organization</b>	Document is structured in a skillful manner to facilitate accessibility. The heading/subheading structure provides a sound roadmap.	Document structure is sound but does not feature optimal use of headings, etc.	Structure/organization is less than optimal.	Document is difficult to follow.
<b>Methodology</b>	Parameters for review (e.g., types of works included, year range, etc.) are clearly articulated and contextually grounded.	Parameters for review are not articulated sufficiently.	Parameters for review are not clearly articulated.	Parameters for review are not explicitly discussed.
<b>Conceptual grounding</b>	The review is tightly organized according to a relevant conceptual framework (e.g., theoretical models, research paradigms, etc.).	The review is more loosely organized according to a relevant conceptual framework (e.g., theoretical models, research paradigms, etc.).	A relevant conceptual framework is not adequately described and/or justified.	There is no explicit conceptual grounding.
<b>Integrative</b>	Studies reviewed are critically appraised and integrated along multiple dimensions (e.g., participant populations, methodological shortcomings, etc.).	Studies reviewed are critically appraised in an appropriate manner – but true integration across studies is lacking.	Elements of critical appraisal are lacking.	Critical appraisal is absent altogether or lacking in multiple significant ways.
<b>Synthesis</b>	The review culminates in a series of conclusions and future directions that advance the field of inquiry.	Studies reviewed are critically appraised in an appropriate manner – but true integration across studies is lacking.	Elements of synthesis are lacking in significant ways.	Critical appraisal or synthesis absent altogether or lacking in multiple significant ways.
<b>APA Format</b>	All needed citations are included in the report. End-of-text references match the in-text citations, and all were encoded in APA format. Font, spacing, and APA format are correct.	All needed citations are included in the report. Some references matched the citations and were encoded in APA format. Font, spacing, and APA format are correct.	Citations within the body of the report and a corresponding reference list were presented. Some formatting problems such as font, spacing, and APA format exist.	Citations for statements included in the report were not present, or references which were included were not found in the text. Significant formatting problems such as font, spacing, and APA format exist.
<b>Total</b>				

**DIRECTED STUDY (EMPIRICAL) RUBRIC (40 points)**  
**Rating (1-4)**

**Note:** To obtain a total percentage, divide total score by 40 and multiple by 100. Minimum level of achievement (MLA) is 80%.

	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Literature review</b>	The information presented was gathered using multiple, recent, research-based sources.	The information presented was gathered using multiple recent sources.	The information presented was gathered using a limited, number of sources.	The information presented was gathered using non-peer reviewed articles from three or less sources.
<b>Written structure-organization</b>	Document is structured in a skillful manner to facilitate accessibility. The heading/ subheading structure provides a sound roadmap.	Document structure is sound but does not feature optimal use of headings, etc.	Structure/organization is less than optimal.	Document is difficult to follow.
<b>Use of Principal /Primary Readings</b>	Accurately and appropriately used multiple principal readings in the topic area.	Used at least two principal readings in the topic area, appropriately.	Used two or fewer principal readings or inappropriately used principal readings in topic area.	Did not use or used inappropriately principal readings.
<b>Flow</b>	Goes from general ideas to specific conclusions. Transitions tie sections together, and flow smoothly for one section to the next.	Presents overall general ideas but fails to reach specific conclusions. Flows smoothly from one section to the next.	There is a basic flow from one section to the next, but not all sections or paragraphs follow in a natural or logical order.	The review appears to have no direction, with disjointed subtopics and an excessive number of direct quotations presented as support.
<b>Synthesis</b>	The review concludes with a strong summary or closing statement and clearly states what needs to be further explored. The candidate was able to make succinct and precise conclusions to the research problem based on the articles reviewed. Broad research questions and hypotheses should be included if appropriate.	The review provides concluding remarks that show that a critical analysis and synthesis of ideas took place. While some of the conclusions were not supported in the body of the report, the research questions and hypotheses were stated.	The review provides weak remarks that mostly repeat the conclusions reached by the studies reviewed. The candidate presents conclusions not supported in the body of the report. Research questions and hypotheses could be stated in connection to the research problem but are not appropriately supported by the reviewed literature.	There is no attempt to synthesize the information or to make a conclusion based on the literature under review. No research questions or hypotheses were provided.
<b>Research Questions</b>	Formation of question or questions are based on theory and previous research and stated in the form of a question or questions; questions are focused, clear, specific, and feasible.	Questions are based on theory and previous research; the questions are focused but not clear and not feasible.	Questions are based on prior research but are not clear.	Questions are not based on prior research and are not feasible.
<b>Methodology</b>	The scope of the project is commensurate with a research consumer focus. The design is methodologically broad and data analysis sophisticated and appropriate. Conclusions are sound.	The design is basically sound and data analysis appropriate. Conclusions are sound.	The design has basic weaknesses and / or the data analysis is weak and / or internal or external validity is weak. Conclusions may be weak.	The design is weak and / or the statistical analysis is inappropriate or inaccurate. Conclusions are not sound.
<b>Conceptual grounding</b>	The review is tightly organized according to a relevant conceptual framework (e.g., theoretical models, research paradigms, etc.).	The review is more loosely organized according to a relevant conceptual framework (e.g., theoretical models, research paradigms, etc.).	A relevant conceptual framework is not adequately described and/or justified.	There is no explicit conceptual grounding.

