

TSU PRE-K–12 PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING — STUDENT FIELDWORK EVALUATION

Disaggregated Fieldwork Analysis | CAEP Accountability Measure — Candidate Performance Data | All Candidate Identifiers Removed

I. OVERVIEW

A total of 33 fieldwork evaluations were submitted across three program levels: Practicum, Internship I, and Internship II. Of these, 30 contained scorable data (n=3 had no item-level responses recorded and are excluded from quantitative analysis). Evaluations were completed by site supervisors using a two-section instrument: Section 1 — Professional Knowledge & Counseling Competencies (15 items; scale 1–5) and Section 2 — Professional Practice & Dispositions (12 items; scale 1–4). Scores of "0" (Not Applicable) were excluded from all mean calculations. Two evaluations included a formal concern flag and are detailed in Section III.

II. DISAGGREGATED PERFORMANCE BY FIELD EXPERIENCE LEVEL

Field Experience Level	Sec. 1 Mean (/5.0)	Exc % (5)	Good % (4)	Acc % (3)	Sec. 2 Mean (/4.0)	Exc % (4)	Good % (3)	Acc % (2)	Unac % (≤2/1)
Practicum (n=12)	4.17	38%	39%	23%	3.30	37%	51%	11%	11%
Internship I (n=9)	4.60	63%	34%	3%	3.52	57%	39%	4%	4%
Internship II (n=9)	4.41	63%	28%	4%	3.77	91%	6%	0%	3%

Sec. 1: 5=Excellent, 4=Good, 3=Acceptable, 2=Unacceptable, 0=N/A (excluded). Sec. 2: 4=Excellent, 3=Good, 2=Acceptable, 1=Unacceptable, 0=N/A (excluded). Unacceptable column reflects combined ratings ≤2 (Sec. 1) and ≤1 (Sec. 2).

III. ANALYSIS AND PROGRAM IMPLICATIONS

Developmental Progression: Data reveal a positive developmental trajectory across the program sequence. Section 1 mean scores increase from 4.17 (Practicum) to 4.60 (Internship I), reflecting growing mastery of counseling knowledge and content competencies as candidates advance. Section 2 means show consistent improvement from 3.30 (Practicum) through 3.52 (Internship I) to 3.77 (Internship II), indicating that professional practice skills and dispositions strengthen meaningfully with cumulative field experience.

Area Requiring Attention — Section 2, Practicum Level: The Practicum cohort recorded the highest rate of unacceptable (11%) and acceptable-level (51%) ratings in Section 2 (Professional Practice & Dispositions). This pattern is consistent with candidates in an early observational phase; however, the 11% unacceptable rate warrants structured faculty review. Program coordinators should examine which specific Section 2 competencies are driving lower ratings at the Practicum level and determine whether pre-practicum dispositional preparation requires strengthening.

Internship II Outlier: The 4% unacceptable rate in Section 1 at the Internship II level is attributable primarily to one candidate with substantially low scores across nearly all competency items, while the majority of Internship II candidates performed at the highest levels. This outlier should be reviewed individually by the program coordinator in conjunction with the site supervisor concern log.

IV. FLAGGED CONCERNS (Q4 = Yes)

Candidate ID	Level	Nature of Concern	Program Implication
Candidate A	Internship II	Supervisor flagged irregular attendance at placement site; insufficient on-site hours to conduct full evaluation across competency areas.	Review of attendance and time-log compliance; advising intervention recommended.
Candidate B	Internship II	Supervisor noted limited direct observation opportunities; scored N/A on majority of items. All directly observed competencies rated at highest level.	Placement structure review; ensure sufficient supervisor access for full evaluation. No performance deficiency identified.

V. QUALITATIVE THEMES FROM SUPERVISOR OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

Supervisors frequently cited candidates' relationship-building capacity, professional dispositions, and commitment to student equity as distinguishing strengths. Several comments noted candidates' initiative in launching original programs (e.g., school-based mentoring, data chats, family outreach). One supervisor recommended improved communication between the TSU internship coordinator and site supervisors to better structure intern experiences, and noted the value of providing site supervisors with clearer evaluation guidance prior to the placement. This feedback directly supports the EPP's ongoing effort to strengthen clinical partnership protocols and supervisor orientation.