WILEY

A snapshot of multicultural training in school psychology

Celeste M. Malone [ID] | Kareem Z. Ishmail

Department of Human Development
and Psychoeducational Studies,
Howard University, Washington, DC

Correspondence
Celeste M. Malone, Department of Human
Development and Psychoeducational Studies,
Howard University, 2441 4th St NW,
Washington, DC 20059.
Email: celeste.malone@howard.edu

Abstract

With the rapidly increasing racial and ethnic diversity of
the school-aged population, school psychologists must
be properly trained to engage in culturally competent
practice; however, little is known about how school
psychology programs prepare their trainees to serve
diverse populations. The purpose of this study was to
update Rogers et al.'s study on multicultural training by
examining the extent to which school psychology pro-
grams use multicultural training recommendations noted
in the literature. Thirty-eight school psychology program
coordinators completed the Multicultural Environmental
Inventory-Revised (MEI) to assess their perceptions of
their program's multicultural environment. Participants
were also asked about their training in multicultural and
diversity issues and how their program conducts multi-
cultural training. Findings suggest that programs most
frequently used the integration and separate course
models for multicultural training along with clinical ex-
periences serving diverse students. In addition, multi-
cultural coursework was associated with higher scores on
the MEI Curriculum and MEI Research subscales. With
regard to program environment, the percentage of racial
and ethnic minoritized (REM) students was positively
correlated to the percentage of REM faculty and
the number of required multicultural courses. However,

programs lacked specific strategies to recruit and retain diverse students. Findings and implications for training programs are discussed.

KEYWORDS

graduate education, graduate training, multicultural school psychology

1 | A SNAPSHOT OF THE STATE OF MULTICULTURAL TRAINING IN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

The United States (U.S.) is becoming more culturally and linguistically diverse with this change most evident in the school-age population. By the year 2020, children from racial and ethnic minoritized (REM) groups will comprise one-half of children under age 18, and, by the year 2060 will represent almost two-thirds of all children (Vespa, Armstrong, & Medina, 2018). In addition, over 20% of children between the ages of 5 and 14 speak a language other than English at home (Ryan, 2013). As the U.S. shifts to becoming a more culturally plural nation, it is important to understand how culture impacts the way individuals experience the world and the institutional barriers and structural inequities that disproportionately affect REM populations. Within the PK-12 school system, these inequities have led to the achievement gap between REM and White students, overrepresentation of REM students in special education and underrepresentation in gifted education, and excessive use of exclusionary discipline practices (Biddanda, Shriberg, Ruecker, Conway, & Montesinos, 2019). Given these disproportionate outcomes related to minority status, school psychologists must be cognizant of how cultural factors affect children's experiences in schools and impact all aspects of school psychology practice.

The importance of this cultural competence in school psychology is embedded throughout the professional standards of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP; i.e., *Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services*, *Standards for the Credentialing of School Psychologists*, *Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists*, and *Principles for Professional Ethics*). A content analysis of these standards suggests that culturally competent school psychologists acknowledge cultural differences among the students and families they serve, develop awareness of their own cultural identity through self-reflection and recognition of their biases, and have knowledge and skills to bring about positive outcomes for diverse students (Johnson, Bahr, & Navarro, 2019). To develop this competence in school psychology trainees, both NASP and the American Psychological Association (APA) require school psychology programs develop cultural competence and evaluate the extent to which trainees' have acquired multicultural knowledge and can demonstrate multicultural skills (APA, 2015; NASP, 2010).

While neither association specifies how multicultural training should be provided, programs typically use one or more of the multicultural training models: separate course, interdisciplinary, area of concentration, and integration (Chae, Foley, & Chae, 2006; Newell et al., 2010). Separate course and interdisciplinary models both offer a single course on multicultural and diversity issues; however, in an interdisciplinary model, the course is offered in another academic department (e.g., anthropology, sociology) instead of in the school psychology training program. In an area of concentration model, programs require multiple multicultural courses and practica to emphasize training for a specific population. Finally, with an integration model, multicultural content is infused throughout the curriculum without a specific multicultural course. Many researchers have suggested that programs use an "integration-separate course model" in which they adopt both an integration model and a separate course model of multicultural training (Fouad, 2006; Newell et al., 2010; Rogers, 2006). This entails having at least one course

specifically focused on multicultural and diversity issues while also infusing this content throughout the curriculum (Chae et al., 2006; Newell et al., 2010). The standalone coursework builds trainees' knowledge of multicultural terminology, specific cultural groups, and multicultural interventions (Fouad, 2006; Mallott, 2010). It can also help trainees increase their awareness of and sensitivity to cultural issues (Patterson, Papa, Reveles, & Domenech Rodríguez, 2018; Vega, Tabbah, & Monserrate, 2018). The integration of multicultural content in core school psychology courses emphasizes to trainees that multiculturalism is central to all school psychology practice. As such, an integrated-separate course model ensures trainees have sufficient exposure to basic concepts around culture and diversity while they also learn how these concepts fit within the broader context of school psychology practice.

While content, didactic, and experiential knowledge are critical to multicultural training, this training also needs to be provided within a program environment that supports diversity. Programs are advised to demonstrate a commitment to diversity through their mission statements and training philosophies, faculty conducting research on multicultural issues (i.e., research on REM communities and the issues impacting them), and a culturally sensitive program ambience (Dickson & Jepsen, 2007; Dickson, Jepsen, & Barbee, 2008; Fouad, 2006). For example, in two studies of school psychology programs known for exemplary multicultural training, the programs reported using an integration model, offering standalone diversity coursework, and exposing their trainees to culturally and linguistically diverse clients during practicum and internship (Rogers, 2006; Rogers, Hoffman, & Wade, 1998). But these programs also had at least one REM faculty member and/or faculty member with research interests in multicultural school psychology, used intentional strategies to recruit and retain REM graduate students, and had university climates supportive of diversity issues (Rogers, 2006; Rogers et al., 1998). Both the programs' curricula and their environments were supportive of multicultural training.

