

SAMPLE: TEST ADMINISTRATION
Formal Observation Form
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST

Name: Ima Student
Observer: Dr. Shirley Woika
Location: Conference Room in Counseling Office
Local Area High School – South

Date: November 12, 2013
Time: 10:00 – 10:50 a.m.

Activity Observed: Ima administered the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test – IV to a student as part of an initial evaluation. The student was a 16 year old male with Down Syndrome who has been homeschooled to this point in his educational career.

Observations: Ima was already engaged in the assessment process when this observer entered the room. Ima had arranged the small room so that the student faced away from the door and so that the observer was out of the student’s direct line of sight. Ima had testing materials organized. She properly placed manipulatives and the testing easel on the table.

Ima noticed that the student tended to lower his head and did not have good eye contact. She proceeded many items with “ready?” and made sure that the student was looking before presenting the item.

Ima frequently reinforced the student for his effort. Sample praise statements included:
Alright. You’re working really hard.
These things get harder as we go on, but you’re really working hard, so thank you.
You’re working really hard, so now we’re going to do something a little bit different.
Good effort on that one. We’re doing something a little different again.
Alright. You worked really hard on that.

The student experienced difficulty with many of the items presented. He had difficulty understanding some of the tasks. Ima did a good job of sticking to standard administration and correction procedures. At one point, the student attempted to look over a screen that was used to block items from his sight. She smiled at him and said, “Can’t look”. He complied. Ima also had a nice pace of administration. She spoke clearly and slowly. When it seemed clear that the student could not complete an item, she would ask questions like, “Is that your answer or are you still working?” He typically responded to these two part questions with a statement such as “alright”. Then Ima would have to ask additional questions in order to clarify his response. As an example, she initially asked, “Will you tell me when you need a break?” When he did not respond, she asked, “Do you want to take a break or not?” He responded, “Yes”. Ima followed up with, “Yes, what? Should we take a break?” Ima then just announced that they would take a short break.

Although the student's articulation was pretty good, he sometimes said words that Ima could not decipher. She politely asked him to repeat his responses. For example, she said, "Can you say that again? I didn't hear you." He was responsive to her prompts to repeat.

Areas of Strength: The administration of the Binet was without error. Ima held to standardized administration procedures and implemented error correction procedures correctly. She appropriately reinforced the student for his effort and refrained from providing feedback regarding the accuracy of his responses. When she had difficulty understanding his responses, she asked the student to repeat himself.

Suggestions for Improvement: Ima indicated that the student tends to respond in the affirmative to any yes/no questions posed. Therefore, she sought to avoid asking yes/no questions. Instead, she asked questions in two parts in order to encourage the student to state a preference. The student inappropriately responded in the affirmative to these two part questions which resulted in her asking additional questions to ascertain what he meant by his response. She needs to consider other options for communication with students like this. If a student's communication skills are limited in that he/she cannot answer yes/no questions, he/she typically has even more difficulty with more sophisticated forms of questions. Sometimes students with limited verbal skills use systems such as the Picture Exchange Communication System in order to indicate a preference by choosing a picture card. Consulting with teachers and/or speech therapists who work with the student regularly often provides some useful strategies to enhance communication.

Comments/Concerns from student and/or field supervisor: Ima is enjoying her work in the field. The high school placement presents a range of experiences, and she is learning much about the traditional role of the school psychologist. Dr. Psychologist, field supervisor, noted that Ima is completing tasks as requested. She engages in discussion of relevant issues, but she is just starting to put all of the pieces together. He is pleased with Ima's performance in the school setting, and he has no concerns about her progress at present.

SAMPLE: CONFIDENTIALITY
Formal Observation Form
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST

Name: Ima Student

Date: March 27, 2014

Observer: Dr. Shirley Woika

Time: 1:00 – 2:00 p.m.

Location: School Psychologist's Office at Nearby Middle School

Activity Observed: Ima established rapport and administered some screening instruments to a middle school female who was experiencing academic difficulties. She also conducted an informal interview.

Observations: Ima was introduced to the student by Dr. Psychologist in the reception area outside of the school psychologist's office. Handshakes were exchanged, and Ima said, "C'mon over" while offering the student a seat in the office.

Ima asked the student how things were going and the student responded, "Today went well." Ima followed up by asking why things went well. The student indicated that she had gotten enough sleep the night before. Ima asked the student if she knew why she had been called to the office. The student reported that she did not know the reason. Ima stated that there were concerns about the student's grades and talked briefly about the types of activities she would be completing. She mentioned this observer briefly, assuring the student that the observer was present to observe the school psychology student, not her. Ima also instructed the student to indicate if she needed a break and asked if she had any questions. Ima then began to organize her testing materials. With a cue from this observer, Ima reviewed confidentiality with the student. The student demonstrated a good understanding of the limits of confidentiality.

