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ABSTRACT

THE IMPACT OF TARGETED RECRUITMENT STRATEGIES ON DIVERSITY OF
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM APPLICANTS

Name: Hendricks, Emily Anne
University of Dayton
Advisor: Susan Davies, EdD

This study examined the impact of targeted recruitment strategies during School Psychology Awareness Week (SPAW) on the number of applicants who applied to the University of Dayton’s (UD) School Psychology Program and whether the recruitment efforts yielded a more diverse applicant pool and incoming cohort to the program. Researchers presented to undergraduate psychology and education students (N = 195) at eight universities in Ohio, including two Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Applicants’ demographic information from the previous year was compared to applicant data from the current year. In addition, a comparison between the diversity of the program’s cohort in 2012 to 2013 was made. Participants’ interest in applying to a
school psychology program was measured through the School Psychology Awareness Inventory (SPAI). Researchers also obtained suggestions and improvements for the SPAW presentation and the types of recruitment information students found beneficial through qualitative data analysis. While there were no statistically significant differences between the two applicant pools, the diversity ratio of cohort 2012 to cohort 2013 increased in variability in terms of age, ethnicity, and gender. There was an increase in the level of interest in school psychology among participants, who reported the presentation to be beneficial. Implications for school psychology graduate program recruitment strategies are discussed with regard to increasing the diversity in the field.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

School psychologists play a central role in the lives of students and their future success by advocating for strong educational services and positive learning environments. There are approximately 35,400 credentialed school psychologists in the United States (Curtis, Grier, & Hunley, 2004). With the student population growing around 50% by 2050, there will be a growing need for trained school psychologists (National Association of School Psychologists, 2009). Though the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) recommends at least a 1:1000 ratio of school psychologists to students, the national average is 1,653 students per school psychologist (Curtis, Grier, & Hunley, 2004). Along with increasing numbers of students, the ethnic diversity of students will increase, with the Caucasian (currently “majority” ethnic group) population experiencing the smallest increase. As schools become more culturally and linguistically diverse, it is desirable for school psychologists to also represent diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

A very flexible and rewarding field, school psychology was rated the number one social service job by U.S. News and World Report (2013). One reason why school psychology was chosen as the number one social service job is because of its above average job satisfaction (i.e. upward mobility and flexibility), average stress level, 1.4% unemployment rate, and a median salary of $67,880 (U.S. News and World Report,
2013). With the size of classrooms growing along with the number of students with special needs, school psychologists will be in high demand in schools, despite the recent budget cuts in school districts nationwide. Thus, it is even more important to create awareness about the field and continue strong efforts to recruit a diverse range of students in school psychology graduate programs.

The recruitment of students to graduate school psychology programs will be instrumental creating a more diverse field. As school psychology programs prepare for the shift in populations, it is important that graduate students are equipped for the changes. One way school psychology programs can recruit a diverse group of graduate students is through targeted activities during School Psychology Awareness Week (SPAW), an organized week of events sponsored by NASP. By informing undergraduate students about the roles of school psychologists, school psychology programs can actively recruit students with a wide range of skills and from diverse backgrounds.

Before SPAW began, NASP held a school psychology awareness month to coincide with National Mental Health Awareness month. SPAW began in 2001 as a way for NASP to promote the field of school psychology and provide members with the resources (i.e. annual themed posters) needed to bring awareness into their school (K. Cowan, personal communication, May 25, 2012). It is held every year during the second full week of November and has evolved over time to include more resources and programming (K. Cowan, personal communication, May 25, 2012). Graduate programs across the nation participate in a number of activities such as workshops, fundraisers, school newsletters, press articles, and presentations to school boards and to the community. These activities help create awareness about the significant impact of
school psychologists on the education system and promote the field to future applicants (Cowan, 2011).

With little research completed on the efficacy of SPAW, there is a need for a well-designed evaluation of how SPAW impacts recruitment, particularly in terms of attracting a diverse pool of applicants. The present study examined the impact of targeted recruitment strategies such as giving a personal and interactive school psychology awareness presentation to multiple groups of undergraduate students during SPAW. Specifically, the study examined the impact of such a presentation on the number of applicants who applied to the University of Dayton’s (UD) School Psychology Program and whether the efforts yielded a more diverse applicant pool/cohort to UD’s School Psychology Program.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Since the early 1900s, the field of school psychology has evolved as a profession. As the role of a school psychologist expanded from “gate-keeper” for special education to an advocate and resource for everyone in the school system, so has the type of applicants pursuing the career. In the past, school psychology graduate students were mainly special educators or counselors within the school system who had previous work experience. Today, applicants to school psychology programs are younger, have less work experience, and have less educational background (i.e., there are more psychology majors, fewer education majors) than in the past (Krieg, Meikamp, O’Keeffe, & Stroebel, 2006). Because of this change and the need for more diverse applicants, school psychology programs are investigating and improving the way graduate students are recruited and trained. This literature review gives a holistic approach to the limited research that is available regarding school psychology recruitment methods, starting first with the history of school psychology then discussing the need for recruitment, current recruitment methods used, students’ knowledge about school psychology, SPAW, and the University of Dayton’s recruitment methods.

The History of School Psychology

The field of school psychology is fairly young when compared to other professional fields (Fagan & Wise, 2007). The history of school psychology can be
divided into two parts: the “hybrid years” (1890-1969) and the “thoroughbred years” (1970-present) (Fagan & Wise, 2007). The hybrid years were the time when the primary role of school psychologists was to conduct psychological assessments. During this time, many practitioners were certified in other fields including teacher education, counseling, and guidance counseling and later received certification as a psychologist.

The American education system adopted compulsory education along with the addition of many educational tools and technologies, which created a need for school psychological services in the 1900s. Compulsory schooling was the most influential force for special education services (Fagan & Wise, 2007). School psychologists became the “gate-keepers” for special education, helping to identify students in need of services. In 1905, Alfred Binet and Theophile Simon developed the first intelligence test in Paris as a way to identify students who would need specialized treatment and who may not be successful in the regular educational setting. Subsequently, the profession of school psychology became a respectable practice that involved achievement and intelligence testing for a variety of school settings (Fagan & Wise, 2007).

One of the most well-known school psychologists is Arnold Gesell, who received the first position as a “school psychologist” from 1915 to 1919 by the Connecticut State Board of Education. His job included similar responsibilities to today’s practitioners. Emerging in the 1920s, the term “school psychology” was coined and states such as New York and Pennsylvania started training programs for undergraduate and graduate students. By the late 1930s, Pennsylvania State University became the first school to offer a doctoral program for school psychology students (Fagan & Wise, 2007).
As the profession grew and developed a more clear identity, the number of school psychologists increased from 500 to 5,000 from 1940 to 1970. The organizational development also expanded as school psychology received a separate division in the American Psychological Association (APA Division 16) in 1945, with over 1,229 members by 1968 (Fagan & Wise, 2007). After this occurred, states’ school psychology associations were created, with Ohio having one of the first separate state associations for school psychologists (Fagan & Wise, 2007). One of the most influential conferences during the hybrid years was the Thayer Conference in 1954, which helped develop a comprehensive picture of the profession of school psychology that addressed levels of training, credentials, and practice. Though difficult to confirm, the Thayer Conference and creation of APA Division 16 have been connected to the expansion of the field and the development of effective training and accreditation programs across the states (Fagan & Wise, 2007).

As the number of students in school grew, mostly due to the “baby boom” following World War II, the number of students with disabilities and academic or behavioral problems also increased (Fagan & Wise, 2007). This created a need for more professional development and educational laws to meet the needs of these students. As the field of school psychology entered the thoroughbred years (1970-present), educational laws and procedures set standards for delivering school psychological services and special education, (e.g., Section 504 of Rehabilitation Act in 1973). The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA), also known as the Public Law 94-112, was established in 1975 as a unified federal law to mandate a free and appropriate public education for students with disabilities (Fagan & Wise, 2007). This
law initiated a domino effect in education, with the reauthorization and implementation of this legislation in 1986, which provided a free and appropriate education to women and minorities within the United States. The EAHCA created a major need for more school psychology training programs and is the main reason for the increase in practitioners in the 1970s-1990s (Fagan & Wise, 2007).

Legislation in 1990 and 1997 led to the renaming of this law to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Further legislative action has created the current Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, which has shaped the role of school psychologists today. The passage of these laws has led to the expansion of the profession, transforming their role from the special education “gate-keepers”, to school psychologists providing a wide range of services from individual assessment to system changes within the school. With this expansion, school psychologists now offer a wide variety of services for schools. Highly trained in psychology and education, school psychologists are certified in counseling individual students, group counseling, consultation with teachers and parents, designing and implementing academic and behavioral interventions, and analyzing data to improve student outcomes. School psychologists also play a role in: coordinating the delivery of community services to students and their parents; transitioning students from schools into the community; evaluating students’ emotional, behavioral, and academic needs; motivating students to engage in learning; teaching prevention programs (i.e., targeting dropout rates, safe schools); crisis intervention training; promoting understanding and acceptance in cultural awareness; and collaborating with school staff to provide evidence-based interventions within the school setting (Silva, 2003). Playing a prominent role in the educational
system, school psychologists are advocates for students in providing them with the best support system within the schools. From implementing a bullying prevention program to helping a student with test anxiety, school psychologists have an important role in providing a safe and comfortable learning environment for every student. The thoroughbred years included a strong movement toward educational research, the development of state and national associations, accreditations, and growth in school psychology graduate preparation programs (Fagan & Wise, 2007).

**Need for Recruitment**

As the field of school psychology progresses, a strong recruitment is essential to providing the best services and increasing the number of credentialed school psychologists. Charvat (2005) completed a study to find out the approximate number of school psychologists working in the United States. To investigate this, ten states were randomly selected to participate in the study based on the population differences between the school psychologists and the residential population. Each state that was selected for the study had their School Psychology Association representative email the number of credentialed school psychologists who were providing services for the state. After each state responded, the results were compared with a similar study that was previously conducted in 1999 (Thomas, 2000). An analysis of these results created a formula to estimate the number of credentialed school psychologists in each state. This helped to provide the numbers for the other states that did not participate in the first stage of the survey (Charvat, 2005).

The second part of the survey included the remaining states’ School Psychology Association representatives who did not take part in the first survey. The leaders were
sent two estimates of the number of credentialed school psychologists in their state and were asked to approve or reply with official statistics of their state. A total of 33 states participated in the study along with the District of Columbia (Charvat, 2005). For the remaining 17 states that did not participate in the study, the original estimates were used from the previous analysis. From this study, it was estimated that there are approximately 37,893 certified school psychologists practicing amongst the 50 states and the District of Columbia (Charvat, 2005).