	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Integrative</b>	Studies reviewed are critically appraised and integrated along multiple dimensions (e.g., participant populations, methodological shortcomings, etc.).	Studies reviewed are critically appraised in an appropriate manner – but true integration across studies is lacking.	Elements of critical appraisal are lacking.	Critical appraisal is absent altogether or lacking in multiple significant ways.
<b>APA Format</b>	All needed citations were included in the report. End-of-text references match the in-text citations, and all were encoded in APA format. Font, spacing, and APA format are correct.	All needed citations were included in the report. Some references matched the citations and were encoded in APA format. Font, spacing, and APA format are correct.	Citations within the body of the report and a corresponding references list were presented. Some formatting problems such as font, spacing, and APA format exist.	Citations for statements included in the report were not present, or references which were included were not found in the text. Significant formatting problems such as font, spacing, and APA format exist.
<b>Total</b>				

**DIRECTED STUDY (CASE STUDY) RUBRIC (40 points)****Rating (1-4)**

**Note:** To obtain a total percentage, divide total score by 40 and multiple by 100. Minimum level of achievement (MLA) is 80%.

	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Case Study Format</b>	The rationale for the case example(s), assessments, and outcome measures, is clearly presented. The paper uses methods for assessing treatment outcomes that are appropriate for the case and conceptual framework.	A rationale for the case example(s), assessments, and outcome measures, is presented but is not a clear as would be optimal. The paper uses methods for assessing treatment outcomes, but other measures may be more appropriate for the case.	The rationale for the case example(s), assessments, and outcome measures is not appropriate or of limited value. The paper uses methods for assessing treatment outcomes that are not appropriate, or this aspect is lacking in methodological rigor.	A rationale for the case example(s), assessments, and outcome measures is not evident. The paper does not attempt to present any assessment of treatment outcomes that are appropriate for the case.
<b>Written structure-organization</b>	Document is structured in a skillful manner to facilitate accessibility. The heading/subheading structure provides a sound roadmap.	Document structure is sound but does not feature optimal use of headings, etc.	Structure/organization is less than optimal.	Document is difficult to follow.
<b>Literature review</b>	The information presented was gathered using multiple, recent, research-based sources.	The information presented was gathered using multiple recent sources.	The information presented was gathered using a limited, number of sources.	The information presented was gathered using non-peer reviewed articles from three or less sources.
<b>Use of Principal/Primary Readings</b>	Accurately and appropriately used multiple principal readings in the topic area.	Used at least two principal readings in the topic area, appropriately.	Used 2 or fewer principal readings or inappropriately used principal readings in topic area.	Did not use or used inappropriately principal readings.
<b>Synthesis</b>	The case study concludes with a strong summary or closing statement and clearly states what needs to be further explored. The candidate was able to make succinct and precise conclusions based on the study and articles reviewed. Research questions and hypotheses should be included if appropriate.	The case study provides concluding remarks that show that a critical analysis and synthesis of ideas took place. While some of the conclusions were not supported in the body of the report, the research questions and hypotheses were stated.	The case study provides weak remarks that mostly repeat the conclusions reached by the studies reviewed. The candidate presents conclusions not supported in the body of the report. Research questions and hypotheses could be stated in connection to the research problem but are not appropriately supported by the reviewed literature.	There is no attempt to synthesize the information or to make a conclusion based on the case study and literature under review. No research questions, hypotheses, or underlying thesis were evident.
<b>Research Questions</b>	Formation of question or questions are based on theory and previous research and stated in the form of a question or questions; questions are focused, clear, specific, and feasible.	Questions are based on theory and previous research; the questions are focused but not clear and not feasible.	Questions are based on prior research but are not clear.	Questions are not based on prior research and are not feasible.
<b>Conceptual grounding</b>	The review is tightly organized according to a relevant conceptual framework (e.g., theoretical models, research paradigms, etc.).	The review is more loosely organized according to a relevant conceptual framework (e.g., theoretical models, research paradigms, etc.).	A relevant conceptual framework is not adequately described and/or justified.	There is no explicit conceptual grounding.
<b>Integrative</b>	Studies reviewed are critically appraised and integrated along multiple dimensions (e.g., participant populations, methodological shortcomings, etc.).	Studies reviewed are critically appraised in an appropriate manner – but true integration across studies is lacking.	Elements of critical appraisal are lacking.	Critical appraisal is absent altogether or lacking in multiple significant ways.

	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Methodology</b>	The scope of the project is commensurate with a research consumer focus. The design is methodologically broad and data analysis sophisticated and appropriate. Conclusions are sound.	The design is basically sound and data analysis appropriate. Conclusions are sound.	The design has basic weaknesses and / or the data analysis is weak and / or internal or external validity is weak. Conclusions may be weak.	The design is weak and / or the statistical analysis is inappropriate or inaccurate. Conclusions are not sound.
<b>APA Format</b>	All needed citations were included in the report. End-of-text references match the in-text citations, and all were encoded in APA format. Font, spacing, and APA format are correct.	All needed citations were included in the report. Some references matched the citations and were encoded in APA format. Font, spacing, and APA format are correct.	Citations within the body of the report and a corresponding references list were presented. Some formatting problems such as font, spacing, and APA format exist.	Citations for statements included in the report were not present, or references which were included were not found in the text. Significant formatting problems such as font, spacing, and APA format exist.
<b>Total</b>				



## **VII. Sample Forms and Pages**

---

The following pages contain sample forms and pages to be used in the Directed Study:



### Directed Study Prospectus

Candidate **MUST** present this completed form to the School Psychology Program Office by February 28.

**NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_ **NSU ID#:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Title:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Description:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate project type (by placing a check next to relevant type):

\_\_\_\_\_ Literature review      \_\_\_\_\_ Case study      \_\_\_\_\_ Empirical study  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other (please describe): \_\_\_\_\_

**Note:** If you will be the principal investigator of a study involving the participation of human subjects, you must secure IRB approval prior to beginning your study. Check below as needed. See <http://www.nova.edu/irb/training.html> for guidelines regarding how to complete CITI training and <http://www.nova.edu/irb/manual/forms.html> for IRB guidelines.