Based on a review of recommendations for multicultural training and the characteristics of school psychology programs with exemplary multicultural training, Newell et al. (2010) have proposed a best evidence approach to multicultural training that addresses both multicultural instruction and program climate. The program/faculty-level best evidence components of this approach include the use of an integration-separate course model of multicultural training, faculty engaged in multicultural research, and the recruitment and retention of REM faculty and students. The student-level best evidence components include students gaining cultural knowledge about different groups, applying that cultural knowledge in clinical and practical experiences, and being evaluated on their multicultural knowledge and skills (Newell et al., 2010).

Given the relationship between culturally competent practice and social justice practice (Shriberg et al., 2008), the best evidence approach to multicultural training (Newell et al., 2010) has also been applied to social justice training in school psychology. For example, one model of social justice training for school psychology emphasizes institutional factors including a program mission statement focused on social justice, faculty commitment to advancing social justice, and partnerships with schools and community agencies that serve children (Moy et al., 2014). In addition, this model includes coursework focused on multicultural and social justice topics with appropriate reading and self-reflection activities, field-based experiences with diverse clients, and service-learning activities (Moy et al., 2014). Miranda, Radliff, Cooper, and Eschenbrenner (2014) developed a similar model in which they developed a foundation for social justice training through a program social justice mission statement, commitment to recruiting REM students, and faculty modeling of social justice practice. The dynamic components of their model (i.e., integration-separate course model of multicultural coursework, field-based experiences, and community-based projects) are modified based on feedback to more clearly connect to social justice practice (Miranda et al., 2014).

Based on a review of the conceptual and empirical literature, Grapin (2017) found that programs with high-quality social justice training often have a program mission indicating a commitment to social justice coupled with a focus on recruiting REM students and faculty, as well as institutional support via funding for REM students and support for multicultural research. With regard to training, these programs also address multicultural topics in

coursework, provide field-based training with diverse clients, and assess trainees' multicultural competence (Grapin, 2017). Taken together, these social justice training elements closely mirror the best-evidence approach (Newell et al., 2010) in that they address the importance of institutional climate and didactic, clinical, and experiential experiences in preparing school psychologists for social justice practice.

1.1 | Present study

Recent studies examining multicultural and social justice training in school psychology have focused on a few exemplary programs (e.g., Miranda et al., 2014; Rogers, 2006; Rogers et al., 1998). However, it is unknown the extent to which these strategies have been broadly adopted by school psychology programs. Moreover, the last comprehensive review of multicultural training in school psychology was conducted over 25 years ago (Rogers, Ponterotto, Conoley, & Wiese, 1992). Since that time, both NASP and APA have adopted new standards for the approval/accreditation of school psychology programs. The present study sought to provide an updated overview of the state of multicultural training by examining multicultural coursework, clinical training experiences (i.e., practicum and internship), and faculty and student diversity. In addition, unlike previous studies, program climate was also examined using a formal measure.

2 | METHOD

2.1 | Participants

Participants in this study were 38 school psychology faculty members (22% response rate) listed as program coordinators in the NASP School Psychology Program Database. The participants were predominantly female (73.7%) and White (76.3%). The other racial/ethnic categories reported were Asian/Pacific Islander (5.2%), Black/African American (7.9%), and other/multiracial (10.5%). In addition, 10.5% reported being of Hispanic or Latinx origin. Ten participants (26.3%) spoke a language other than English with three of those participants reporting that they have provided bilingual school psychological services. Out of the participants, 2.6% were instructors/clinical faculty, 10.5% were assistant professors, 44.7% were associate professors, 36.8% were full professors, and 5.3% were nontenure track faculty. Most (89.5%) of the respondents have the role of program coordinator/director with the remaining respondents identifying as core faculty. Participants reported that they have been in academia for 5 to 35 years with a mean of 16.3 years (standard deviation [SD] = 8.5 years) and have been a faculty member at their current institution for 2 to 32 years with a mean of 12.8 years (SD = 7.2 years).

2.2 | Procedure

Upon obtaining IRB approval, invitations to participate in the study were sent to the program directors listed in the NASP School Psychology Database (https://apps.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/graduate-education/index.aspx). Of the 193 listed sites, 175 program coordinators' contact information was available and accurate. Invitations to participate in the study were disseminated in two waves: April to June 2018 and September to November 2018. Participants received an email at the start of the recruitment wave. Those who had not completed the measures received follow-up emails at 2 weeks and 5 weeks. Participants completed all measures via Qualtrics. To access the questionnaire, participants had to review the preamble describing the study's purpose and respond "yes" to the informed consent question.

2.3 | Measures

2.3.1 | Multicultural Environment Inventory-Revised

The Multicultural Environmental Inventory (MEI-R; Pope-Davis, Liu, Nevitt, & Toporek, 2000) is a 27-item measure that assesses an individual's perceptions of how psychology graduate programs address multicultural issues within supervision, the program climate, and research. The MEI was developed based on the six areas of multicultural training (i.e., students, faculty, practica and internships, research, and institutional commitment) that graduate programs should address to meet diversity-related requirements of APA accreditation (APA Commission on Ethnic Minority Recruitment, Retention, & Training in Psychology, 1997). In a pilot study (Pope-Davis et al., 2000), the MEI was administered to 208 counseling psychology graduate students and faculty. An exploratory factor analysis yielded four factors: Curriculum and Supervision (11 items; inclusion of multicultural issues in coursework and supervision), Climate and Comfort (11 items; sense of safety and comfort as a multicultural person in the program), Honesty in Recruitment (3 items; transparency about the multicultural environment when recruiting new students, faculty, and staff), and Multicultural Research (2 items; belief that faculty conduct or are interested in multicultural research). The overall reliability of the measure was 0.94; the subscales demonstrated strong reliability ranging from 0.83 to 0.92.