The same study also provided a student-to-school psychologist ratio of 1,621 students for every school psychologist working in the K-12 setting. Although this ratio has decreased by 11% since 1999, the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) recommends a school psychologist for every 1,000 students in a “school psychological services unit” (NASP, 2000, p.54). Due to the variability in each state and school district, it is very likely that some units exceed the ratio by more than the recommendation (Charvat, 2005). The estimated ratio is also not an indication of the quality of services students are receiving or the number of caseloads the school psychologist on-site takes on within the school. Without proper recruitment of school psychologists, this ratio will only grow with the rising student population in the U.S.

Following Charvat’s (2005) study, the same researcher completed a 2008 study to estimate the shortage of school psychologists and how many additional school psychologists it would take to adequately serve the school populations across the United States. In 2008, it was predicted that there were 28,500 credentialed school psychologists in the 50 states and the District of Columbia (Charvat, 2008). The study projected that the student to school psychologist ratio was 1,671 students for every one school
psychologist. This estimate, thus, predicts a shortage of about 9,000 school psychologists in the United States today (Charvat, 2008).

NASP (2006) provided a list of factors that potentially contribute to this shortage in an article titled “Supporting student success: Remedying the shortage of school psychologists.” One major factor may be financial problems, including budget cuts to student service programs and a lack of funding for programs that provide assistance and incentives to students and school districts (i.e. loan forgiveness programs, personal preparation grants, newly innovated programs) (NASP, 2006). Another issue is that retirement rates for current school psychologists exceed the number of school psychology students graduating each year. There is also the factor of school psychologists having restricted roles (e.g., testing for special education eligibility) in school districts that rely strictly on a test-and-place model. When limited to such a restrictive role, school psychologists are not able to use their trained expertise to address systemic issues (e.g. low-achievement, bullying etc.) that in the long-term, reduces the need for individual services. Additionally, there is a distribution problem in that a disproportionately low number of school psychologists work in an urban, rural, high poverty, underrepresented, or underserved population (NASP, 2006). With the growing shortage of school psychologists and the disproportionality of practitioners among those aforementioned varied settings, one potential solution may be through deliberate recruitment of a more diverse pool of school psychologists.

**Diversity within the Field**

With a clear need for future school psychologists, the field must focus on strong recruitment strategies, especially given the need for more diversity within the field, with
regard to gender, ethnicity, educational background, and age. In 2004-2005, a sample of practicing school psychologists from a NASP membership list completed a survey to project the current status of the profession. Along with considering the number of practicing school psychologists, it is also important to examine the trends and projections for the future field of school psychology. A study by Curtis, Grier, and Hunley (2004) evaluated the trends from the past and present in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, age, experience in the field, and credentials. The study predicted that in 2020, school psychologists will be primarily Caucasian females with a specialist-level degree (Curtis et al., 2004). Since the start of school psychology, the most significant change is the “feminization” of the field. In 1969-1970, the majority of school psychologists were males (59%); 41% were females. With an increase of 70% in the number of female school psychologists since 1970, the gender disposition within the field is now 65% female and 35% male (Curtis et al., 2004). This increase in females coincides with the rise in females entering other fields of psychology. A similar research study of 1,748 school psychologists indicated that 74% of all school psychologists were female, with 77% of those females working within the schools (Curtis, Lopez, Castillo, Batsche, & Minch, 2008). Given that school psychology is a female-dominated field, it is important that school psychology training programs focus on recruiting a student population that more closely mirrors the U.S. student population, which they will eventually serve.

Curtis et al. (2008) also reported the racial/ethnic diversity with 92.6% of the survey respondents identifying themselves as Caucasian and only 7.4% identifying themselves in racial minority groups. In the 2009 NASP survey, nine out of ten school psychologists identified themselves as Caucasian (Curtis, Castillo & Gelley, 2012). With
the most recent demographic projections indicating that minorities will represent half of
the people living in the United States by the year 2042, it is important that the needs of
minority students are met within the schools (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008; U.S Census
Bureau, 2011). The 2010 Census Bureau indicated that the U.S “minority” population
reported their race and ethnicity as something other than non-Hispanic white. This is a
growth of 29 percent within a decade (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). The largest overall
increase in the minority groups is estimated to be within the Hispanic population, which
is expected to comprise approximately 30% of the total U.S. population by 2050 (U.S.
Census Bureau, 2011). However, the U.S. Census Bureau (2013) announced that the
Asian population was the fastest growing in the year 2012, with more than 60% of the
growth due to international migration, so it is catching up to the Hispanic population. At
the same time, African Americans are projected to comprise 13% of the population (U.S.
Census Bureau, 2011). Children under the age of 5 are closely becoming majority-
minority with 49.9% of them falling within the minority population (U.S. Census Bureau,
2013). Conclusively, the growth of minorities among the population will continue to
diversify the U.S. population (Day, 2011).

The most recent study of school psychology’s demographic characteristics
indicated that minority groups are largely underrepresented in the profession, with 3.0%
school psychologists identifying themselves as Hispanic, 1.9% as African American,
0.9% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 0.8% Native American/Alaskan Native (Curtis et al.,
2008). These data indicate that the field of school psychology must better prepare to
accommodate the rapidly changing student population (Bocanegra, 2012).
Examining the projections in race and ethnicity within the field of school psychology, Curtis et al. (2004) noted that there has been little change in the number of school psychologists from non-Caucasian backgrounds, even with the efforts from national and state organizations to diversify the profession. Although the population of ethnic minorities is growing, school psychologists lack the culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds to serve the mental health and educational interests of all youth (NASP, 2003; NASP 2009). NASP advocates for an increase in culturally and linguistically diverse school psychologists to correct the disproportionality that currently serve both regular and special education students (NASP, 2003; NASP, 2009). As stated by NASP (2009), it is believed that by having a strong body of diverse school psychologists who represent the growing heterogeneous population, the field of school psychology can better serve the educational and mental health interests of all youth and help train future practitioners in diversity. With only one out of every ten school psychologists having the skills to speak a language other than English, it is projected from historical data that the body of diverse school psychologists is still going to be underrepresented in the future (Curtis et al., 2004). Numbers of current graduate students who represent ethnic and racial diversity are also low, with only 175 minority students graduating each year in a field of 33,000 current school psychologists (Curtis et al., 2004).

When advocating for diversity within the field, it is important to acknowledge the benefits that arise from having a school psychologist with similar ethnic and cultural characteristics as the students they serve within the school. Demographic changes will require new perspectives in the training of school psychologists and unique skills in
understanding and serving the student population (Zhou et al., 2004). Loe and Miranda (2005) found that school psychologists conducting consultation, counseling, and assessment commonly reported ethnic incongruence in all settings (e.g., rural, urban, and suburban school districts). Ethnic incongruence is defined as the ethnic differences that occur between a professional figure and client/student (Loe & Miranda, 2005). With consultation and assessment playing a vital role in determining a child’s special education eligibility, a school psychologist with a high level of ethnic incongruence could run into potential problems with unknown or unrecognized biases that may impact his/her clinical judgment and/or diagnostic decisions. For example, these unknown/unrecognized biases could lead a practitioner to assume a child’s academic problem is a learning disability rather than an underlying language barrier (i.e., English as a second language). The current disproportionate representation of ethnic-minority students in special education (Ladner & Hammons, 2001; Oswald, Coutinho, Best, & Singh, 1999; Zhang & Katsiyannis, 2002) indicates there may be an issue with cultural bias in the context of assessment due to the ethnic incongruence in schools (Loe & Miranda, 2005). Additionally, Wintersteen, Mensinger, and Diamond (2005), in their study on substance abuse treatment for adolescents, found that clients who had a racial mismatch with their therapist, especially those who were Caucasian and minority pairings, had a negative impact on the client’s retention and treatment. Though it may not always be possible for students to work with a school psychologist of similar race or culture, it is possible for practitioners to have the proper diversity training. If the proportion of minority students continues to increase as projected along with the current ethnically and culturally
homogenous field of school psychologists, it is only expected that this ethnic incongruence will increase in professional practice.

Loe & Miranda (2005) also examined the extent to which practitioners had access and felt prepared in the area of cultural-diversity training and the range of ethnic and cultural differences that they are likely to experience with their students. A majority of school psychologists in the study indicated that they felt their preparation to work with culturally and linguistically diverse students and families was a weakness in their training (Loe & Miranda, 2005). By having a stronger representation of diverse school psychologists, it is expected that diversity training among programs (via practica and internship experiences) will improve; thereby increasing the effectiveness of services to students and families of all backgrounds. Overall, it is important that school psychologists are effectively trained in diversity and how best to serve culturally and linguistically diverse populations, especially in settings in which the school psychologist may not have the same characteristics as the students or families they serve.

In addition to the large proportion of Caucasian females in the field, the same survey of school psychologists by Curtis and colleagues (2008) found a “graying” of the field. Moreover, the mean age of practicing school psychologists was found to be 46.2 years (Curtis et al., 2008). This is a strong indication that as we progress into the next decade a large number of school psychologists will be entering retirement.

Curtis et al. (2004) indicated that there is little doubt about the “graying” of the field, with the mean age of school psychologists increasing from 38.8 years to 45.2 years from 1980 to 2000. The number of school psychologists over the age of 50 has increased from 20.2% to 32.8% with a decline of 12% in school psychologists aged 40 and younger.
(Curtis et al., 2004). These statistics indicated that one out of every three practicing school psychologists is over the age of 50. This evidence is also supported in the retirement projections for the profession. Using the data collected from the NASP membership database and surveys administered throughout the states, it was projected that 52.9% of school psychologists will retire by 2015. The projections were calculated by subtracting the total years of experience of the school psychologists (with 30 years of experience as the estimated time of retirement). Looking at each state, an analysis indicated that 27 states would experience a 50% or higher rate of retirement by the year 2012 (Curtis et al., 2004). This predicts that four out of ten school psychologists are likely to retire by the end of this year alone. Data collected in the 2009-2010 school year by Curtis et al. (2012) indicated that the trends over the current years are continuing as the field is becoming older and predominantly female. Even though the majority of school psychologists serve ethnic minority students, school psychology practitioners continue to not reflect the diversity of the growing student population (Curtis et al., 2012).