\_\_\_\_\_ I will be the principal investigator of a study involving human subjects and acknowledge that I am responsible for securing IRB approval by signing below.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**SIGNATURE**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**DATE**



Below is a time-line that can be modified by the faculty chair, i.e., the faculty chair can require that drafts and/or the final document be submitted earlier.

Task	Due date	Faculty approved due date (if different)
<b>Prospectus form completion</b>	<b>February 28 first year</b>	
General outline submitted	October 1 second year	
Document submitted to second reader	September 1 third year	
<b>Final document due</b>	<b>October 1 third or fourth year</b> (prior to applying for doctoral internship)	

Please sign below indicating your acknowledgement of the specifications set forth in this prospectus.

_____	_____	_____
Candidate (print)	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Committee chair (print)	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Committee member (print)	Signature	Date



**RESEARCH COMPLETION FORM**

An abstract of the Directed Study must be attached to this form. A complete copy of the Directed Study is also required.

Candidate Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Please print)

Date of Final Approval: \_\_\_\_\_

has completed:

Psy.D. Directed Study \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Research Chair (Please print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Second reviewer (Please print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Please print title of Directed Study below:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Return this form with attached abstract to  
The School Psychology Program Office



**SAMPLE TITLE PAGE**

**CHANGES IN COGNITION FROM ELABORATIVE STRATEGIES  
IN PSYCHOTHERAPY**

**By**

**Jane Psychologist**

A Directed Study Presented to the Center for Psychological Studies  
of Nova Southeastern University  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.)

**NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY**  
[Year]

(suppress page)

## SAMPLE OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	
LIST OF FIGURES.....	
ABSTRACT.....	
CHAPTER I: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	
Attitude Change .....	
Theory and Laboratory Research .....	
Clinically Relevant Research .....	
Simulation: Constructing Scenarios.....	
Theory and Laboratory Research .....	
Clinically Relevant Research .....	
Purpose of the Study .....	
Hypotheses .....	
CHAPTER II: METHOD.....	
Subjects .....	
Measures .....	
Treatments.....	
Procedure.....	
CHAPTER III: RESULTS .....	
Descriptive Statistics.....	
Treatment Effects.....	
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION.....	
The Hypotheses .....	
Limitations of the Study .....	
Findings Relative to Previous Research .....	
Implication for Practice and Future Research .....	
REFERENCES .....	
APPENDICES .....	
A. Client Consent Form.....	
B. Cognitive Elaboration Measures.....	

(Roman numeral page #)

(suppress page # on this page)

**SAMPLE ABSTRACT**

**CHANGES IN COGNITION FROM ELABORATIVE STRATEGIES  
IN PSYCHOTHERAPY**

**By**

**Jane Psychologist**

Nova Southeastern University

**ABSTRACT**  
(Maximum 350 words)

**SAMPLE OF THE FORMAT**

(Note 5 levels of headings)

**CHAPTER I (Level 5)****Statement of the Problem (Level 1)**

Research in school psychology has validated the efficacy methods of changing cognitions and attitudes and provided support for theoretical models of the process. Clinicians have always promoted cognitive and attitudinal changes during psychotherapy and developed various techniques to do so. What is now needed is clinical research to validate the efficacy of well-specified interventions to change cognitions and attitudes.

***Attitude Change (Level 2)***

Research on attitude change has been accumulating for 50 years. The relevance of persuasion and attitude change to psychotherapy has been asserted and clinically relevant research conducted for 30 years.

***Theory and Laboratory Research (Level 3)******Early Work (Level 4)***

The first systematic program of research on attitude change was based on learning theory, while more recent work is based on cognitive theory.

## VIII. Current Research Projects

---

### **Suicide Prevention among at-risk Adolescents: Research and Evaluation (SPARE)**

The SPARE project is a collaborative effort between the Florida Initiative for Suicide Prevention (FISP, also called the Florida Initiative for Solving Problems) and the NSU Center for Psychological Studies (CPS). The main purpose of the project is to determine the extent to which teaching adolescents who are deemed to be particularly at-risk for suicide or other self-injurious behavior because of the facility with which they are involved (e.g., juvenile justice or special schools for those with mental health problems) or as a result of nomination by knowledgeable personnel from their school or club (e.g., Boys and Girls Club and YMCA). Parents/legal guardians of potential participants are provided with an informational packet describing the program curriculum and inviting them to meet with a representative from FISP or SPARE to obtain additional information about the study. Informed consent is obtained at this time. Participants who are minors sign assent forms during the initial session.

Each group consists of ten, 1.5-hour sessions, typically held weekly. Group facilitators are doctoral-level graduate candidates in clinical psychology. The experimental condition utilizes the Solutions Unlimited Now (SUN) 10-step model of problem-solving (Tellerman, 2001). Experimental group facilitators are trained by FISP in accordance with the SUN program curriculum. The SUN program focuses on educating adolescents about the problem-solving process in order to reduce their engagement in risky behavior. Participants are taught to tackle problems in the following steps: (a) recognize there is a problem; (b) identify the problem; (c) bring the problem to the group; (d) have other participants pretend the problem is his/her own; (e) brainstorm solutions; (f) discuss pros and cons of each solution; (g) choose a good solution; (h) plan how to carry out the solution; (i) carry out the solution; and (j) report back to the group the efficacy of the plan. Goals of the experimental group are to teach participants to put problems into words, to explain problems to others, to recognize that there are numerous solutions to a given problem, to evaluate alternative problem solutions, and to accept that others may have good opinions and can help to resolve problematic situations.

Metropolitan Teaching and Learning (Metro TLC, 2005) Workbooks are utilized as the reading curriculum in the control condition. The workbooks are chosen according to the reading grade levels of the participant and within each grade level, are selected from among several alternatives based on their interest to the participants. Control group facilitators are trained by a reading specialist affiliated with the Broward County, Florida, School District to do an informal assessment of reading level, to assign books based on reading and interest levels, and to employ the 10-session protocol to work on reading accuracy and comprehension.