For the present study, participants rated the extent to which they believed a statement reflects their program on a Likert scale of 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*a lot*). Composite scores for the MEI subscales were created based on the mean scores of the items on the subscale. Higher scores indicated more favorable perceptions of the program's multicultural environment. Internal consistency for each composite score was examined using Cronbach's alpha. The alphas were acceptable to strong: MEI Curriculum and Supervision (.89), MEI Climate and Comfort (.77), MEI Honesty in Recruitment (.91), and MEI Research (.86).

2.3.2 | Program Coordinator Survey

The Program Coordinator Survey was comprised of two parts. The first part consisted of demographic questions and items related to participants' role in the school psychology program and past training in multicultural and diversity issues. The second part of the survey was modeled after previous surveys on multicultural training in school psychology (e.g., Rogers, 2006; Rogers et al., 1998). Participants responded to questions about the school psychology program (e.g., program philosophy, multicultural coursework and field training experiences, and number of REM students and faculty), the models used to provide multicultural training, and the diversity topics addressed in the curriculum. The list of diversity topics was based on the areas listed in the APA *Standards of Accreditation for Health Service Psychology* (APA, 2015) and the NASP *Standards for Graduate Preparation in School Psychology* (NASP, 2010). A copy of the program coordinator survey is in the Appendix.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Participant training in multicultural and diversity issues

Most participants (86.8%) received multicultural and diversity training as graduate students. Types of training reported were an entire course on multicultural/diversity issues (57.9%), discussion of multicultural/diversity issues across several courses (73.7%) or in one course (15.8%), and working with diverse clients during practicum (73.7%) and internship (76.3%). About two-thirds (63.2%) of participants participated in additional multicultural and diversity training since completing their graduate program. Postdegree training included professional association

conferences, university-sponsored workshops, teaching culture and diversity courses, working with diverse students and teachers, and reading multicultural literature.

3.2 | Program characteristics and multicultural training

Most participating programs were in urban settings (50%) and predominantly White institutions (65.8%), utilized the scientist-practitioner model of training (57.9%), and had mission or vision statements related to diversity (76.3%). Additional information about program characteristics, including student and faculty diversity, is provided in Table 1. On average, programs had 34.6% REM students (range: 6.3–97.1%) and 27.2% REM faculty (range: 0–100%). Thirteen programs (34.2%) reported that they did not have any REM faculty.

With regard to multicultural training, all programs reported using at least one training model with 44.7% reported using two models, 15.8% using three models, and 5.3% using all four models. The number of multicultural/

TABLE 1 Program characteristics

Characteristic	(N = 38)
Location, n (%)	
Rural	11 (28.9)
Suburban	8 (21.1)
Urban	19 (50.0)
Geographic region, n (%)	
Central	8 (21.1)
Northeast	9 (23.7)
Southeast	10 (26.3)
West	11 (28.9)
Type of college/university, n (%)	
Predominantly White Institution	25 (65.8)
Historically Black College/University	1 (2.6)
Hispanic Serving Institution	9 (23.7)
Asian American and Pacific Islander Serving Institution	3 (7.9)
Programs by terminal degree type, n (%)	
Masters	12 (31.6)
Specialist	26 (68.4)
Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study	4 (10.5)
Doctorate	11 (28.9)
Degrees offered by institution, n (%)	
Doctoral only	4 (10.5)
Masters/Specialist/CAGS only	27 (71.1)
Both Doctoral and Masters/Specialist/CAGS	7 (18.4)
Program Approval/Accreditation, n (%)	
APA	9 (23.7)
NASP Specialist Level	28 (73.7)
NASP Doctoral Level	8 (21.1)
Other	6 (15.8)
None	3 (7.9)

(Continues)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Characteristic	(N = 38)
Training philosophy/model, n (%)	
Practitioner	8 (21.1)
Pragmatic	1 (2.6)
Scholar-Practitioner	3 (7.9)
Scientist-Practitioner	22 (57.9)
Scientist-Practitioner-Scholar	3 (7.9)
Other	1 (2.6)
Diversity mission/vision statement, n (%)	
No	9 (23.7)
Yes	29 (76.3)
Multicultural training models used, n (%)	
Area of concentration	10 (26.3)
Integration	35 (92.1)
Interdisciplinary	2 (5.3)
Separate course	26 (68.4)
Student enrollment, M (SD)	43.4 (31.7)
REM student enrollment, M (SD)	17.1 (20.8)
Total faculty, M (SD)	4.0 (1.3)
Total REM faculty, M (SD)	1.1 (1.0)

Note: States included in each geographic region: Central (IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, OK, SD, and WI), Northeast (CT, DE, DC, ME, MD, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, PR, RI, and VT), Southeast (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, TX, VA, and WV), and West (AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NV, NM, OR, UT, WA, and WY). Student enrollment numbers include students currently on internship.
Abbreviations: APA, American Psychological Association; CAGS, Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study; NASP, National Association of School Psychologists; M, mean; REM, racial and ethnic minoritized; SD, standard deviation.

diversity courses required by programs was 0–9 courses with over half of the programs (55.3%) requiring one course. Most programs offered their multicultural/diversity courses within the school psychology program (76.3%). In terms of areas of diversity addressed, most programs addressed ethnicity (97.4%), gender (97.4%), language (97.4%), sexual orientation (94.7%), disability (92.1%), race (92.1%), gender identity (86.8%), and socioeconomic status (81.6%). Less frequently addressed were age (68.4%), national origin (65.8%), and religion (57.9%). Almost all programs (97.4%) noted that their students work with diverse clients during practicum and internship.