These research findings indicate that the field of school psychology is not only decreasing in number, but also stagnant in terms of diversity. Fagan (2004) indicated that there has not been a time when the supply of school psychologists has sufficiently met the population in gender, race, ethnicity, student-ratio, and age. In order to provide more efficient services to K-12 students, it is crucial that the field of school psychology increases the number of practitioners and create a growing and sustainable increase in the profession. By increasing the knowledge about the field and fostering interest in the
profession, it will ensure that the needs of future generations of students with diverse backgrounds and experiences are met in years to come (Fagan, 2004).

**Recruitment Strategies**

In order to meet the needs of the changing demographics, school psychologists need to be recruited with diversity in mind, acknowledging the importance of training practitioners from underrepresented backgrounds and minorities. By recruiting a more diverse pool of applicants, the needs of future student populations can be met, and students in school psychology programs can learn from different people of varying backgrounds. Even though the research on diversity recruitment is limited, there are proactive recruitment strategies that can be implemented by graduate school psychology programs.

**Strategies for recruiting diverse applicants.** To fully understand how to effectively recruit a diverse pool of applicants, training programs must first investigate the barriers that impede ethnic-minority and other underrepresented groups from choosing their program (Zhou et al., 2004). Zhou et al. (2004) suggest that financial support, inadequate academic preparation in undergraduate education, and a lack of minority representation in the program and faculty are some difficulties that may hinder underrepresented students from applying or accepting admittance to a program. In order to support and recruit students from underrepresented populations, training programs must use a combination of informal presentations and personal connections with the potential candidates (Zhou et al., 2004). It is also suggested that programs offer financial support for their students, represent diversity (including individuals with disabilities) in website images and marketing materials, and contact local colleges and universities with
diverse populations to provide them with additional information. Training programs should also consider increasing the diversity of faculty and promoting retention of students by establishing connections and placing a high value on student creativity and intelligence (Zhou et al., 2004). Similar to Zhou et al. (2004), Chandler (2011) found that African American psychology graduate students felt a sense of support and safety when some of the faculty members had similar racial-ethnic characteristics to them. The students felt that a non-African American faculty member would not be able to relate to their experiences, understand their concerns, or appreciate their work as much as an African American professor. Therefore, diversifying the school psychology faculty members may benefit the support and retention of students within the program (Chandler, 2011).

Griffin and Muñiz (2011) found that the diversity of students increased through faculty involvement in recruitment efforts at conferences. One effective strategy used to connect with students at graduate school fairs and conferences was by personally inviting students to apply to the program. This strengthened the connection with the student and faculty members, making the application experience more inviting. However, large conferences and graduate fairs sponsored by other universities were less effective in increasing graduate school diversity. Another suggestion for increasing direct relationships with students of diverse backgrounds is through summer research programs. Summer research programs attract academically competitive students to the program and offer a unique recruitment tool for training programs (Griffin & Muñiz, 2011). Other recruitment strategies include campus visitation programs and building relationships with faculty at colleges with a strong population of minorities.
Quartermann (2008) found, after surveying predominately white universities in the mid-western United States, that the lack of financial resources and the need for recruitment and retention programs included two main themes in the barriers of a diverse graduate school student population. Strategies that were suggested for these obstacles included establishing personal contact with diverse student populations, availability of financial resources for recruitment and promotion of programs, establishing a strong partnership with large minority populated universities, and offering recruitment fairs, career days, and visits to diverse campuses (Quartermann, 2008). Playing a crucial part in the recruitment and retention of diverse graduate students, program coordinators and directors need to take proactive measures in order to be effective and efficient in the retention of their diverse student applicants. This includes serving as mentors, having financial support for minority students, and increasing the visibility of minority graduate faculty. With these strategies in mind, it is also important to recruit undergraduate students from underrepresented populations who are academically prepared. Programs should also maintain a strong community atmosphere in which all students within the graduate program feel supported and respected (Quarreterman, 2008).

**Minority recruitment.** Recruiting more minority students into school psychology programs would likely lead to more minority school psychologists in the field, both in academia and within schools (Bocanegra, 2012). One recruitment strategy is to have strong school psychology programs that support minority students (NASP, 2003). A study conducted by Rogers and Molina (2006) examined 11 psychology programs that were considered exemplary in recruiting and retaining minority students. When investigating each program, the common recruitment strategies implemented in
each program included: (a) planning activities where the current minority faculty and students engaged with one another, (b) offering and advertising financial packages, (c) taking the time to invite students to visit and ask questions about the program, (d) having one-on-one interaction with the faculty and students throughout the recruitment process, (e) targeting minority undergraduate students from the same institution, and (f) having a strong relationship with historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs; Rogers & Molina, 2006). The successful graduate programs all demonstrated distinct and creative ways to recruit minority students, but all undoubtedly made diversity recruitment a priority when structuring their recruitment process.

The strategy of establishing a relationship with HBCUs is one way to recruit more minority students (Sanders, Wilson, Jones, 2010). HBCUs are known for a high percentage of minority students and can be an effective way to increase diversity in a graduate program (Griffin & Muñiz, 2011). Founded before 1964, HBCUs are higher education institutions that have a focused goal of educating African American students (Graves & Wright, 2009). Though working with HBCUs is a noted recruitment strategy, most school psychology graduate programs have not used this connection to their advantage. Chandler (2011) explored this issue in a study on the shortage of African Americans in the field of professional psychology programs. According to the study, 35% of the African American students surveyed at an HBCU, were unaware about the field of school psychology, and 80% of those students who indicated knowing about the field, had an inaccurate job description (i.e., described it as similar to a school counselor or social worker) of a school psychologist (Chandler, 2011). This lack of awareness about school psychology as a profession was also found in a study conducted by Graves
and Wright (2009). HBCU students had fewer sources of information on the field and little knowledge about school psychology. The study revealed that only 12 of the 165 undergraduate students were provided with information on school psychology (i.e., information from American Psychological Association or National Association of School Psychologists) during their college years. Even though 90% of the students who participated in the study said they want to attend graduate school, only a few indicated that they would pursue school psychology as their future profession (Graves & Wright, 2009).

Additionally, HBCU students ranked school psychology as their third choice with counseling and clinical psychology rated as most preferred (Graves & Wright, 2009). The students’ most reported reason for ranking other psychology professions above school psychology was that they wanted to work with diverse populations and children. Interestingly, working with diverse populations is a large aspect of a school psychologist’s job, but due to the lack of knowledge about the field, students ranked it lower than other professions (Graves & Wright, 2009). Additionally, a majority of HBCU faculty members (64%) stated that school psychology graduate programs do not actively recruit from their college (Graves & Wright, 2009). Similar studies with majority Caucasian students have yielded similar findings; students demonstrated unfamiliarity with the field of school psychology in general (Gilman & Handwerk, 2001; Stark-Wroblewski, Wiggins, & Ryan, 2006).

One example of students’ unawareness of school psychology was exhibited in Wandle and Brandt’s (2007) study, where 39% of non-minority, school psychology graduate students and 23% of minority school psychology graduate students reported not
knowing of their own university’s efforts to recruit graduate students for their school psychology program. The findings of this study suggest that programs should more actively recruit students, especially those with diverse backgrounds by: (a) highlighting the unique aspects of the university’s program, (b) ensuring the research interests of the faculty are related to diversity, and (c) ensuring that the training program’s model embraces diversity (Wandle & Brandt, 2007). By using a variety of recruitment strategies, the program can demonstrate a priority for recruiting minority applicants in their program.

Traditionally, recruitment materials have been a mainstream method for promoting graduate programs and attracting a wide variety of applicants. One way to recruit minority students has been through the application process, including application packets and program websites. Studies have shown that programs that had the most material targeted towards minority students also had the highest number of minority students within their program (Bernal, Barron, & Leary, 1983; Bidell, Turner, & Casas, 2006).

However, most psychology program websites lack diversity related material. Bidell, Ragen, Broach, and Carrillo (2007) surveyed the content of professional psychology programs and found that only 3.3% of the program websites demonstrated a high level of diversity and minority inclusion. The researchers examined the website content by using a survey instrument that rated six areas related to diversity, including: (a) an antidiscrimination policy, (b) minority-based financial aid, (c) the program’s commitment to diversity training, (d) information on recruitment for diversity, (e) an option for a diversity minor, (f) and multicultural faculty research. The survey also found
that 56% of the websites contained low levels of minority-involved material (e.g., ethnic, sexual orientation, and diversity content) (Bidell et al., 2007). Further analysis of the websites sorted by psychology profession revealed that school psychology program websites had the least amount of minority inclusion information when compared to counseling or clinical psychology program websites (Bidell et al., 2007). As indicated by these studies, using diverse recruitment material can influence the number of minority and underrepresented students that attend graduate programs and thus should be utilized as a minority recruitment strategy.

Looking into the lack of diverse membership, NASP conducted a minority recruitment survey as part of the Minority Recruitment Task to study the most effective recruitment strategies and ways to increase minority representation in the field (Franco & Green, 2004). The Minority Recruitment Task Force held four NASP-sponsored training sessions in settings with a large number of minority school psychologists. At the sessions participants were administered a survey to investigate ways that NASP could increase minority membership. The survey data indicated that NASP could recruit more minority school psychologists by: (a) developing services to support minority school psychologists, (b) tapping into community resources, (c) having minority school psychologists present at schools, (d) recruiting in urban areas, (e) targeting undergraduate students, and (f) looking more into universities’ school psychology programs’ admissions process (Franco & Green, 2004). With a total of 92 members joining NASP after the recruitment efforts, Franco and Green (2004) suggested utilizing recruitment strategies, such as giving informative presentations, to recruit a more diverse number of school practitioners.
Examining how the role of the school psychologists has evolved to the scientist-practitioner model, Davis, McIntosh, Phelps, and Kehle (2004) analyzed the shortage of school psychologists and suggested potential solutions to improve the number and diversity of school psychologists employed in the United States. One suggestion to improve the underrepresentation in the field is to increase the visibility of minority school psychologists and be proactive in recruiting candidates by marketing the program to support students from various backgrounds. This type of support is essential in retaining graduate students. Another important influence during the recruitment process is financial support, particularly tuition waivers and graduate assistantships (Davis et al., 2004). As noted in this summative report, both financial support and strong recruitment strategies play an important role in increasing the number of school psychologists and improving the recruitment and retention of future school psychology students (Davis et al., 2004). It is with these significant efforts that the field of school psychology will improve the student-to-school psychologist ratio and continue to train progressive leaders in education who resist the traditional “test and place” model. If the ratio of student-to-school psychologist continues to increase, it will only create high caseloads for practitioners, making it difficult for them to focus on the systematic changes that need to occur within the school (i.e., comprehensive, preventative academic, behavioral, and mental health services) that would ultimately reduce the number of referrals and the needs of individual students (NASP, 2006).