To date, almost 400 participants constitute this ongoing project's data base. The data have been collected using funds from several grants and are being/have been used for dissertations; state, national, and international presentations; and various publications. Graduate candidates are needed to update literature reviews, to help plan project extensions (e.g., to serve college-age students, recent immigrants, victims of traumatic brain injury), to enter and to analyze data, to serve as group facilitators, and to participate in preparing publications and presentations.

### **Ongoing Research: Emergent Literacy Skills Enhancement (OR ELSE)**

This project involves collaboration among the NSU Mailman Segal Institute's (MSI) Family Center; the Jack and Jill Preschool, a private pre-kindergarten program in Broward County; NSU's Speech/Language Department; and NSU's College of Optometry. Although additional data are not currently being collected for this project, the archival data base, which was collected over a 3 year period, consists of developmental screening information, hearing and vision screenings, parent and teacher ratings, demographics, and assessment of emergent literacy skills on several hundred preschool children from two socioeconomically and racially different prekindergarten programs. The two programs also differ in their pre-k curricula. During the first year, screening data were collected near the beginning of the school year and emergent literacy skills data were obtained near year's end. In the second year, trained graduate candidate assistants were randomly assigned to classes to work with the preschool teachers for an hour a week, either to augment the curriculum with the *Ladders to Literacy* strategies or simply to lend a hand to teachers in implementing their regular curriculum. In the third year, parents of participating preschoolers were taught how to enhance emergent literacy skills at home or how to manage their child's behavior more effectively.

The emergent literacy data have been collected using funds from several grants and are being/have been used for dissertations; state, national, and international presentations; and various publications. Graduate candidates are needed to update literature reviews, to help plan additional projects, to verify and to analyze data, and to participate in preparing additional publications and presentations.

### **Teaching Elementary Age Children to Help Apply Critical Thinking Skills (TEACH ACTS)**

The purpose of this study is to compare the effects of training in critical thinking skills on learning disabled (LD) and typically developing children in early elementary school. Participants in this study are children currently enrolled in 1st, 2nd, and 3rd grades at the NSU University Lower School, both typical learners and those diagnosed with LD, who are enrolled in University School's Learning and Research Academy (LRA). At least 10 children from each of the 3 grades, half of whom are LD candidates enrolled in the LRA, will be participating.

Once parents agree to have their children participate and complete the informed consent process, the participants will be administered a battery of tests designed to measure intellectual functioning and critical thinking. Due to the lower enrollment in the LRA, once participants in the LRA are assessed along the aforementioned domains, non-LD participants from the mainstream educational program who match along the variables of sex, grade, age, ethnicity, and socio-economic status will be selected and assessed with the same brief measure of intellectual functioning (Kaufman Brief Intelligence Test, Second Edition) and a test of problem-solving (Test of Problem Solving, Third Edition). Non-LD and LD participants who match along the aforementioned demographic variables and whose overall summary scores on the aforementioned measures fall within one standard error of measurement of each other will be considered a match. Additionally, participants will be matched along the variable of prior time spent in the Mind Lab critical thinking training program. Lastly, all participants will have taken the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Eighth Edition the prior year as part of University School's annual school-wide assessment. Those non-LD candidates who do not match with an LD candidate along each of the variables will be dismissed from the study, although they will continue to participate in the Mind Lab program. Identified participants will be then be

administered the remaining battery of tests. The battery will be administered again near the conclusion of the school year to assess progress.

Assessments will be administered by graduate candidates enrolled in the Doctoral Program in Clinical Psychology and Specialist Program in School Psychology at the Center for Psychological Studies under the supervision of Ralph E. "Gene" Cash Ph.D., NCSP, and Kristen Jones, Psy.D., as well as by graduate candidates in the Doctoral Program in Speech-Language and Communication Disorders at the Fischler School of Education and Human Services under the supervision of Leslie Miller, M.S., CCC-SLP. Parents will be afforded the opportunity to have a brief synopsis of results of their child's testing verbally shared with them upon completion of the study should they request same. Graduate candidates are needed to assist in test administration and scoring, data entry and analysis, preparation of results for presentations and publications, and planning of follow-up studies.

### **Simulated Patient Evaluation, Research, and Collaboration (SPARC)**

This study seeks to augment the clinical interviewing skills of graduate candidates in psychology at Nova Southeastern University's Center for Psychological Studies. All first year graduate candidates in psychology will be invited to participate in the study. Those who volunteer will be randomly assigned to one of two laboratory conditions: the traditional peer role-play condition or the standardized patient condition. The traditional role-play condition will serve as the control condition and will consist of various role-plays with peers who are at a similar level in their graduate training. The standardized patient condition will be implemented as the experimental group and will involve practice of clinical interviewing skills with a standardized patient trained by Heidi Lane, Ed.D., Assistant Professor of Internal Medicine and Director of Patient-Centered Education in Nova Southeastern University's College of Osteopathic Medicine. Dr. Lane has been training standardized patients in the College of Osteopathic Medicine for 3 years and previously at did so at Brody School of Medicine for 15 years. She is an active member of the Association of Standardized Patient Educators (ASPE), an international organization for professionals in the field of standardized patient methodology. Each group will seek to facilitate development of the same set of interviewing skills, and similar scenarios will be employed in both groups.

Students' participation in the proposed study will not be a mandated component in the required curriculum; rather it will be an optional experience that may enhance the curriculum, for which there will be no charge. A total of 40 or more candidate volunteers will be recruited to participate in the study, with 20+ candidates randomly assigned to the traditional role-play condition and 20+ candidates randomly assigned to the standardized patient condition. Investigators will coordinate 2 laboratory groups for each condition, with 10+ candidates in each group.