3.3 | Recruitment and retention strategies

When asked about specific strategies used to recruit and retain REM students, 60.5% of programs reported specific recruitment strategies and 50% had specific retention strategies. Recruitment strategies used include targeted recruitment at minority-serving institutions, fellowships designated for REM applicants, and highlighting faculty conducting multicultural research and training opportunities with culturally and linguistically diverse clients. The retention strategies reported include mentoring programs in which newly admitted REM graduate students are paired with other REM graduate students to help build community and belongingness, research mentoring opportunities with faculty who conduct multicultural research, connecting students with REM psychologists in the community, and linking students with professional opportunities related to race/ethnicity.

3.4 | Perceived multicultural program environment

Participants completed the MEI to assess their perceptions of the multicultural program environment. Means and standard deviations for the subscales were as follows: MEI Curriculum ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 0.71$), MEI Climate ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.44$), MEI Recruitment ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.73$), and MEI Research ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.31$). Mean scores by group are presented in Table 2 and correlations among the study variables are presented in Table 3.

3.4.1 | Subgroup differences

A series of Kruskal–Wallis H tests were conducted to examine group differences on the MEI subscales by geographic region, degrees offered by the institution, program location, and number of multicultural training models used. For each group variable, Levene's test for equality of variances was nonsignificant indicating homogeneity of variance.

With respect to MEI Curriculum, there were no differences in group scores by geographic region [$\chi^2(3) = 1.95$, $p = .583$], degrees offered by institution [$\chi^2(2) = 3.49$, $p = .175$], program location [$\chi^2(2) = 1.65$, $p = .438$], and number of multicultural models used [$\chi^2(3) = 7.55$, $p = .056$]. With respect to MEI Climate, there were no differences in group scores by geographic region [$\chi^2(3) = 4.63$, $p = .201$], degrees offered by institution [$\chi^2(2) = 2.31$, $p = .316$], program location [$\chi^2(2) = 4.30$, $p = .117$], and number of multicultural models used [$\chi^2(3) = 1.72$, $p = .633$]. With

TABLE 2 Mean subscale score by group

Group	MEI Curriculum		MEI Climate		MEI Recruitment		MEI Research	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Total sample	3.73	0.71	4.14	0.44	4.23	0.73	3.43	1.31
Program location								
Rural	3.72	0.60	4.01	0.20	4.43	0.50	3.20	1.43
Suburban	3.45	0.87	4.06	0.47	4.04	0.88	2.63	1.13
Urban	3.87	0.70	4.25	0.51	4.21	0.77	3.89	1.17
Geographic region								
Central	3.66	0.60	4.09	0.19	3.75	0.71	3.56	1.18
Northeast	3.96	0.67	4.35	0.40	4.56	0.53	3.56	1.51
Southeast	3.57	0.75	3.90	0.53	4.26	0.80	3.28	1.44
West	3.75	0.83	4.21	0.47	4.30	0.74	3.36	1.31
Degrees offered by institution								
Doctoral only	3.77	0.67	4.32	0.42	4.33	0.82	4.38	0.75
Masters/Specialist/CAGS only	3.62	0.70	4.08	0.44	4.16	0.71	3.15	1.33
Both Doctoral and Masters/ Specialist/CAGS	4.24	0.69	4.32	0.42	4.50	0.84	4.08	1.11
Number of training models								
One	3.44	0.82	4.16	0.41	4.13	0.81	3.31	1.28
Two	3.80	0.56	4.14	0.39	4.23	0.69	3.06	1.39
Three	4.33	0.40	4.29	0.45	4.72	0.44	4.75	0.27
Four	3.36	1.03	3.59	0.96	3.50	0.71	3.25	0.35

Abbreviations: CAGS, Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study; M, mean; MEI, Multicultural Environmental Inventory; SD, standard deviation.

TABLE 3 Intercorrelations among the measured variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. REM students, %	–														
2. REM faculty, %	.85**	–													
3. Minority serving institution	.66**	.64**	–												
4. Diversity mission	.19	.16	.40*	–											
5. Multicultural coursework	.35*	.21	.11	–.11	–										
6. Practicum/internship	.11	.17	.12	–.09	.10	–									
7. Separate course	–.25	–.17	.13	.55**	–.25	–.11	–								
8. Area of concentration	–.01	.06	.07	.33*	–.01	.10	.28	–							
9. Interdisciplinary	.01	.13	.08	.13	.01	.04	.16	.39*	–						
10. Integration	.27	.18	.01	–.16	.17	–.05	–.20	–.05	.07	–					
11. Number of training models	–.05	.03	.13	.46*	–.08	–.02	.68**	.77**	.58**	.21	–				
12. MEI Curriculum	.08	.21	.17	.21	.36*	.20	.26	.22	–.13	.13	.27	–			
13. MEI Climate	.07	.11	.09	.13	.25	.09	.02	–.05	–.30	–.07	–.12	.67**	–		
14. MEI Recruitment	.14	.16	–.03	.17	.01	.05	.15	.11	–.24	–.04	.06	.34*	.61**	–	
15. MEI Research	.07	.25	.17	.05	.33*	.25	.05	.43**	–.03	–.09	.22	.63**	.48**	.09	–

Abbreviations: MEI, Multicultural Environmental Inventory; REM, racial and ethnic minoritized.
*Significant at the .05 level (two-tailed).
**Significant at the .01 level (two-tailed).