Additionally, it is important for school psychology graduate programs to consider the barriers that may impede an ethnic minority students’ success. Clark, Mercer, Zeigler-Hill, and Dufrene (2012) surveyed approximately 87 ethnic minority and 313
ethnic majority school psychology graduate students and found that ethnic minority students self-reported lower levels of feelings of belongingness than majority students in their training programs. Also, ethnic minority students reported more negative race-related experiences that impacted their levels of belongingness within the program. With social belongingness and autonomy playing a fundamental part in students’ happiness and success within graduate school, school psychology training programs should be aware of the race-related experiences minority students may endure and provide opportunities for strong connections to be made within cohorts and with faculty members (Clark et al., 2012; Steele & Fullager, 2009).

**Undergraduate Students’ Knowledge of School Psychology**

Along with knowing about diversity recruitment strategies, it is also important to address factors that may influence a student’s decision to enter the profession. Graves and Wright (2007) investigated which factors influenced school psychology graduate students’ decision to enter the field. During the study, a national sample of 307 school psychology graduate students responded to a survey that evaluated the impact of the present condition of professional practice, the impact of parental education, and the professional organization recruitment using a five-point Likert scale. Results indicated that both doctoral and non-doctoral students cited the main reason for choosing school psychology was that they wanted to work with children (92.2%) and had personal experiences within the school system (Graves & Wright, 2007). Other factors that impacted their career decision included salary potential, job stability, and the public school work schedule. Participants indicated that recruitment efforts by national organizations, such as NASP and APA, did not impact their decision to enter the field of
school psychology. Graves and Wright (2007) suggested that current school psychology graduate students should actively recruit applicants by utilizing PowerPoint presentations created by national organizations such as NASP on the field of school psychology. In order to continue recruitment efforts of underrepresented groups, school psychology graduate students should directly recruit potential applicants, such as undergraduate students in psychology and education classes, inform them about the field and make the profession more visible and known to others (Graves & Wright, 2007).

Gilman and Handwerk (2001) conducted a study investigating undergraduate students’ knowledge about school psychology. The study consisted of 600 undergraduate students, who attended one of five large universities. The students who participated responded to a survey entitled the “Undergraduate Psychology Information Inventory,” which included questions about five different fields of psychology. The survey was developed by the examiners to assess students’ understanding of the various psychology disciplines. The five-part inventory looked at the students’ perceived knowledge of each field (Gilman & Handwerk, 2001). Those who participated were majority females (61%) and Caucasian (80%), with 195 participants classifying themselves as a psychology major, 85 as education majors, and 342 as “other.” Among the students who responded, 13% were African American, 4% Hispanic American, and 3% Asian American. Results indicated that psychology majors had the highest knowledge ratings of clinical and school psychology of all participating majors. Additionally, participants stated that they learned more about school psychology through their own experiences (i.e., meeting a school psychologist) than they did of clinical psychology (Gilman & Handwerk, 2001). There were no significant differences among the respondents’ race, age, or gender. When
analyzing the number of students interested in graduate school, 135 students stated they planned on pursuing a graduate level degree. Although the majority of the participants stated the reason for attending graduate school was to work with children and their families, only 9% of the sample demonstrated interest in school psychology. The majority of students wanted to pursue a graduate degree in clinical psychology (34%) or counseling psychology (24%) (Gilman & Handwerk, 2001).

In this same study, when asked, respondents indicated that clinical psychologists were more involved in assessment, consultation, therapy, and research than school psychologists. These data indicate that students who plan on applying to graduate schools do not consider school psychology a desirable choice. The study indicates that a more proactive approach to educating and recruiting undergraduate students about the field of school psychology may be beneficial to the field. These findings also support the idea of recruiting students through targeted methods (i.e. presentations, handing out brochures) since most respondents in this study reported relying more on their personal experiences with school psychology. Similar results were found in Crislip’s (2011) study, which demonstrated that undergraduate students who were more knowledgeable of school psychology were more likely to consider school psychology as a profession. Using targeted recruitment methods may help increase the knowledge of the profession and provide undergraduates the information needed to pursue a graduate level degree in school psychology.

School Psychology Awareness Week

The annual NASP School Psychology Awareness Week (SPAW) was created as an opportunity for school psychologists and school psychology graduate students to
promote the profession and share their own experiences within the field (K. Cowan, personal communication, May 25, 2012). Branching off the NASP sponsored school psychology awareness week and National Mental Health Awareness month, SPAW first began in 2001 as way of providing useful information to both high school and undergraduate students and other professionals who may have been unaware of the role of school psychology (K. Cowan, personal communication, May 25, 2012). With past themes such as “Every Link Matters. Make a Connection” and the 2012 theme of “Know Your Own Strengths. Discover Them. Share Them. Celebrate Them,” SPAW occurs during the second full week of November each year and promotional materials (e.g., posters, sample press release, parent bulletin, activity suggestions) are provided to NASP members (K. Cowan, personal communication, May 25, 2012) to encourage their efforts. Ideas that are suggested to school psychologists by NASP during the SPAW include: distributing brochures, giving informative presentations to undergraduate students and teachers within the field, organizing fundraisers, and displaying the SPAW poster publicly. The 2011 theme, “Every Link Matters, Make a Connection,” centered on how school psychologists can help students create positive connections within the community, academics, and with their peers (Sikorski, 2012). Student leaders across the nation reported a number of ways they contributed to the advocacy of SPAW and the profession. For example, graduate students at the University of South Florida (USF) presented to undergraduate classes about Response to Intervention (RTI) and spoke about the field of school psychology and their graduate program. The faculty and students at USF also presented at local high schools to provide additional information on how school psychologists advocate for students and work constantly to maintain the most ideal
learning environment for all students. Humboldt State University provided undergraduate students information on the field of school psychology by setting up an informational booth on their campus and handing out brochures describing school psychology to interested students (Sikorski, 2012).

SPAW can also serve as a way of showing appreciation for current faculty and practitioners within the field. As an example, Northeastern University held an appreciation luncheon for all school psychology faculty members thanking them for their dedication to the field. Graduate students at New Mexico State University thanked their local school psychologists and practicum supervisors by sending them thank you cards. As a way to celebrate the week, some universities, such as the University of Southern Maine, bring awareness to the field by giving back to the community and holding a book drive for students who are disadvantaged (Sikorski, 2012). Whichever way school psychologists and graduate students decide to promote the field, SPAW creates an opportunity for faculty, practitioners, and future school psychologists to show pride in their profession and reach NASP’s goal of helping all students achieve their potential success (Sikorski, 2012).

**University of Dayton’s Recruitment**

Located in Dayton, Ohio, the University of Dayton (UD) is a private, Roman Catholic University that offers more than 70 academic programs on campus. UD’s School Psychology graduate program offers students the Education Specialist (Ed.S) degree in school psychology. The program is NASP accredited and strives to recruit and promote the growing field. The current recruitment strategies used include: spreading information of the program by word of mouth, listing the program in the *APA Guide to*
Graduate Studies in Psychology and on the NASP website, along with recruitment through SPAW each year (S. Davies, personal communication, August 23, 2012). Since the 2006-2007 academic year, members of the active student organization, School Psychologists of the University of Dayton (SPUD), have spoken to education and psychology undergraduate classes about school psychology and UD’s school psychology program. These annual presentations generally involve current graduate students presenting a school psychology PowerPoint presentation provided by NASP. The PowerPoint was not only utilized as a method for recruiting, but also as a time to celebrate the field and share it with others (S. Davies, personal communication, August 23, 2012). The presentation, however, in the past, was not personalized to UD’s program.

In order to increase the diversity of applicants to the program, professors of local universities, including HBCUs, were contacted to encourage minority and non-traditional students to apply to the program (S. Davies, personal communication, August 23, 2012). The program director, Susan Davies, EdD, held conversations with racially diverse students currently in the program to improve strategies for recruiting diverse applicants. The demographic makeup of applicants has fluctuated over the years, with an average of 60-70 total applications. Though it is too soon to tell if the current recruitment efforts are effective, one recruitment strategy that was recently revised is the program website. It was previously noted that potential students had difficulty locating information and applying to the program using the website; therefore, the program is working on a more effective strategy to more efficiently disseminate information about the program.
Another recruitment strategy that has been considered is the use of social media; however, there is little research on the efficacy of such a recruitment effort (S. Davies, personal communication, August 23, 2012). Further, content on a social media website could be difficult to maintain and control. With the retention of both part-time and full-time students at 90%, UD is striving to improve current recruitment methods in an effort to increase diversity in the program and the field.

**Purpose of the Present Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the efficacy of targeted recruitment strategies during School Psychology Awareness Week (SPAW), specifically looking at ways to increase the number and diversity of school psychology applicants who apply to the University of Dayton’s (UD) School Psychology Program. This program evaluation study will help to determine if the use of targeted recruitment strategies during SPAW (e.g., giving an informational presentation on the field and UD’s program, handing out informational program brochures, etc.) will impact the number of undergraduate students who apply to the program and whether the diversity of the applicants will increase due to the recruitment efforts when compared to the 2012 recruitment year. With the recent shortage of school psychologists and the need for a more diverse profession given the predicted rise in minorities in the upcoming years within the schools, it is important that recruitment strategies are examined in order to determine the most effective recruitment approaches for creating a diverse and influential group of future school psychologists.
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METHOD

Research Questions and Predictions

The following research questions were developed for the present study:

(1) Does the use of targeted recruitment strategies during School Psychology Awareness Week’s activities increase the number of applicants who apply to the University of Dayton (UD)?

(2) Does the use of targeted recruitment strategies yield a percentage increase in the number of diverse applicants (i.e., age, gender, ethnicity, full-time or part-time etc.) at UD, thus leading to a more diverse cohort in 2013?