Candidate volunteers in each condition will participate in a pre-assessment interview with a standardized patient, 4 laboratory sessions, and a post-assessment interview with a standardized patient. Participation in all sessions will be required, as long as the candidate continues in the study. Although no formal grades will be assigned, candidates will be provided with feedback regarding their performance to help them enhance their clinical skills. In the pre-assessment interview, volunteers in both conditions will participate in a 30-45 minute pre-assessment of interviewing skills with a standardized patient. Volunteers will receive feedback on their skills, and the initial session will be conducted in one of several laboratory rooms located in Nova Southeastern University's Health Professions Division. In laboratory sessions 1-4, candidates

will be trained to utilize effective interviewing skills through clinical practice (i.e., role play), as well as didactic experiences. Laboratory sessions will involve a curriculum based on the enhancement of interviewing skills developed by experienced faculty. Laboratory sessions will last approximately 2 hours and will take place in Nova Southeastern University's Center for Psychological Studies. Participants in both the role-play condition and the standardized patient condition will observe their colleagues as they conduct interviews, while also having opportunities to participate themselves. Thus, over the course of the laboratory session, participants in the traditional role-play condition will have an opportunity to serve as both the therapist and the patient in various simulations of situations that commonly arise in clinical practice. These candidate participants will engage in traditional role-plays with their peers. Conversely, in the standardized patient condition, candidate participants will serve only as therapist interviewer, and a standardized patient will portray the role of a patient presenting for treatment. Standardized patients will be trained to portray the patient in the same role play scenarios that will be used in the traditional role-play condition.

In the post-assessment, volunteers assigned to either condition will participate in a 30-45 minute post-assessment of interviewing skills with a standardized patient. Like the pre-assessment, the post-assessment will take place in a laboratory located in Nova Southeastern University's Health Professions Division. The same method of scoring utilized during the pre-assessment will be implemented during the post-assessment. Ratings will be made by post-doctoral residents, the same raters will complete both the pre-assessment and the post-assessment ratings, and each rater will be blind to knowledge of the condition to which the participants have been assigned. The raters evaluating clinical interviewing skills during the pre- and post-assessments will not conduct the interviewing skills laboratory sessions. The pre- and post-assessments will also be videotaped, and ratings will be validated for each volunteer in both conditions.

The laboratory instructors will be postdoctoral residents from Nova Southeastern University's Center for Psychological Studies who are not involved in the pre- and post-ratings of participants. They will be trained by the principal investigator and co-investigators to conduct the training sessions. A standardized patient will be included only in the experimental groups. Standardized patients will conduct a rating of interpersonal satisfaction with the interview during both pre-assessment and post-assessment. During pre- and post-assessment, raters will score participants' interviewing skills using a rating scale currently used in the PSY 1703 Pre-Practicum I, a course in the doctoral program in clinical psychology at the Center for Psychological Studies. This 7-item rating scale quantifies candidate volunteers' appropriate use of eye contact, posture and gestures, vocal tone, rate of speech, verbal attending behavior, and accurate responses to client's feelings. Some items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale, while others are on a 4-point scale.

The purpose of the proposed research will be to investigate whether having the opportunity to interact with a standardized patient enhances interviewing skills when compared with traditional role play with peers. This study also seeks to determine whether implementation of a standardized patient model of training clinical interviewing skills would be an effective financial investment for the Center for Psychological Studies. Graduate candidates are needed to help collect, score, enter, and analyze data as well as to update the literature review and to prepare for presentations and publications.

### **School-related Psychological Assessment and Clinical Interventions (SPACI) Data Base**

The School Psychology Assessment and Consultation Center examines many characteristics of those who are referred for evaluation for educationally-related problems, such as a student's achievement levels, cognitive and intellectual functioning, psychological processing, social and emotional functioning, as well as many demographic characteristics. The examiners have administered (and continue to administer) a variety of measures. The following list provides a sample of measures that have been given to participants and, therefore, are a part of the database:

- Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Fourth Edition: Intelligence test also used to assess for ADHD and Learning Disabilities. The test is comprised of ten core subtests and five supplemental ones.
- Wechsler Primary and Preschool Scale of Intelligence, Third Edition: Intelligence test designed for children ages 2 years 6 months to 7 years 3 months. The test is comprised of 14 subtests.
- Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children, Second Edition: Intelligence test using simultaneous and sequential mental processes. The test is comprised of 16 subtests.
- Reynolds Intellectual Assessment Scales: Intelligence test appropriate for ages 3 through 94 years. It is comprised of 6 subtests which minimize the effect of processing speed.
- Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, Fifth Edition: Intelligence test that assesses intelligence and cognitive abilities in children and adults aged 2 to 85+.
- Wechsler Nonverbal Scale of Ability: A nonverbal measure of ability for all, especially designed for culturally and linguistically diverse groups.
- Test of Nonverbal Intelligence, Third Edition: A language-free assessment of nonverbal intelligence and reasoning abilities for ages 6-0 – 89-11.
- Universal Nonverbal Intelligence: Entirely nonverbal stimulus and response administration format incorporating eight hand and body gestures
- Leiter International Performance Scale- Revised: Nonverbal measure of intelligence ideal for use with those who are cognitively delayed disadvantages, non-English speaking, hearing impaired, speech impaired, or autistic.
- Differential Ability Scales – Second Edition: Test used to measure the child's strengths and weaknesses, so the appropriate IEP goals, intervention strategies, and progress monitoring can be developed
- Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Cognitive Abilities: Measures general intellectual ability and specific cognitive abilities
- Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test: Used to assess general reasoning ability in children and adolescents. The NNAT-Individual is a companion to the NNAT-Multilevel Form and is the revision of the Matrix Analogies Test-Expanded Form (MAT-Expanded Form).
- Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement: Measures academic achievement.
- Kaufman Tests of Educational Achievement, Second Edition: Covers all achievement areas mandated by IDEA through error analysis along with detailed prescriptive information for simple remediation planning.
- Wide Range Achievement Test- Expanded Group Assessment: An assessment of reading comprehension, mathematics and non-verbal reasoning.