respect to MEI Recruitment, there were no differences in group scores by geographic region [$\chi^2(3) = 5.11$, $p = .164$], degrees offered by institution [$\chi^2(2) = 1.31$, $p = .521$], program location [$\chi^2(2) = 1.19$, $p = .553$], and number of multicultural models used [$\chi^2(3) = 5.19$, $p = .159$]. With respect to MEI Research, there were no differences in group scores by geographic region [$\chi^2(3) = 0.39$, $p = .943$] and degrees offered by institution [$\chi^2(2) = 4.86$, $p = .088$]. There were differences by program location [$\chi^2(2) = 6.03$, $p = .049$], with a mean rank MEI Research score of 22.87 for urban area, 17.10 for rural area, and 12.19 for suburban area; however, follow-up Dunn's pairwise tests did not indicate statistically significant differences between groups. There were also differences in MEI research scores by number of multicultural models used [$\chi^2(3) = 8.06$, $p = .045$], with a mean rank MEI Research score of 30.25 for three models used, 17.73 for one model used, 16.19 for two models used, and 16.00 for four models used. Based on Dunn's pairwise tests, there was a significant difference between programs using three models and programs using two models ($p = .037$, adjusted using the Bonferroni correction). However, this result should be interpreted with caution given that there were less than five responses in the three models used and four models used subgroups (McDonald, 2009).

4 | DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which programs offered multicultural training consistent with the best practices described in previous research and to explore the impact of program characteristics and multicultural training on faculty perceptions of their program's multicultural environment. Consistent with the best evidence approach, many programs endorsed an integration-separate course model with accompanying clinical training experiences and addressed a broad range of diversity topics. While this is encouraging, the significant variability in faculty's postdoctoral training in multicultural school psychology likely affects how effectively faculty integrate and teach multicultural content in core school psychology courses. For an integration model to be successful, faculty must be both knowledgeable in their subject area and have the multicultural competence to teach the subject from a multicultural perspective (Morgan Consoli & Marin, 2016; Newell et al., 2010). As such, it is incumbent upon faculty to engage in continuous professional development in multicultural school psychology.

With regard to recruitment and retention of REM students, programs were more likely to have specific recruitment strategies than retention strategies. Some programs noted that specific strategies were not needed because the program was in a diverse city; other programs responded about general support for all students. This use of generic recruitment and retention strategies is inconsistent with the best-evidence approach to multicultural training (Newell et al., 2010). The literature on diversifying psychology documents the importance of intentional recruitment and retention in ensuring that REM students enter and complete graduate programs and highlights effective strategies (e.g., Maton, Kohout, Wicherski, Leary, & Vinokurov, 2006; Rogers & Molina, 2006). The lack of specificity in many of the programs' REM recruitment and retention strategies suggests that faculty may be unfamiliar with the literature on this topic or may underappreciate the unique challenges REM students often encounter.

There were several interesting associations among program characteristics, student and faculty diversity, and multicultural training. Consistent with previous research (e.g., Bernal et al., 1999; Proctor & Truscott, 2013), the significant, positive relationships between the percentage of REM students and REM faculty and the percentage of REM students with number of required multicultural courses suggest that programs with diverse faculty and that provide access to multicultural training are more likely to attract diverse students. These same trends were found in school psychology programs with exemplary multicultural training (Rogers, 2006; Rogers et al., 1998). Previous studies have noted that the availability of diversity coursework, clinical training with diverse clients, and oppor-tunities to engage in multicultural research are salient to prospective REM school psychology students (Newell et al., 2010; Smith, Blake, & Graves, 2013). Similarly, minority-serving institution (MSI) status was positively

associated with student and faculty diversity. MSIs were founded to serve REM students and have diversity embedded in their missions. These institutions also have targeted recruitment and retention strategies for REM students and typically embed issues of diversity and equity into coursework (Gasman, Castro Samayoa, & Ginsburg, 2016). This makes MSIs an attractive option for both REM students and faculty. Relatedly, programs with articulated diversity missions were likely to demonstrate their commitment to diversity through their multicultural training. These programs were more likely to use multiple multicultural training models, particularly the separate course and area of concentration models.

On the MEI, faculty generally rated their program's multicultural environment favorably; however, programs reported the lowest scores on MEI Curriculum and MEI Research. Somewhat surprisingly, there was no difference in MEI scores by degrees offered by the institution; however, there were differences in MEI Research scores by number of multicultural training models. Multicultural coursework was positively associated with MEI Curriculum and MEI Research scores. In addition, use of an area of concentration model was associated with higher MEI Research scores. The positive contribution of coursework is not surprising. If a program offers multiple multi-cultural courses, as well as coursework and clinical training experiences focused on a specific aspect of diversity (i.e., area of concentration model), it is highly likely that the program has faculty who conduct research focused on minoritized populations and multicultural issues. Faculty with expertise and professional interest in multicultural school psychology often contribute to the teaching of diversity content and conduct research on multicultural issues (Zhou et al., 2004).

4.1 | Implications and future directions

This study has implications for school psychology graduate programs. First, given the variability in faculty's mul-ticultural training, there is likely a need for quality assurance and best practice guidelines for teaching multicultural school psychology to ensure sufficient depth and breadth of diversity topics across the program curriculum. Previous studies have found that faculty often overestimate the time spent addressing multicultural content in coursework or may not address these topics to the extent students would like (Beer, Spanierman, Greene & Todd, 2012; Constantine, Ladany, Inman, & Ponterotto, 1996; Rogers, 2006). School psychology programs should support the faculty's professional development in multicultural school psychology so that they are competent to teach this content.