It was predicted that targeted recruitment activities during NASP’s School Psychology Awareness Week would (1) increase the number applicants who apply to UD’s School Psychology Program, and (2) result in a percentage increase in the number of diverse applicants, inclusive of minorities (Non-Caucasian applicants), males, varied ages, and program tracks. This prediction was based on findings indicating that actively recruiting applicants at various universities and colleges through targeted recruitment can help increase awareness of school psychology; thus leading to more interested undergraduate students applying to school psychology programs (Gilman & Handwerk, 2001; Graves & Wright, 2007; Griffin & Muñiz, 2011; Quarterman, 2008).
**Research Design**

The current study was a program evaluation that evaluated the efficacy of targeted recruitment strategies for a school psychology program. A co-researcher on this project examined the pre/post presentation knowledge and interest of the participants. The applicant pool was evaluated by examining the diversity of the applicants who applied to UD’s School Psychology Program. Diversity in this study was defined as prospective students coming from various educational backgrounds, different age groups, race, gender, and work experience. Researchers had participants complete the School Psychology Awareness Inventory (SPAI) to determine participants’ knowledge and interest in applying to a school psychology program before and after the informational presentation (see Appendix B).

Once the presentation was complete, qualitative information regarding the student’s perspectives on the presentation and their likelihood to apply to a school psychology program in the future was obtained by completing the SPAI. Researchers expected that the participants’ level of interest before the session, knowledge of school psychology graduate programs, and interest in attending graduate school would impact the likelihood of undergraduate students applying to a school psychology program after graduation.

The researcher also compared the diversity ratio (i.e., age, gender, ethnicity) of the 2012 school psychology applicants to the 2013 applicants along with the diversity ratio of the cohort in 2012 to the cohort in 2013. Data were gathered from the UD’s School Psychology Program database and through asking 2013 applicants how they heard about UD’s program during the individual interviews with the program director.
Participants and Setting

Participants included \((N = 192)\) undergraduate students attending a diverse set of local colleges or universities in southwest and central Ohio, including University of Dayton, Wright State University, Wilberforce University (HBCU), Central State University (HBCU), Wittenberg University, Sinclair Community College, Capital University, and Otterbein University. The participants were primarily college juniors (46.88%) and seniors (45.31%). Table 1 provides a description and the location of each recruitment site in the present study.

Table 1

College and University Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/University</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital University</td>
<td>Private, four-year undergraduate institution and graduate school</td>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State University</td>
<td>Public, Historically Black college and university (HBCU)</td>
<td>Wilberforce, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otterbein University</td>
<td>Private, four-year liberal arts college</td>
<td>Westerville, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair Community College</td>
<td>Urban, community college, lowest tuition rate in Ohio for residents of Montgomery County</td>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Dayton</td>
<td>Private, Roman Catholic</td>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilberforce University</td>
<td>Private, Liberal arts, Historically Black college and university (HBCU), Nation’s oldest African American college</td>
<td>Wilberforce, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittenberg University</td>
<td>Nationally ranked Lutheran-affiliated, liberal arts college</td>
<td>Springfield, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University</td>
<td>Public university</td>
<td>Fairborn, Ohio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were invited to attend a School Psychology Awareness presentation with permission from their school’s department and course professors. Through a cluster, convenience-sampling strategy, participants included undergraduate psychology and education majors. Table 2 displays the demographic characteristics of the 192 participants included in the study. Participants were informed that participation was voluntary; they were told that their completion of the survey indicated their consent to participate. Demographic and background data were collected, including: (a) gender, (b) age, (c) ethnicity, (d) major, (e) education level, (f) year in school, and (g) expected year of graduation (see Appendix B).
Table 2

*Participant Demographic Data (N=192)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>77.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>92.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>61.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Ethnicities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>45.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underclassman</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College major</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>59.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hometown location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>67.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwestern United States</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern United States</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern United States</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern United States</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials

**Measures.** Data from the 2012 applicant pool were collected using UD’s School Psychology Program database with permission from the program director. Those students who applied for the upcoming 2013 applicant year were also placed in the program database in February 2013. Information on how the applicants learned about UD’s program and school psychology was obtained qualitatively during the student’s interviews with the program director. The researcher also compared the 2012 cohort data to the 2013 cohort data to determine if admitted applicants planning to attend UD’s program were more diverse than the previous year. In addition to this part of the study, a co-researcher for this project used a quantitative, electronic school psychology knowledge and interest survey, the SPAI, using iClickers. During Part II of the survey, a qualitative, paper-and-pencil section (*Demographic Questionnaire*) was administered to participants to evaluate the presentation and obtain suggestions for future presentations.

*School Psychology Awareness Inventory (SPAI).* The survey instrument was a modified version of the *Undergraduate Knowledge about the Field of School Psychology* developed by Jessica Crislip (2011). The *Undergraduate Knowledge about the Field of School Psychology* survey instrument is a modified version of Gilman and Handwerk’s (2001) *Undergraduate Psychology Information Inventory* (UPII). The UPII was assessed for content validity and reliability before it was released. Permission to use a modified version of the UPII was obtained from Gilman and Handwerk. The modified survey (SPAI) was evaluated and approved by the thesis committee chair and the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Dayton before it was administered to
participants. The SPAI (electronic and paper version) contained two sections: (1) Likert scale questions, and (2) true/false questions.

**Demographic Questionnaire.** The first page of the demographic questionnaire included questions regarding: (1) college/university attend, (2) age, (3) expected date of graduation, (4) gender, (5) major, (6) iClicker number, (7) hometown, and (7) ethnic background. The second page of the demographic questionnaire was completed after the presentation and post-SPAI. It included one question on how the participants learned about school psychology and two qualitative questions on how researchers could improve the presentation in the future and what information would be beneficial for applicants who are interested in applying to a school psychology program in the future.

**Recruitment materials.** The targeted recruitment activities included: (1) a PowerPoint presentation to varied undergraduate institutions on the field of school psychology and UD’s current program; (2) contact information of current school psychology graduate students enrolled in UD’s program; (3) an informational brochure on UD’s School Psychology Program; (4) and a business card of current Program Director, Susan Davies, EdD.

The presentation was a modified version of the NASP-approved School Psychology Awareness PowerPoint and contained information on the field of school psychology, graduate training options, and UD’s School Psychology Program. The presentation lasted approximately 30 minutes and was personalized to each audience and focused on demonstrating enthusiasm for the field and maintaining the participants’ attention by offering relevant information on school psychology and graduate programs (see Appendix C for a copy of the PowerPoint presentation used in the current study).
An informational brochure was given to the students following the presentation to serve as a reference on UD’s current school psychology program. The brochure contained contact information for the researcher and the program director (see Appendix D). The participants were encouraged to make personal contact via email or phone should they have additional questions about the admission process or the program in general. Business cards of the program director (Susan Davies, EdD) were distributed among interested students as an additional personal contact for the program.

As an additional targeted recruitment strategy, participants and potential applicants to UD’s School Psychology program were provided with contact information of current students with whom they might connect well. This information can be found on the brochure and PowerPoint presentation (see Appendix C & D).

Procedures

During the summer of 2012, the survey instruments (SPAI & Demographic Questionnaire), presentation, and brochure were created and evaluated by the thesis committee. The instructors of the undergraduate education and psychology classes in which the participants were enrolled were contacted several months in advance via email and phone to schedule presentation times. Permission was obtained from the program directors and professors of the undergraduate psychology and education classes at all participating universities. As permission was obtained from each university, psychology and education classes were selected randomly for the study based on presentation schedule, availability of the presenters, and class time.

The primary researcher and fellow school psychology trainees collected data before and after the presentation. The co-presenters included current school psychology
graduate students with diverse backgrounds, including a male presenter and a minority student. All individuals who collected data were trained on how to appropriately administer the pre- and post- survey using the iClickers. The iClickers are electronic audience response system that allows students to provide instant feedback on what they know by “clicking” their responses on a remote control. A wireless signal immediately sends the students’ responses to a receiver, which links their answers to their iClicker identification number. The iClicker allows each student to have an anonymous and unique identifier, so that the participants’ names would not be recorded and their answers would be completely confidential. All data were linked through the anonymous, unique identifier. The school psychology trainees were instructed on how to properly conduct the presentation, so that it was consistent among the universities. A fidelity checklist (see Appendix E) was provided and followed consistently throughout each presentation.

An informed consent script (see Appendix A) was read to the participants prior to administration of the pre-survey SPAI. Participants were informed that their answers would remain anonymous and that there would be no penalty for not participating or choosing not to answer any or all questions. Informed consent was obtained by participants choosing to answer the questions using the given iClickers.

Following informed consent and the administration of the first electronic iClicker survey, the researchers then proceeded to present the prepared PowerPoint presentation (see Appendix C). Participants used the electronic iClickers to indicate their answers on Part I of the SPAI, which included two Likert scale questions and ten True/False questions. The iClickers allowed the participants to view the survey question within the
PowerPoint presentation and “click” their personal answer instead of hand writing their responses.

After the presentation, the principal researcher collected Part II of the SPAI, which included two different sections: (1) the post electronic survey using the iClickers on the students’ knowledge and understanding of the field of school psychology after the presentation, and (2) a paper-pencil evaluation of the presentation including two open-ended questions to offer anonymous feedback on the presentation (see Appendix B). The last section of Part II of the survey was completed after the additional recruitment strategies were implemented, which included: (1) the informational brochure; (2) and the program director’s business card. The informational brochure was distributed among the participants.

Data collection. Data were collected from each of the eight universities in Ohio using the iClickers and the paper/pencil Demographic Questionnaire. Previous year’s data on applicants was collected from the program director at the University of Dayton to compare the diversity of applicants in the upcoming year (2013). Data were also gathered qualitatively by asking 2013 applicants how they heard about UD’s program during the interview process with the program director. All quantitative data gathered from the survey were entered into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

A total of 195 undergraduate psychology and education students at eight Ohio colleges and universities participated in the study. Out of the 195 undergraduate students, 192 responses were analyzed for the co-researchers’ analysis of students’ pre/post knowledge and interest, along with the qualitative feedback on the presentation. Three survey results were excluded from the analyses due to one participant not completing a substantial amount of questions and two other participants electing not to fill out the post-SPAI (See Table 2).

Nominal data were collected for the background and demographic information of the 192 participants. Percentages were used to summarize remaining nominal background and demographic data (descriptive). Descriptive statistics indicated the participants’ overall interest in applying to a school psychology program and the likelihood that they would apply to the University of Dayton in the upcoming admittance period. Program data from the previous years were used to analyze the impact of the recruitment strategies on the program’s applicant pool. The applicant data for the study were analyzed using a chi-square goodness of fit, comparing the baseline of diversity proportion in the 2012 applicant pool to the diversity proportion in the 2013 applicant pool. A level of \( p = .05 \) was used to determine significance in SPSS. Due to the small sample size of the cohorts, the cohort data were analyzed by reporting percentages and
proportions of growth from cohort 2012 to cohort 2013. Qualitative data were coded and analyzed into themes, summarizing the evaluation of the recruitment efforts and suggesting improvements for the future.