- Bracken Basic Concept Scale – Revised: Assesses a child's receptive knowledge of basic concepts. Use results for IEP development and remediation.
- Wechsler Individual Achievement Scale, Third Edition: It is a comprehensive yet flexible measurement tool useful for achievement skills assessment, learning disability diagnosis, special education placement, curriculum planning, and clinical appraisal for preschool children through adults.
- Test of Memory and Learning: A nationally-standardized test for evaluating general and specific memory functions.
- Children's Memory Scale: This battery comprehensively assesses the integrity of memory functions in children and enables comparison with measures of both ability and achievement.
- Peabody Picture Vocabulary, Fourth Edition: The leading measure of receptive vocabulary for standard English and a screening test of verbal ability.
- Expressive Vocabulary Test, Second Edition: A measure of expressive vocabulary and word retrieval.
- Tests of Early Reading Ability, Third Edition: A measure of early reading abilities.
- Fox in a Box – An Adventure in Literacy: Identifies primary candidates at risk. Concepts measured are phonemic awareness, phonics, reading and oral expression, listening and writing.
- Bilingual Verbal Ability Tests: Provides a measure of verbal ability for bilingual individuals.
- Oral and Written Language Scales: An assessment of written language for children and young adults administered individually or in small groups
- Comprehensive Assessment of Spoken Language: An in-depth, research-based, theory-driven assessment of oral language skills.
- First Step Screen Test for Evaluating Preschoolers: Developmental screening tool.
- Mullen Scales of Early Learning AGS Edition: A developmentally-integrated system that assesses language, motor, and perceptual abilities.
- SCAN-A Test of Auditory Processing Disorders in Adolescents and Adults: SCAN-A is a test for Auditory Processing Disorders in Adolescents and Adults can identify a central auditory processing disorder and obtain information about an individual's ability to process auditory stimuli.
- SCAN-C Test for Auditory Processing Disorders in Children-Revised: SCAN-C is a test for Auditory Processing Disorders in children ages 5-11 yrs. SCAN-C assesses the perception stage of auditory processing, which is pre-cognitive.
- Delis-Kaplan Function System: Provides a comprehensive assessment of higher-level thinking and cognitive flexibility – key components of executive functioning believed to be mediated primarily by the frontal lobe.
- Psychoeducational Profile: Used to assess the skills and behaviors of children with autism and communicative disabilities with a developmental age between 6 months and 7 years.
- NEPSY, Second Edition: A series of neuropsychological tests that are used in various combinations to assess neuropsychological development in children ages 3-16 years in six functional domains: Attention, Executive Functions, Language and Communication, Sensorimotor Function, Visuospatial Functions, Learning and Memory.

- Roberts-2: Provides a measure of the child's social understanding as expressed in free narrative, reflecting both development and clinical concerns.

In addition to the aforementioned measures, many demographic characteristics have also been gathered from questionnaires, checklists, interviews, and report forms. Some of these data include, but are not limited to age, gender, race, DSM-IV diagnosis/diagnoses, birth and developmental history, educational history, family history, family medical history, and socioeconomic status. Graduate candidates are needed to help organize and enter the data, to plan and to carry out various analyses, and to prepare the results for presentations and publications.

### **Summer Reading Explorers Enhanced Reading Services**

The Summer Reading Explorers program is a funded research and service project to be implemented during the summer of 2013. It is the goal of the project to inform decision-making regarding future services provided by The Children's Trust. A description regarding the scope of the project follows. Graduate students are needed to assist in service delivery implementation; to assess integrity and quality of universal reading instruction during summer camp; to evaluate children's receptive language, early reading skills, and progress in the intervention program; and to provide results to parents regarding child performance. Following the implementation of the program, graduate students will be needed to assist in data organization and analyses, as well as to prepare papers for presentation and publication.

These itinerant enhanced reading services will be layered into existing Children's Trust-funded summer camp programs, specifically for rising kindergarten (age five as September 1, 2013) and first graders who are attending camp sites located in and around the public school system's Education Transformation Office (ETO) elementary schools. The provider will hire, coordinate, train, supervise, and deploy certified teachers, trained reading paraprofessionals/volunteers, and/or education undergraduate/ graduate students to deliver research-based reading services. These will include small group literacy instruction and enhanced parent literacy engagement activities. Reading tutors will pull out students from non-core summer camp activities to provide 30 minutes of small group (maximum 5 children) literacy instruction for a minimum of four times per week, leveled for the child's age and current functioning.

The design of the service delivery will enable a program evaluation that compares among various levels of enhanced summer reading services. The services will be delivered by Florida International University (FIU) in conjunction with a subcontract with Hope for Miami (formerly Family and Children Faith Coalition), which brings together research-based academic expertise with staff experience in real-world, community implementation and dissemination. Summer camp sites will be randomly assigned to three (3) possible reading services conditions, with matching on factors such as site size, location, and predominant language preference to ensure similar assignments across conditions. The conditions are as follows:

1. Parent literacy engagement activities (that will count for The Trust's family involvement requirement), book giveaways, collection of Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) testing, personalized feedback for parents about child's oral reading/pre-reading progress, and assistance connecting families to more formal reading supports if needed at the end of the summer. All summer sites currently implementing the Children's Defense Fund (CDF) Freedom Schools will be in this group.

2. All activities in the first condition, as well as small group (maximum 5 children) interactive (dialogic) reading, delivered 30 minutes/day, 4 days/week for 6 weeks.
3. All activities in the first condition, as well as small group (maximum 5 children) structured reading instruction tailored to children's ability levels, delivered 30 minutes/day, 4 days/week for 6 weeks.