In addition, this training can enhance the faculty's capacity to support students from diverse backgrounds. Faculty's increased multicultural competence will help programs be more intentional in their efforts to recruit and retain REM students (Koch et al., 2018; Proctor & Truscott, 2012). The lack of racial and ethnic diversity in the profession has been a longstanding issue; graduate programs play an important role in making the profession more diverse. Most efforts to increase student diversity have focused on recruitment (Proctor, Nasir, Wilson, Li, & Castrillon, 2018); however, it is a disservice to REM students to focus on recruitment without addressing the factors that lead to attrition. REM students are more likely than their White counterparts to experience racial microaggressions from faculty, supervisors, and peers with these experiences of microaggressions negatively im-pacting REM students' sense of belongingness in the program (Clark, Mercer, Zeigler-Hill, & Dufrene, 2012). Poor, or nonexistent, relationships with faculty and advisors and difficulties socially integrating with cohort peers are factors that contribute to REM student attrition (Proctor & Truscott, 2012). Positive and supportive relationships with faculty are critical to retaining students but especially those from minoritized backgrounds. Faculty must be proactive in initiating these relationships with REM students and demonstrating cultural awareness and sensitivity in doing so (Proctor et al., 2018). In addition to providing training to teach multicultural content, program and institutional efforts to promote diversity should also include mechanisms for building faculty's capacity for working with students of diverse backgrounds (Mena & Rogers, 2017; Slay, Reyes, & Posselt, 2019). The NASP (2016) position statement *Recruitment and Retention of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse School Psychologists in Graduate*

Education Programs highlights several recruitment and retention strategies described in the literature. These include partnering with MSIs to develop a student pipeline (Proctor & Truscott, 2013; Rogers & Molina, 2006); providing additional financial support to REM students (Chandler, 2011; Grapin, Bocanegra, Green, Lee, & Jaafar, 2016; Proctor & Truscott, 2013); and providing student support groups and peer mentoring programs for REM students to share information with each other and provide social support (Rogers, 2006; Rogers et al., 1998).

Finally, and related to the first two points, this study highlights the important role REM faculty play in attracting diverse students to school psychology programs and increasing access to multicultural coursework and research opportunities. The presence of REM faculty sends the message that the university and graduate program are committed to diversity and inclusion (Finkelstein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016; Grapin et al., 2016). In addition, REM faculty promote the achievement of REM students by making them feel more welcome and promoting their identity as psychologists, serving as role models and mentors, and facilitating access to social and professional networks (Clark et al., 2012; Lott & Rogers, 2011). Thus, as programs seek to diversify their student populations, they should also be intentional about recruiting and retaining REM faculty. The strategies proposed to recruit and retain REM faculty are very similar to those suggested to recruit and retain REM graduate students. Specifically, suggestions to recruit and retain faculty include mentoring networks, research support, an inclusive institutional climate, and policies supportive of diverse faculty (Harte et al., 2009; Stanley, 2006; Turner, González, & Wood, 2008). In addition, programs should support REM faculty by recognizing their involvement in diversity initiatives and REM student recruitment and retention efforts in tenure and promotion criteria (Grapin et al., 2016).

The topic of multicultural training is an important one and merits additional attention and research. While this study provides important insight into the status of multicultural training in school psychology, there are some limitations. Participation in this study was limited to those listed as program coordinators. Future studies should survey program faculty and students as they may have different perceptions of the program's multicultural environment. In addition, the low response rate limits the generalizability of these findings to other school psychology programs. Moreover, there may have been a self-selection bias in participants. Those who responded may be more interested in multicultural training compared to other program directors. The overrepresentation of programs in urban settings and housed in MSIs in the sample suggest that this may have been the case. Future studies may combine self-report data from measures such as the MEI with information from program websites (e.g., mission statement, program schemes, and course syllabi) and the NASP Program Database (e.g., student and faculty diversity and institution type) to obtain a more comprehensive view of multicultural training across programs.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors declare that there are no conflict of interests.

ORCID

Celeste M. Malone http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5803-5001

REFERENCES

American Psychological Association. (2015). *Standards of accreditation for health service psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/about/policies/standards-of-accreditation.pdf

American Psychological Association Commission on Ethnic Minority Recruitment, Retention, and Training in Psychology (1997). *Diversity and accreditation*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Beer, A. M., Spanierman, L. B., Greene, J. C., & Todd, N. R. (2012). Counseling psychology trainees' perceptions of training and commitments to social justice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59*, 120–133. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026325

Bernal, M. E., Sirolli, A. A., Weisser, S. K., Ruiz, J. A., Chamberlain, V. J., & Knight, G. P. (1999). Relevance of multicultural training to students' applications to clinical psychology programs. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 5*, 43–55. https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.5.1.43

Biddanda, H., Shriberg, D., Ruecker, D., Conway, D., & Montesinos, G. (2019). Navigating the waters of social justice: Strategies from veteran school psychologists. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 23, 379–387. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-018-0187-9

Chae, M. H., Foley, P. F., & Chae, S. Y. (2006). Multicultural competence and training: An ethical responsibility. *Counseling and Clinical Psychology Journal*, 3, 71–80.

Chandler, D. R. (2011). Proactively addressing the shortage of Blacks in psychology: Highlighting the school psychology subfield. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 37, 99–127. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798409359774

Clark, C. R., Mercer, S. H., Zeigler-Hill, V., & Dufrene, B. A. (2012). Barriers to the success of ethnic minority students in school psychology graduate programs. *School Psychology Review*, 41, 176–192.

Constantine, M. G., Ladany, N., Inman, A. G., & Ponterotto, J. G. (1996). Students' perceptions of multicultural training in counseling psychology programs. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 24, 241–253. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.1996.tb00306.x

Dickson, G. L., & Jepsen, D. A. (2007). Multicultural training experiences as predictors of multicultural competencies: Students' perspectives. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 47, 76–95. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2007.tb00040.x

Dickson, G. L., Jepsen, D. A., & Barbee, P. W. (2008). Exploring the relationships among multicultural training experiences and attitudes toward diversity among counseling students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 36, 113–126. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2008.tb00075.x

Finkelstein, M. J., Conley, V. M., & Schuster, J. H. (2016). *Taking the measure of faculty diversity* (pp. 1–18). New York, NY: Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America.