A chi-square goodness of fit test was conducted to assess whether the diversity ratio of UD’s applicant pool changed after presenting to eight different universities and colleges during SPAW. A level of $p = .05$ was used to determine significance in SPSS. The results of comparing the ethnicity of the applicant pool from 2012 to 2013 were not significant, $X^2 (4, N= 87) = 7.699, p < 0.103$ (see Figure 1). Additionally, the results of comparing the gender of the applicant pool from 2012 to 2013 were not significant, $X^2 (1, N= 87) = 0.979, p < 0.322$ (see Figure 2). When comparing the 2012 applicant pool to the 2013 applicant pool in terms of age, the results were not significant, $X^2 (3, N= 87) = 0.271, p < 0.965$ (see Figure 3). Furthermore, the total number of applicants who applied to UD’s school psychology program dropped from 51 applicants in 2012 to 36 applicants in 2013, $X^2 (1, N= 87) = 2.586, p < 0.108$. The majority of applicants from both the 2012 and 2013 applicant year indicated a hometown in Ohio. Additionally, no applicants during the interview process stated they attended one of the presentations during SPAW. Table 3 provides the percentages of the diversity ratio comparing the applicant pool from 2012 to 2013.
Figure 1

Applicant Pool 2012 to 2013 Comparison for Ethnicity

Applicant Pool 2012 Ethnicity Percentage

\[ n = 51 \]

- Caucasian: 90%
- Indian: 8%
- African American: 2%
- Asian: 0%
- Not specified: 0%

Applicant Pool 2013 Ethnicity Percentage

\[ n = 36 \]

- Caucasian: 75%
- Indian: 14%
- African American: 3%
- Asian: 0%
- Not specified: 0%
Figure 2

*Applicant Pool 2012 to 2013 Comparison for Gender*

**Applicant Pool 2012 Gender**

- Females: 12%
- Males: 88%

**Applicant Pool 2013 Gender**

- Females: 19%
- Males: 81%

**n=51**

**n=36**
Figure 3

*Applicant Pool 2012 to 2013 Comparison for Age Ranges*

**Applicant Pool 2012 Age Ranges**  
*n=51*

**Applicant Pool 2013 Age Ranges**  
*n=36*
Table 3

*Applicant Pool Comparison*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Applicant Year (N=51)</th>
<th>2013 Applicant Year (N=36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the total number of applicants who were accepted and subsequently attended UD’s school psychology program in 2012 went from 11 full-time, Caucasian
females (one student was dismissed after the first semester) to 12 students (2 part-time students and 10 full-time students) in cohort 2013. When examining the diversity ratio in terms of ethnicity of cohort 2012 to cohort 2013, there was a substantial difference in the ethnic make-up of the cohorts. As shown in Figure 4, cohort 2012 was comprised of all Caucasian students while cohort 2013 is comprised of 83% Caucasians, 17% Latino, and 17% African Americans. Additionally, when comparing the gender of cohort 2012 to 2013, it showed a shift from 100% females to an upcoming cohort of 92% females (n=10) and 8% males (n=2) (See Figure 5). The composition of students’ age also changed from 2012 to 2013. As shown in Figure 6, approximately 91% of students in cohort 2012 were between the ages of 19-26, with the remaining 9% of the 11 students falling within the age range of 27-34. Cohort 2013 has a more dispersed range of ages with 58% of the cohort between the ages of 19-26, 33% between the ages of 27-34, and 8% between the ages of 35-42 years old. Furthermore, with an age range of 19-38 years and mean age increasing from 24 years old to 26 years old, cohort 2013 when compared to cohort 2012 is more heterogeneous. Altogether, the cohorts have increased in terms of diversity from a majority full-time, Caucasian female cohort to a more diverse cohort with 1 male, 4 minority students, and 2 students electing the part-time track.
Figure 4

*Cohort 2012 to 2013 Comparison for Ethnicity*

**Cohort 2012 Ethnicity Percentage**

- Caucasian: 100%
- African American: 17%
- Latino: 17%

*n=11*

**Cohort 2013 Ethnicity Percentage**

- Caucasian: 83%
- African American: 17%
- Latino: 17%

*n=12*
Figure 5

Cohort 2012 to 2013 Comparison for Gender

Cohort 2012 Gender

$\begin{array}{l}
\text{Males} \\
\text{Females}
\end{array}$

$n=11$

0%

100%

Cohort 2013 Gender

$\begin{array}{l}
\text{Males} \\
\text{Females}
\end{array}$

8%

92%

$n=12$
Figure 6

*Cohort 2012 to 2013 Comparison for Age Ranges*

**Cohort 2012 Age Ranges**

n=11

- 19-26: 90.91%
- 27-34: 9.09%

**Cohort 2013 Age Ranges**

n=12

- 19-26: 58.33%
- 27-34: 33.33%
- 35-42: 8.33%
**Participant Knowledge, Interest, and Feedback**

Participants’ knowledge of and interest in school psychology significantly increased following the presentation, as examined by comparing their total knowledge and interest scores from pre-SPAI to post-SPAI. Before the presentation, undergraduate students indicated that a school psychologist’s primary role was individual therapy, and after the SPAW presentation, the undergraduate students indicated that the primary role for a school psychologist was assessment. This demonstrated a more accurate knowledge of a school psychologist’s responsibilities (see Figure 7 and Figure 8). A large percentage of participants (30% of respondents) indicated that their primary source for learning about the field of school psychology was from their instructors. Undergraduate students also indicated that they heard about school psychology from course textbooks (17% of respondents), the internet (17% of respondents), and personal experiences (11% of respondents). When researchers examined how helpful/informative participants found the PowerPoint presentation, 43% of undergraduate students who were presented to found the presentation to be “extremely helpful” while 54% of undergraduate students indicated that the presentation was “pretty helpful” and the remaining 3% of undergraduate students found the presentation “somewhat helpful” (see Figure 9).

Though 44% of the 192 participants indicated after the presentation that they would likely not attend a school psychology program in the future, 40% stated they would “most likely” attend a school psychology program and 7% indicated that they “most definitely will apply” (see Figure 10). Creating interest in the program, 35% of the undergraduate students the researchers presented to indicated that they would “most likely” apply to a school psychology program after they graduate, and 6% of the 192 participants stated that they “most definitely will apply” (see Figure 11).
Figure 7
*Participants on Primary Role of School Psychologist Pre-SPAI*

![Pie chart showing the distribution of primary roles before SPAI intervention.]

- Individual Therapy: 46%
- Assessment: 7%
- Consultation: 27%
- Research: 18%
- Group therapy: 2%

Figure 8
*Participants on Primary Role of School Psychologist Post-SPAI*

![Pie chart showing the distribution of primary roles after SPAI intervention.]

- Assessment: 56%
- Consultation: 21%
- Individual Therapy: 16%
- Research: 5%
- Group therapy: 2%
Figure 9

Participants’ Feedback on PowerPoint Presentation

- Pretty Helpful: 43%
- Extremely Helpful: 54%
- Somewhat Helpful: 3%
- Not Helpful: 0%

Figure 10

Students’ Interest in Attending a School Psychology Program in the Future (n=192)

- No Interest: 9%
- Not Likely: 7%
- Most Likely: 40%
- Definitely will apply: 44%
Figure 11

*Students' Likelihood of Applying to a School Psychology Program After Graduation*

(*n* = 192)

![Pie chart showing students' likelihood of applying to a school psychology program after graduation.]

Qualitative feedback was sought from participants after attending the SPAW presentation. Participants provided suggestions regarding the presentation that would make it more helpful in the future. The qualitative data were coded and divided into themes, which were cross-checked by the co-researcher. Overall, students reported that the presentation was very informative and provided “great” information with little to no recommendations for future presentations. Recommendations noted on the feedback form included giving a handout for students to take notes on during the presentations, making sure the technology works, and making the presentation more interactive with the audience. Below is some of the participant qualitative feedback and recommendations for future presentations, reflecting three major themes (i.e., presentation was informative (no changes), recommendations for presentation including more interaction with audience, and presenters skills were ideal).
“It was a great presentation. It was very informative and I liked the fact that the presenters incorporated personal stories. It may be helpful to have someone who is already a school psychologist come into talk as well.”

“You both did an awesome job. You delivered everything successfully. I love that you didn’t read from the PowerPoint, but used it as a guide.”

“I thought this was really great & informative! Definitely makes me think about applying to a program like this because I’m interested in school psychology! Thanks!”

“The presentation was awesome. I think more interaction between survey giver and survey taker would improve the presentation for the future.”

When asked what specific information would be beneficial for students interested in school psychology, the majority of students (approximately \( n = 120, 62.5\% \)) stated that they were provided adequate information during the presentation with limited to no further information. Materials requested by students included more information on financial aid, assistantships, cost of the program, a curriculum/course requirement map, internship salary, and the cost of the study abroad trip. Students noted that they appreciated the sharing of personal experiences and more beneficial and engaging when presenters appeared confident, projected their voice, talked slow, and were prepared and knowledgeable on the topic. Below is some of the participant qualitative feedback and recommendations for future presentations, reflecting the three major qualitative themes (i.e., students stated they were provided adequate information, requested additional information specific to UD’s program, and students appreciated the sharing of personal experiences and interaction with presenters).
“I am/I was actually thinking of duel majoring in education and psychology! All of this info was very inspiring and beneficial.”

“I would like to know more about UD’s program and more about paid internships and half off each semester.”

“The information in the slideshow was enough to perhaps persuade me to change my graduate major. ☺”

“What the school looks for in applicants, application process, funding available.”
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of targeted recruitment strategies such as giving a personal school psychology awareness presentation to multiple groups of undergraduate students during SPAW. The study evaluated the impact of such strategies on the number of applicants to UD’s School Psychology Program and the diversity of the applicant pool/resulting cohort of students.

Review and Interpretation of Findings

Results indicated that targeted recruitment methods, such as giving a presentation on school psychology and handing out informational brochures, resulted in increased interest in and knowledge of the field and were reported to be helpful to students when learning about different career options. These results support Gilman and Handwerk (2001) and Crislip (2011)’s study in which undergraduate students benefited from proactive approaches to creating awareness and those with more knowledge and personal experiences about school psychology were more likely to consider the profession.