Summer 2013 is framed as a demonstration pilot year. The goal of the evaluation is to assess which type of reading service enhancements results in the most improved reading skills and to inform future investments in summer reading supports.

**Program evaluation questions:**

- Do(es) the intervention(s) reduce summer learning loss? Do they improve (pre) literacy skills?
- Does one intervention work better than another? More cost effective? More easily implemented?

**Design:** Sites will be randomly assigned to one of three reading service conditions, with groups being matched on site size, location (ETO areas); and language predominance.

**Assessment Schedule:** Below is the schedule of program evaluation measures. Pre- refers to measures collected pre-intervention during parent enrollment in their summer program. Mid- refers to three weeks after the start of the Summer Reading Explorers Program. Post- refers to measure collected post-intervention.

Measure	Pre-	Mid-	Post-
<b>Child Measures</b>			
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Fourth Edition (PPVT-IV)	X		X
Oral Reading Fluency (ORF)	X	X	X
Florida Assessment for Intervention in Reading (FAIR) (Collected from MDCPS pre-intervention for rising 1 <sup>st</sup> students and for both rising K and 1 <sup>st</sup> post-intervention)	X		X
VPK-assessment (Collected from preschool pre-intervention for rising K students)	X		
Intervention Attendance (Collected Daily)			
<b>Parent Measures</b>			
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)	X		X
Intervention Satisfaction & Improvement Rating			X
Home Literacy Questionnaire (HLQ)	X		X
Parent Engagement Activity Attendance (Collected at Each Point of Contact)			
<b>Teacher Measures</b>			

Measure	Pre-	Mid-	Post-
<b>Child Measures</b>			
Kindergarten/First Grade Behavioral and Academic Competency Rating Scale (KBACS)			X
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)			X
<b>Staff Measures</b>			
Improvement Rating Scale			X
<b>Site Measures</b>			
Intervention Satisfaction			X

**Expected participant outcomes:** Given its novelty, this first year of the program will be a demonstration year to determine the feasibility and potential promise of this summer reading intervention. It is difficult to predict the magnitude of improvement expected from this intervention due to the variability in children and families across Miami-Dade and the novelty of embedding a reading intervention within a wide-range of summer camp activities. There is no research precedent for this scope of services. Below are our hypothesized outcomes, current assessment instruments, and what we generally expect to see. Across conditions, we expect that 85% of participating children will improve or maintain ORF skills. Targeted predictions for each condition are as follows:

- **Parent Engagement Only:** We expect that 85% of participating children will maintain ORF skills across the summer months. We expect that, on average, participating children in this group will experience less improvement when compared to children in the small-group intervention conditions.
- **Small group dialogic reading:** We expect that, on average, participating children will maintain or improve their ORF skills. We expect that children in this group will experience more improvement, on average, in their ORF skills and FAIR scores at the start of the school year when compared to children in the parent engagement only group. We also expect that children in this group will have more improvement, on average, in parent reported home literacy activities than children in the parent engagement only group.
- **Small group intentional reading:** We expect that, on average, participating children will improve or maintain their ORF skills. We expect that children in this group will experience more improvement, on average, in their ORF skills and FAIR scores at the start of the school year when compared to children in either of the conditions above. We also expect that children in this group will have more improvement, on average, in parent reported home literacy activities than children in either of the conditions above.

**Service Attendance.** We will systematically keep track of children and family intervention participation. Specifically, we will track the number of daily small-group sessions attended by the children and the number of parent involvement sessions attended/completed by each family. For any child who is not present at the OOS site in the morning, we will have the parent contacted each morning, and the reason for non-attendance will be documented. Any non-attendance due to intervention barriers (e.g., transportation) will be actively problem-solved.

These procedures will be coordinated with any OOS site procedures so as to not duplicate absentee procedures. For children in the small-group reading conditions, program completion is defined as at least 85% of the 24 small-group intervention sessions (20 of 24 sessions).

***Oral Reading Fluency (ORF).*** We will use the ORF assessment to measure oral reading performance three times over the course of the program. Staff will administer the ORF to all participating children during the first week of the program. At the end of the third week of the program, staff will again administer the ORF to all participating children to assess their progress in and response to the intervention. During the final week of the program, staff will administer the ORF for a final time to assess the overall response to intervention. ORF progress monitoring probes will also be administered to children in the small-group conditions each Friday in order to measure weekly progress in the program. Scores will be reviewed during supervision and any modifications to the program will be discussed at that time. In order to determine if the target population is better off as a result of the small-group literacy intervention, and in line with the Trust's approach, we will consider it a success when children improve or maintain oral reading performance, particularly phonics, phonemic awareness, and word recognition, during the summer months. We do expect that children in the small-group intentional reading intervention will experience more improvement in their scores as a result of the intervention. Specifically, we expect to see a 20% increase in ORF scores for children assigned to the small-group intentional reading condition. For children assigned to the small-group dialogic reading group, we expect to see a 10% increase in ORF scores. For children assigned to the parent engagement activities only, we do not expect to see any improvement (only maintenance) in ORF scores for children. We will also compare post-intervention ORF scores to the average scores collected through Project RISE for children attending programs in non-ETO regions. We expect to see a higher percentage of improvement for children in the small-group reading conditions when compared with children who receive standard OSS summer services.

***Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ; Goodman, 1997).*** The SDQ is a brief behavioral screening questionnaire for children ages 3-16 years old. The SDQ consists of 25 items that are divided among 5 scales: 1) emotional symptoms, 2) conduct problems, 3) hyperactivity/inattention, 4) peer relationship problems, and 5) prosocial behavior. The SDQ also consists of an impact scale that assesses the degree to which the child's problems (if present) are impairing to their overall functioning. Parents will complete the SDQ at the beginning of the summer and end of service in order to assess for any concurrent behavioral concerns and to evaluate potential moderators of intervention success. We will also ask parents for their permission to contact their child's school-year teacher to complete and to return this rating after completion of the summer program. Given that the focus of the intervention is not on behavioral skills, but rather reading skills, we do not expect to see any significant changes in scores on this measure. However, completion of this rating will allow us to determine the extent to which other factors (i.e., behavioral concerns) impact intervention improvement.

***Kindergarten/First Grade Behavioral and Academic Competency Rating Scale (KBACS; Hart, Graziano, & Pelham, 2010).*** This measure consists of 24 items, rated on a 5-point Likert scale, designed for teachers to assess children's readiness for kindergarten and first grade in terms not only of their academic skills, but also of their behavioral and attentional regulation and ability to follow classroom directions (e.g., "Follows adult direction."). While the KBACS is a new measure, preliminary data indicate acceptable internal reliability, Cronbach's  $\alpha=.98$  (Hart et al., 2010). We will ask parents for their permission to contact their child's school-year teacher after

completion of the summer program. On this measure, we expect to see mean ratings of pre-literacy skills (item 18) fall in the average to excellent range for those children who receive the small-group reading conditions, with higher mean ratings for children in the small-group intentional reading intervention group when compared to children in the small-group dialogic reading intervention group.

***Parent & Staff Improvement Ratings.*** Our group has developed an Improvement Rating Scale (Pelham et al., 2000), completed by our paraprofessional staff used to measure improvement at the end of our summer program. We will develop a similar measure to assess staff perceptions of child improvement with the implementation of our intervention efforts. Summer Reading Explorer Staff and parents will be asked to rate how much improvement they believe children have made in the program at the end of the service period. We expect to see mean ratings of improvement fall in maintenance to some improvement range on both staff and parent ratings for children in both small group conditions and that more improvement is observed in the small-group intentional reading condition.

***Home Literacy Questionnaire (Farver, Xu, Eppe, & Lonigan, 2006).*** This parent self-rated questionnaire, available in Spanish and English, and which will be available in Creole, contains 13 items rated on a 7-point scale (1= never, 7=daily) that addresses the frequency of parents' modeling of literacy activities in the home (e.g., How often do you read for pleasure?), parents' involvement in literacy-related activities (e.g., How many times per week do you read to your child at home?), children's interest in literacy (e.g., How many times per week does your child ask to be read to?), and number of children's books in the home. This questionnaire will be administered to parents pre- and post-intervention to examine possible differences in children's home learning environments and parent response to the parent involvement activities. We expect to see Home Literacy activities increase from pre- to post-intervention for those parents who complete at least 75% of the parent activities.

***Intervention Satisfaction.*** Service quality will also be addressed via the completion of satisfaction forms. Parents and OSS program administration will be asked to provide feedback after the program ends regarding the extent to which they found the services provided (small-group reading intervention, parent involvement activities) relevant and helpful, the demands of intervention, and the quality of staff. We expect that, on average, parents and OSS program administrators will be satisfied with program services. We expect that parents with children in the small-group conditions will be more satisfied with program services than parents who receive parent engagement services alone.

***Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR).*** After the end of the summer program, results from the Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR; FCRR, 2009), the standard measure of reading success for Miami-Dade County Public Schools will be obtained in order to assess each child's early literacy progress as they transition into the school year. In order to do this, we will have parents sign a release of authorization to collect the information from the district. We expect that children in the small-group intentional reading intervention condition will have higher FAIR scores than children in the other two conditions.

### **Additional Measure**

***Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Fourth Edition (PPVT-4; Dunn & Dunn, 2007).*** The PPVT-4 is a measure of receptive vocabulary and provides an estimate of a child's cognitive ability. It is a well-validated and reliable assessment of children's receptive vocabulary and a screening test of verbal ability for ages 2.5-90 years. The PPVT-4 can be completed within 10 to 15 minutes. At the start and end of the program, supervisors and tutors will administer the PPVT-4 to each child in combination with the initial and final ORF assessment. Completion of this assessment will allow us to determine the extent to which other factors (i.e., receptive vocabulary) impact intervention improvement and the extent to which oral language is developed as a result of the Dialogic Reading activities.

### **Data Analysis Plan**

The main analyses for this program will be conducted using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM; Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002), as well as more traditional univariate and multivariate procedures where appropriate. HLM will allow us to examine differences between intervention groups across time while also considering that individual scores may be "nested" with other factors (e.g., summer program site, tutor).

As a first step, descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and range of scores) for all measures will be examined using SPSS statistical software. If significant differences exist in terms of child characteristics (e.g., child behavior concerns, receptive vocabulary, and language of the child) and family characteristics (e.g., single-parents, language) across participants, we will account for these differences in further analyses.

In order to examine differences between intervention groups across sites, we will use growth curve analyses to examine group differences in measured outcomes (e.g., ORF) with three assessment points (pre-, mid-, and post-summer). These types of analyses can easily be applied to answer other types of research questions or outcomes. Using growth curve modeling, we will also explore how tutor characteristics influence the reading gains of students in both interventions. We will further conduct multivariate analyses to examine differences among intervention groups for the outcome measure collected at fewer than three time points (i.e., Home Literacy Questionnaire), and outcome measures collected only at post-test (i.e., KBACS, FAIR scores).

Finally, effect sizes on posttest scores will also be calculated to determine the magnitude, or how large of an improvement, each intervention condition had on children's reading abilities.

***Power Analysis.*** Considering the expected sample size, with three intervention groups, with pre-, mid-, and post- between-subject assessments, we have sufficient power (greater than .99) to detect even very small effect size differences (Cohen's  $d < 0.25$ ).

**NOTES**

**NOTES**