Fouad, N. A. (2006). Multicultural guidelines: Implementation in an urban counseling psychology program. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 37, 6–13. https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.37.1.6

Gasman, M., Castro Samayoa, A., & Ginsburg, A. (2016). *A rich source for teachers of color and learning: minority serving institutions*. Philadelphia, PA: Penn Center for Minority Serving Institutions.

Grapin, S. L. (2017). Social justice training in school psychology: Applying principles of organizational consultation to facilitate change in graduate programs. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 27, 173–202. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2016.1217489

Grapin, S. L., Bocanegra, J. O., Green, T. D., Lee, E. T., & Jaafar, D. (2016). Increasing diversity in school psychology: Uniting the efforts of institutions, faculty, students, and practitioners. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 20, 345–355. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-016-0092-z

Harte, H. A., Gilbert, J. L., Chai, H. H., Soled, S. W., Ofori-Attah, K., & Gunn, K. (2009). Perspectives on facilitating minority faculty success in higher education. *Kentucky Journal of Excellence in College Teaching and Learning*, 7, 45–50.

Johnson, J. L., Bahr, M. W., & Navarro, V. L. (2019). School psychology and cultural competence: Room to grow? *Educational Policy*, 33, 951–976. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904817741542

Koch, J. M., Procopio, S. J., Knutson, D., Loche, R. W., III, Jayne, A., Jayne, C., & Loche, L. (2018). Counseling psychology students' perceptions of faculty multicultural competence. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 4, 140–150. https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000116

Lott, B., & Rogers, M. R. (2011). Ethnicity matters for undergraduate majors in challenges, experiences, and perceptions of psychology. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 17, 204–210. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023673

Mallott, K. M. (2010). Multicultural counselor training in a single course: Review of research. *Journal of multicultural counseling and development*, 38, 51–63. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2010.tb00113.x

Maton, K. I., Kohout, J. L., Wicherski, M., Leary, G. E., & Vinokurov, A. (2006). Minority students of color and the psychology graduate pipeline: Disquieting and encouraging trends, 1989-2003. *American Psychologist*, 61, 117–131. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.61.2.117

McDonald, J. H. (2009). *Handbook of biological statistics*. Baltimore, MD: Sparky House Publishing.

Mena, J. A., & Rogers, M. R. (2017). Factors associated with multicultural teaching competence: Social justice orientation and multicultural environment. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 11, 61–68. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000143

Miranda, A. H., Radliff, K. M., Cooper, J. M., & Eschenbrenner, C. R. (2014). Graduate student perceptions of the impact of training for social justice: Development of a training model. *Psychology in the Schools*, 51, 348–365. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21755

Morgan Consoli, M. L., & Marin, P. (2016). Teaching diversity in the graduate classroom: The instructor, the students, the classroom, or all of the above? *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 9, 143–157. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039716

Moy, G. E., Briggs, A., Shriberg, D., Furrey, K. J., Smith, P., & Tompkins, N. (2014). Developing school psychologists as agents of social justice: A qualitative analysis of student understanding across three years. *Journal of School Psychology*, 52, 323–341. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2014.03.001

National Association of School Psychologists (2010). *Standards for graduate preparation of school psychologists*. Bethesda, MD: Author.

National Association of School Psychologists (2016). Recruitment and retention of culturally and linguistically diverse school psychologists in graduate education programs *[Position statement]*. Bethesda, MD: Author.

Newell, M. L., Nastasi, B. K., Hatzichristou, C., Jones, J. M., Schanding, G. T., & Yetter, G. (2010). Evidence on multicultural training in school psychology: Recommendations for future research. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 25, 249–278. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021542

Patterson, C. A., Papa, L. A., Reveles, A. K., & Domenech Rodríguez, M. M. (2018). Undergraduate student change in cultural competence: Impact of a multicultural psychology course. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 4, 81–92. https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000108

Pope-Davis, D. B., Liu, W. M., Nevitt, J., & Toporek, R. L. (2000). The development and initial validation of the Multicultural Environmental Inventory: A preliminary investigation. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 6, 57–64. https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.6.1.57

Proctor, S. L., Nasir, A., Wilson, T., Li, K., & Castrillon, P. (2018). Retention and persistence of African-American students in school psychology programs. *Psychology in the Schools*, 55, 506–522. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22124

Proctor, S. L., & Truscott, S. D. (2012). Reasons for African American student attrition from school psychology programs. *Journal of School Psychology*, 50, 655–679. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2012.06.002

Proctor, S. L., & Truscott, S. D. (2013). Missing voices: African American school psychologists' perspectives on increasing professional diversity. *The Urban Review*, 45, 355–375. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-012-0232-3

Rogers, M. R. (2006). Exemplary multicultural training in school psychology programs. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 12, 115–133. https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.12.1.115

Rogers, M. R., Hoffman, M. A., & Wade, J. (1998). Notable multicultural training in APA-approved counseling psychology and school psychology programs. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health*, 4, 212–226. https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.4.3.212

Rogers, M. R., & Molina, L. E. (2006). Exemplary efforts in psychology to recruit and retain graduate students of color. *American Psychologist*, 61, 143–156. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.61.2.143

Rogers, M. R., Ponterotto, J. G., Conoley, J. C., & Wiese, M. J. (1992). Multicultural training in school psychology: A national survey. *School Psychology Review*, 21(4), 603–616.

Ryan, C. (2013). *Language use in the United States: 2011*. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2013/acs/acs-22.html

Shriberg, D., Bonner, M., Sarr, B. J., Walker, A. M., Hyland, M., & Chester, C. (2008). Social justice through a school psychology lens: Definition and applications. *School Psychology Review*, 37, 453–468.