Although there was not statistically significant growth in terms of diversity from the applicant pool in 2012 to 2013, there was improvement in the number of diverse students who applied. Despite this promising finding, it cannot be concluded that these effects were a direct result of the targeted recruitment strategies in this study. Through the presentations given during SPAW at various universities and colleges, strong
partnerships were built with two HBCUs in Ohio, potentially improving partnerships with universities with large populations of students from non-white ethnic groups and creating personal contact with diverse student populations and faculty. These indications support the findings and strategies suggested by Quarterman (2008) and Griffin and Muñiz (2011). Furthermore, results indicated a percentage increase in diversity (i.e., gender, ethnicity, age ranges) from cohort 2012 to cohort 2013. Though no applicants during the interview process stated they attended one of the presentations during SPAW, it is possible that because a large percentage of participants were juniors (n=90; 46.88%), more participants will apply in the coming applicant year (2014). Undergraduate juniors may change their future plans (i.e., looking for a job straight out of college) and be more open to consider going to graduate school for school psychology. The other 87 undergraduate seniors (45.31%) indicated to the presenters that they had already established plans after graduation, which may have affected the likelihood of them applying to UD’s program. On the other hand, nine participants identified themselves as underclassmen (sophomores and freshman) in undergraduate college, so these students will not be graduating for a couple more years.

Given that the presentation increased students’ interest in school psychology, 40% of the 192 participants stated that they most likely or definitely would apply to a school psychology program in the future. This demonstrated that by creating awareness about school psychology, researchers and practicing school psychologists could increase the likelihood of undergraduate students applying after graduation. Furthermore, the majority of undergraduate students indicated that the presentation was beneficial to them. A review of the participants’ evaluation of the presentation revealed that they found it
informational and interesting. For future presentations, participants suggested making it more interactive, providing a handout to take notes on throughout the presentation, and making sure the technology (i.e., iClickers) works. Since some of the classrooms at the participating universities did not have the technology to support the iClickers, paper versions of the survey were given to the participants; however, participants acknowledged in their feedback that they would have liked to work with the iClickers.

While there was no increase in the number of applicants who applied to UD’s program or a significant effect in diversity amongst the applicant pool and cohort, this study was a start to creating awareness of more research that needs to be done on expanding the knowledge of effective strategies for recruiting students from diverse backgrounds into the field of school psychology. This study demonstrated that targeted recruitment activities can increase the knowledge, interest, and likelihood of applying for school psychology programs, there still lacks efficient research on how to further increase the diversity in school psychology graduate programs.

Limitations

There were a number of limitations that impacted the conclusions that could drawn from the present study. The convenience sample was a weakness of the study; the undergraduate education and psychology classes selected to take part in the presentation and pre/post survey were based on those professors who agreed to dedicate part of their classroom to our study. Also, it was the first time the researchers had used the electronic iClickers, so depending on the technology within the classroom, the data collection method varied (i.e. either iClickers were used to collect the data or a back-up paper survey with the same questions) when the iClickers did not work during the presentation.
due to different operating systems. Also, during the presentation week, the presenters ran out of the program director’s contact card, so the majority of participants did not receive a business card; however, contact information was still provided on the brochures, which were handed out to all the undergraduate students that participated in the study.

Another limitation to consider is that the majority of participants were juniors (n=90) and seniors (n=87) with only 9 participants identifying themselves as underclassmen (sophomores & 1st years). This limited the number of students that may have applied in the 2013 application year since most students, particularly the seniors, in which some participants noted in the qualitative section of the SPAI that they had already chosen a career or had established plans (i.e., job) after graduation. Nevertheless, the researchers hope that the presentation sparked an interest in those students who were juniors and underclassmen, and that they may consider applying to graduate school for school psychology in the 2014 application year or later. Finally, UD’s School Psychology website has undergone substantial improvement over the past year along with the admission deadline moving from February 1st to January 10th. Both of these aspects are a limitation to the study in that the website and admission deadline could both potentially contribute to the applicant pool in unforeseen ways. The combination of these factors may impact the validity of the results.

**Implications for Future Research**

Future research should replicate and expand on this study to a larger group of undergraduate students in order to determine further statistical effectiveness. Similar studies should be completed with a larger, more diverse group of participants including high school students, 1st and 2nd year undergraduate students, and current teachers who...
may be considering a career change. Researchers should expand the recruitment strategies to larger universities and colleges and universities with a high minority population, including schools outside of Ohio. Future research should also expand the recruitment strategies to other majors besides education and psychology such as foreign language classes and career classes targeting undecided undergraduate majors. In addition, researchers should examine school psychology programs that have a high diversity ratio and conduct a program evaluation to discover more effective recruitment strategies for students of diverse backgrounds. Overall, more extensive research is needed to evaluate effective recruitment methods for diverse populations, examining which components influence minority students to apply, accept, and complete a school psychology program. There continues to be limited research on recruitment strategies used to increase the number of future, diverse school psychologists. This study indicates a need for increased awareness and research on targeted recruitment strategies in order to create a diverse and influential group of school psychologists to impact the growing student population.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT SCRIPT

“Hello. We are graduate students in the school psychology program at the University of Dayton. In the presentation today, we will be providing you with information on the field of school psychology and information about our program at UD. Before we start the presentation, we will ask you some questions about your knowledge and interests in the field of school psychology. You will use iClickers (hold up an iClicker to demonstrate) to give your answers. We are collecting this data for a study we are conducting about undergraduate’s knowledge about school psychology and so we can learn about the impact of our presentations on admissions. Your participation is voluntary and your answers will be confidential, which means no individual response will be linked with you or your name. Your agreement to participate in our survey will be indicated by your decision to accept the electronic iClicker. You can also accept an iClicker and skip any questions that you choose not to answer. There is no penalty for not participating in our study and of course you can choose to not answer the questions, but stay for the presentation. Data from this presentation will be saved and merged with data from other university presentations. At the end of the presentation you will use the iClickers again to answer questions, plus we will pass out paper and pencil surveys so you can give us feedback on the presentation. If you have any questions please feel free to contact us. Our contact information will be included at the end of our presentation and on the brochures we hand out at the end.”
Directions: We would like to know about your current knowledge of the profession of School Psychology. Please be as honest as possible and do not discuss your answers with anyone else while completing this inventory. This is NOT a test. Your answers will not affect your academic grades in any way and your responses will be confidential. Only your clicker number will be associated with your responses and only the presenters and their program advisor will have access to the data collected.

1. Please click how knowledgeable you feel you are about the field of school psychology.

   No Knowledge  Somewhat Knowledgeable  Pretty Knowledgeable  Extremely Knowledgeable
   1              2                        3                        4

   A              B                        C                        D

2. Click the primary role you feel school psychologists are trained to perform:

   Group Therapy: A
   Assessment: B
   Individual Therapy: C
   Consultation: D
   Research: E
For the following questions, please click “true” if the statement you read is correct. Please click “false” if the statement you read is incorrect.

3. True    False School Psychologists work in hospitals.

4. True    False School Psychologists work in private practice.

5. True    False School Psychologists must hold a doctoral degree in order to practice.

6. True    False School Psychologists perform individual assessments on children.

7. True    False School Psychologists help teachers improve their classroom management skills.

8. True    False School Psychologists do crisis support in schools.

9. True    False School Psychologists complete course work in areas such as special education, statistics, child psychology, assessment, and reading.

10. True False School Psychologists only deal with minor forms of emotional disturbances such as depression or anxiety.

11. True    False School Psychologists perform research and program evaluations.

12. True    False I know someone personally who is a School Psychologist.

13. Please click to indicate how interested you are in attending a school psychology program in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Interest</th>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Most Likely</th>
<th>Definitely will apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iClicker Post-Test in PowerPoint Presentation

**Directions:** We would like to know about your current knowledge of the profession of School Psychology. Please be as honest as possible and do not discuss your answers with anyone else while completing this inventory. This is NOT a test. Your answers will not affect your academic grades in any way and your responses will be confidential. Only your clicker number will be associated with your responses and only the presenters and their program advisor will have access to the data collected.

14. Please click how knowledgeable you feel you are about the field of school psychology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Knowledge</th>
<th>Somewhat Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Pretty Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Extremely Knowledgeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A  B  C  D

15. Click the primary role you feel school psychologists are trained to perform:

- Group Therapy: A
- Assessment: B
- Individual Therapy: C
- Consultation: D
- Research: E

For the following questions, please click “true” if the statement you read is correct. Please click “false” if the statement you read is incorrect.


17. True  False School Psychologists work in private practice.

18. True  False School Psychologists must hold a doctoral degree in order to practice.

19. True  False School Psychologists perform individual assessments on children.
20. **True**  **False** School Psychologists help teachers improve their classroom management skills.

21. **True**  **False** School Psychologists do crisis support in schools.

22. **True**  **False** School Psychologists complete course work in areas such as special education, statistics, child psychology, assessment, and reading.

23. **True**  **False** School Psychologists only deal with minor forms of emotional disturbances such as depression or anxiety.

24. **True**  **False** School Psychologists perform research and program evaluations.

25. Please click how informative/helpful you feel the PowerPoint presentation was.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Helpful</th>
<th>Somewhat Helpful</th>
<th>Pretty Helpful</th>
<th>Extremely Helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Please click to indicate how interested you are in attending a school psychology program in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Interest</th>
<th>Not Likely</th>
<th>Most Likely</th>
<th>Definitely will apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. After hearing the presentation, what is the likelihood that you will apply to a school psychology program after graduation? (Click the answer that most applies to your situation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No interest</th>
<th>Not likely</th>
<th>Most likely</th>
<th>Definitely will apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Psychology Awareness Inventory

Paper/Pencil Demographic Questionnaire (Front side)

College/University: __________________________

Major: __________________________

Anticipated Graduation Year: __________

Gender: _____  Age: _____  Clicker #: __________________________

Where are you from? (Check the one that best describes location of your “home town”

☐ Ohio
☐ Midwestern US (not Ohio)
☐ Northeastern US
☐ Southeastern US
☐ Southwestern US
☐ Great Plains
☐ Western US

☐ Outside of the US __________
What is your ethnic background? (Check all that apply)

- African (any African country)
- Canadian
- East Asian (Japan, China, Korea, Philippines)
- European (any European country)
- Latino/a (any Central or S. American country)
- South Asian (India, Malaysia, Indonesia, etc.)
- Native American
- African-American
- Canadian-American
- East Asian-American
- European-American
- Latino/a-American
- South Asian-American
- Not Listed
School Psychology Awareness Inventory

Paper/Pencil Survey (Back side of paper)

1p. Indicate the sources you **primarily** used/are using to learn about the field of school psychology. (NOTE: you may choose more than one if applicable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Books/Magazines</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Television/Movies</th>
<th>Friends/Family</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Experience</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Professional Organizations</th>
<th>Course Textbook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2p. Please provide any suggestions you have for how we can improve the presentation for the future:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

3p. If you are interested in applying to a school psychology program, what information would be beneficial for you?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX C
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY INFORMATIVE POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Making a Difference: A Career in School Psychology
Agenda

- What is a school psychologist?
- What do school psychologists do?
  - Roles & Responsibilities
- Where do they work?
- Why should I be a school psychologist?
- How do I become a school psychologist?
- University of Dayton’s Program

What is a School Psychologist?

- Help children and youth succeed academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally
- Promote children’s mental health
- Work collaboratively with others
- Collaborate with educators, parents, and other professionals to create safe, healthy, and supportive learning environments
- Strengthen connections between home, school, and the community for all students
What Do School Psychologists Do?

- Assessment
- Consultation for student and systems-level change
- Prevention
- Intervention
- Staff, parent, and student education
- Research and program development
- Mental health care
- Advocacy

School Psychologists work with Students

- Help students who may have:
  - Learning difficulties
  - Behavior concerns
  - Attention problems
  - Problems at home or with peers
  - Fears about war, violence, terrorism
  - Depression and other mental health issues
  - Coping with crisis and trauma
  - Poverty, violence, or life changing events
  - Advocacy of their learning and mental health needs
School Psychologists work with Families

- Help address learning and behavioral problems that may interfere with academic success
- Evaluate eligibility for special education services
- Enhance the collaboration between home and school
School Psychologists work with Teachers & Administrators

- Collect and analyze data related to school improvement and student outcomes
- Implement school-wide intervention programs that promote a positive learning environment
- Respond to any crises by providing leadership and coordination with community resources
- Collaborate with teachers to help them identify classroom-based problems and implement data-based interventions (Ex. Classroom management)

Where do they work?

- Public & Private Schools
- Colleges & Universities
- Mental Health Centers
- Private Practice
- Pediatric Clinics & Hospitals
- Public agencies
- Criminal Justice System
The Benefits of Being a School Psychologist

- Making a huge difference in children and families’ lives
  - Help students with learning problems
  - Help students and families with life stressors
  - Help students with behavioral problems learn new ways to respond

What else?

- **Excellent** job outlook both now and long-term!
  - Not enough graduates to meet demand
    - Significant shortages of school psychologists are projected to continue to decline through 2020
  - Retirement will soon open many positions
    - 52.9% are expected to retire by the year 2015

- Named **one of the best careers** in 2010 by US News Weekly and World Report
What do School Psychologists make?

- Median salaries range from $47,880.00 to $67,070.00, while top salaries can exceed $100,000.
- Mean per diem salary for practitioners at the specialist level is $287.00 and $350.00 at the doctoral level.
- Salaries for school psychologists vary by state and region.

Undergraduate Education

- Must complete a Bachelor’s degree
- Consider an education, psychology or related field
- Take courses in
  - Child development
  - General and child psychology
  - Statistics, measurement, and research
  - Philosophy and theory of education
  - Instruction and curriculum
  - Special education
Graduate School

- Education Specialist
  - In most states, certification as a school psychologist requires training at the specialist level.
  - Specialist-level degrees can be identified by several acronyms including: Educational Specialist (EdS), Masters (MA, MS, MEd) and Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies (CAGS/CAS) etc.
- Doctorate (PhD, PsyD or EdD)

Program Length

- Specialist-level:
  - 3-4 years (60+ semester credit hours) of full-time training including a 1200-hour internship*
- Doctorate:
  - 5+ years or more (90+ semester credit hours) of full-time training including a minimum 1500-hour internship*, and dissertation

*At least (600) hours of the internship must be completed in a school setting.
How do I choose a program?

- Specialist vs. Doctoral degree
- NASP approval/alignment and/or APA accreditation
- Size of cohort and location of program
- Department of Education or Psychology
- Theoretical orientation
- Specialties (e.g., early childhood, low incidence, urban, rural, bilingual etc.)
- Research opportunities
- Financial support (assistantships/fellowships)

Applying to a Graduate Program

- GRE: Graduate Record Exam
  - Some programs may require the GRE—Psychology
- Undergraduate transcripts
- Letters of recommendation
- Personal statement(s)
- Practice or research interests
University of Dayton

- NASP & NCATE-approved program
  - Training in intervention-based consultation and assessment approaches
- Receive Master’s degree in Education (MSE) & Education Specialist (Ed. S)
- Hands-on practicum experiences throughout 3 years
- Small student-faculty ratio for ideal learning environment
- Paid internship in Ohio

Why UD?

- Progressive, innovative coursework
  - Course work in areas such as special education, statistics, assessment, crisis intervention, child psychology etc.
- Marianist Mission
  - Strong emphasis on community, leadership, and service
- School Psychologists of the University of Dayton (SPUD)
- Opportunity for study abroad experience
Why UD?

- Well-known faculty members who promote success in variety of ways
- Publications and presentations
- Various research backgrounds & specialties

**Assistantships offered to students**
- Full-time students hold a wide range of assistantships:
  - Department of Counselor Education and Human Services; GA’s to professors; Montgomery County ESC, Teacher Education Department; Ready, Set, Soar!; Center for International Programs

- Students receive their tuition at half price in addition to a bi-monthly stipend.
Argentina Trip

University of Dayton

- 3 cohorts, each with full- and part-time students:
  - Typically accept 10 full-time and 2 part-time students each year.

- All cohorts are made up of students from both psychology and educational backgrounds

- Allows for discussion from different perspectives and experiences.
Contact Information

- Susan Davies  
  Program Coordinator  
  937-229-3652  
- Counselor Education and Human Services  
- Chaminade Hall, Room 301  
- Phone: 937-229-3644  
  Fax: 937-229-1055

Contact Information

- Amanda Fritz  
  School Psychologist in Training  
  afritz1@udayton.edu  
- Emily Hendricks  
  School Psychologist in Training  
  hendrickse1@udayton.edu
Questions?

References


thank you
APPENDIX D

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY INFORMATIVE BROCHURE

Testimonials

“I feel honored to be part of the School Psychology Program at the University of Dayton. The students and faculty have provided me with support and encouragement as I changed my career later in life. I am confident that I am able to provide professional and ethical services to students and their families after receiving my training at UD.” - Kathleen Squires, Intern

“I chose the University of Dayton’s school psychology program because the program’s content is cutting edge. The University of Dayton’s school psychology program offers many unique options for students which includes attending the program on a full-time or part-time basis.” - Keropa Hubbard, Intern

“The professors in our program are unique in that they have all worked, or are currently working as a school psychologist. When covering new material it’s very helpful to have someone with experience to provide insight on how the new information can be applied.” - Errol Fletcher, 2nd year

“School Psychologists are child advocates. There is no greater reward than seeing the smile on a student’s face when they make progress academically or behaviorally to meet grade level expectations.” - Debbie Flunt, School Psychologist & Instructor at UD

Contact Information

Amanda Fritz,
Second Year Student
Phone Number: (513) 323.1218
Email Address:
afriz@udayton.edu

Emily Hendricks,
Second Year Student
Phone Number: (613) 392.6349
Email Address:
hendrickse@udayton.edu

How can I find out more?

Visit the University of Dayton’s School Psychology Program website at:
http://www.udayton.edu/learn/graduate/education/major_school_psychology.php

The application process is online, easy, and free!

Complete online application at:
https://gradadmission.udayton.edu/

Fall Application Deadline: January 16th
What does a School Psychologist do?

- Help children and youth succeed academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally
- Promote children’s mental health
- Work collaboratively with others
- Collaborate with educators, parents, and other professionals to create safe, healthy, and supportive learning environments
- Strengthen connections between home, school, and the community for all students

Benefits of Being a School Psychologist

- Create positive environments and make a difference in the lives of children, both academically and emotionally
- Meet the expanding demand
- 92.9% of school psychologists are expecting to retire by the year 2025

More Highlights of UTD’s Program

- To complete the program you receive your Master’s as well as the specialist level training degree
- This combined MS/Ed.S program can be completed on either a full or part-time basis
- Progressive training in the field, which was listed as one of the 30 best careers in the US News and World Report

University of Dayton
School Psychology Program
(M.S.E., Ed.S.)

- Low student to faculty ratio
- Accredited by the National Association of School Psychologists
- Hands on internship and practicum experience throughout the program
- Intervention based, problem solving approach
- Participate in a unique study abroad experience
- Become a high caliber professional who is an adaptive leader in a changing and evolving world

For More Information...

Sara Burns
Program Coordinator
Email: sburns1@udayton.edu
937-229-3652

Counselor Education and Human Services
Chaminade Hall, Room 311
Dayton, OH 45469-0510
Phone: 937-229-3654
Fax: 937-229-1053

Where do School Psychologists

- Public and Private Schools
- Colleges and Universities
- Private Practices
- Mental Health Centers
- Pediatric Clinics and Hospitals
- Public Agencies
- Criminal Justice Systems
APPENDIX E

PRESENTATION FIDELITY CHECKLIST

Steps for School Psychology Awareness Week Presentations:

1. Introduce yourselves.
2. Read the informed consent to the class.
3. Have one person hand out the iClickers and one upload the PowerPoint from your USB.
4. Once the PowerPoint is up on the computer, remove your USB, and insert the iClicker USB.
5. Open the iClicker file according to the yellow sheet—we will provide more info on this before the presentation.
6. While one of you is opening the iClicker file, the other should hand out the paper portion of the survey.
7. Instruct the students to record their iClicker ID # onto the sheet.
8. Then, demonstrate to the students how to turn on their iClicker.
9. Have the students fill out the first page ONLY of the paper portion of the survey.
10. Open the PowerPoint, tell the class you are going to begin by collecting some information, and begin the PowerPoint survey.
11. After the survey, continue with the PowerPoint and begin the presentation part.
12. Once the presentation part is over, inform the students you will be collecting some more data, and begin the PowerPoint post-presentation survey.
13. Once the PowerPoint (iClicker) post-presentation survey, have the students turn over their paper portion of the survey and fill it out.
14. Collect the iClickers and paper portion of the survey. ***When collecting the paper portion of the survey, check and make sure each students put their iClicker ID# on there.***
15. Hand out the informational brochures to the students in the class.
16. Give the “Thank You” card to the professor and thank him or her for allowing us to present to his or her class.
17. Leave a bag of candy for the students as a gift of our appreciation for their cooperation.
18. You’re DONE!! Thanks so much for your help 😊