Slay, K. E., Reyes, K. A., & Posselt, J. R. (2019). Bait and switch: Representation, climate, and tensions of diversity work in graduate education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 42, 255–286. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2019.0052

Smith, L., Blake, J., & Graves, S. L. (2013). School psychology programs' efforts to recruit culturally diverse students. *Trainers' Forum*, 32, 4–23.

Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly White colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43, 701–736. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043004701

Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139–168.

Vega, D., Tabbah, R., & Monserrate, M. (2018). Multicultural school psychology training: An examination of students' self-reported course outcomes. *Psychology in the Schools*, 55, 449–463. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22123

Vespa, J., Armstrong, D. M., & Medina, L. (2018). *Demographic turning points for the United States: Population projections for 2020 to 2060* (Report No. P25-1144). Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, US Census Bureau.

Zhou, Z., Bray, M. A., Kehle, T. J., Theodore, L. A., Clark, E., & Jenson, W. R. (2004). Achieving ethnic minority parity in school psychology. *Psychology in the Schools*, 41, 443–450. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.10187

APPENDIX: PROGRAM COORDINATOR SURVEY

Participant Information

1. I have read the information about the study and agree to participate
   a. Yes
   b. No
2. How do you identify yourself?
   a. Female
   b. Male
   c. Transgender
   d. Do not identify as female, male, or transgender
   e. Other – Write In (required)
3. Are you of Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish origin?
   a. Yes
   b. No
4. What is your race/ethnicity? Select all that apply?
   a. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   b. Asian or Pacific Islander
   c. Black and/or African American
   d. Middle Eastern and/or North African
   e. Native Hawaiian and/or Other Pacific Islander
   f. White and/or Caucasian
   g. Other – Write In (required)
5. Do you speak any language other than English?
   a. Yes
   b. No
6. What language(s) do you speak? (routed to this question if responded yes to question 5)
7. Have you ever provided school psychological services in a language other than English (routed to this question if responded yes to question 5)
   a. Yes
   b. No
8. What is your academic rank?
   a. Adjunct Professor
   b. Instructor/Clinical Faculty
   c. Assistant Professor
   d. Associate Professor
   e. Full Professor
   f. Non-Tenure Track Faculty
9. What is your role in the school psychology program?
   a. Program Coordinator/Director
   b. Field Experience/Practicum/Internship Coordinator
   c. Core Faculty
   d. None of the above

10. How long have you been in academia?

11. How long have you held a faculty position at your current institution?

12. What training in multicultural/diversity issues did you have in your school psychology training program? Select all that apply.

    a. Entire course specifically on multicultural/diversity issues

    b. Discussion of multicultural/diversity issues across several courses

    c. Discussion of multicultural/diversity issues in one course

    d. Working with diverse clients during practicum

    e. Working with diverse clients on internship

    f. No multicultural/diversity training

13. Describe any training you have had in multicultural/diversity issues post-degree.

Program Information

14. In what state is your school psychology program located?

15. How would you describe the area in which the school psychology program is located?

    a. Rural

    b. Suburban

    c. Urban

16. What best describes the college/university in which your school psychology program is located?

    a. Predominantly White Institution (PWI)

    b. Historically Black College or University (HBCU)

    c. Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI)

    d. Tribal College or University (TCU)

    e. Asian American and Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AAPISI)

17. What degree types does your school psychology program offer? Select all that apply.

    a. Masters

    b. Specialist or equivalent

    c. Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study (CAGS) or equivalent

    d. Doctoral

18. What professional association accredits or approve your school psychology program? Select all that apply.

    a. American Psychological Association – Doctoral Level

    b. National Association of School Psychologists – Non-Doctoral/Specialist Level

    c. National Association of School Psychologists – Doctoral Level

    d. None

    e. Other – Write In (required)

19. What is the philosophy/model of your school psychology program?

    a. Clinical Science

    b. Practitioner

    c. Pragmatic

    d. Scholar-Practitioner (Vail Model)

    e. Scientist-Practitioner (Boulder Model)

    f. Scientist-Scholar-Practitioner

    g. Other – Write In (required)

20. How many students are currently enrolled in the school psychology program? Note the number of students at each degree level.
    a. Masters
    b. Specialist or equivalent
    c. CAGS or equivalent
    d. Doctoral

21. How many current students identify as racial/ethnic minority? Note the number of students at each degree level.
    a. Masters
    b. Specialist or equivalent
    c. CAGS or equivalent
    d. Doctoral

22. How many core faculty are in the school psychology program?

23. How many core faculty identify as racial/ethnic minority?

24. What type of training model does your program use to address multicultural and/or diversity issues? Check all that apply.
    a. Separate course
    b. Area of concentration
    c. Interdisciplinary
    d. Integration

25. How many <u>required</u> courses in the program have a primary focus on multicultural and/or diversity issues in education or school psychology?

26. In which area are your courses focused on multicultural/diversity courses offered?
    a. School psychology
    b. In the department, not under school psychology
    c. Outside of the department, outside of school psychology

27. What aspects of diversity are addressed in your school psychology program coursework? Select all that apply.
    a. Age
    b. Disability
    c. Ethnicity
    d. Gender
    e. Gender identity
    f. Language
    g. National origin
    h. Race
    i. Religion
    j. Sexual orientation
    k. Social economic status
    l. Other – Write In (required)

28. Do students in your program work with diverse clients during practicum?
    a. Yes
    b. No

29. Do students in your program work with diverse clients during internship?
    a. Yes
    b. No

30. Does your program have a mission and/or vision statement?
    a. Yes
    b. No

31. Does your program mission and/or vision statement address diversity?
    a. Yes
    b. No

32. Describe any specific strategies used to recruit racial/ethnic minority students.

33. Describe any specific strategies used to retain racial/ethnic minority students.