Ima began testing with the K-BIT 2, a brief measure of cognitive ability. Administration was straight forward, and there were no errors. Ima encouraged the student to guess when she did not know an answer. She did not reinforce the student for effort. When the student said, "I don't know these words", Ima responded with, "Try you best." At the end of the first subtest, Ima checked in with the student by saying, "How you feeling?" The student responded, "Kinda dumb." Ima then stated, "I should have said this before. This is for people 4 to adult." She proceeded to provide reassurance that the student was not expected to know all answers.

Ima presented the second subtest which involved picture analogies. When the student said she did not know an answer, Ima asked for a guess and the student offered one. When the student said, "I'm not seeing a pattern", Ima said, "Give it your best shot." The student then offered a guess. At the end of the second subtest, Ima again asked, "How you doing?" The student responded, "I don't know". Ima then said, "You're working very hard for me, and I appreciate that."

Ima posed a few interview questions before beginning the next subtest. She asked how the student was doing in school, and the student indicated that she gets frustrated

easily and gives up. Ima then moved on to a subtest involving riddles. As she turned over the page to begin the subtest, she asked, "You doin' okay?" The student responded with "yeah". The student asked what a word meant from a test item, and Ima indicated that she could not tell her the word, but she could repeat the item. She proceeded to repeat the item. At the end of the subtest, the student reported that she was feeling "not smart". Ima replied, "Don't worry about that. You're doing great."

Ima interjected a few more interview questions. The student reported that she gets mad when she can't figure things out, but likes seeing her friends in school and enjoys language arts class. She reported that she is very upset about her grades and has cried about them. She noted that she used to be on the honor roll, and Ima asked what has changed since then. The student reported that the family moved from Anytown to Someplace where she is closer to her friends. She noted that she spends more time socializing and described herself as "overly social".

Ima then moved on to the WIAT-II. She gave an abbreviated battery as a screener. The battery consisted of Word Reading, Calculation and Spelling. On Word Reading, the student read very quickly. At the end of the subtest, Ima said, "Good work". The student responded, "Thank you." The student asked, "Was that bad?" Ima responded, "You're doing fine. You're working hard and doing your best. That's all that matters."

Ima moved on to administer the Numerical Operations subtest. Scrap paper was not readily available, but she quickly located a small lined tablet which she gave to the student to use. Although the stimulus book simply states that "blank paper" is to be provided, typically students are provided with a standard 8.5 x 11 sheet of unlined paper. The student commented that her pencil did not have an eraser, and Ima correctly noted that she was not permitted to have one for this subtest. The student worked at these problems for several minutes. She apparently did not reach a ceiling as Ima prompted her to try a few more. The student responded that she did not know how to do problems 47 or 48, but it took her a while to decide if she knew how to do the problems or not.

At 2:00, this observer exited as Ima continued with the Numerical Operations subtest.

Areas of Strength: Although the KBIT-2 was unfamiliar to Ima, she administered it without error. The administration of the WIAT-2 was also without error. Between items and subtests, she was able to conversationally interview the student about her current functioning in the school setting. She followed up with more specific questions as appropriate.

Suggestions for Improvement: Ima neglected to inform the student of the limits of confidentiality at the start of the session until cued by this observer. Although the purpose of her work with the student was not likely to result in a disclosure of abuse, one can never be sure where a conversation with a student will lead. Thus, it is always important to clarify the relationship at the start. Once cued, Ima did a fine job of

presenting these issues to the student, and the student understood the concept of confidentiality.

At the end of the first subtest, Ima clarified that some tasks would be easy while others would be difficult. However, the student was already making self-deprecating remarks by this point. Sharing this before beginning testing is advisable. Additionally, it is especially important to reinforce a student who is feeling “dumb” for effort. After recognizing that the student was feeling badly about her performance on the first subtest, Ima adjusted her student feedback and provided more praise for effort.

Comments/Concerns from student and/or field supervisor: Ima is enjoying her work in the field. The middle school population presents a different experience than she had last semester in an elementary setting. Additionally, her role has changed dramatically from an intervention implementer.

Dr. Psychologist, school psychologist at Nearby Middle School, indicated that she has no concerns regarding Ima’s performance in the school setting. She has been pleased with Ima’s functioning throughout the practicum experience.

SAMPLE: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS
Formal Observation Form
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST

Name: Ima Student

Date: November 7, 2013

Observer: Dr. Shirley Woika

Time: 10:00 – 11:20 a.m.

Location: Conference Room – Local Middle School

Activity Observed: Ima had administered a cognitive assessment to a learning disabled student who was due for a routine reevaluation. Ima participated in the team meeting, and she presented the results of the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Ability.

Observations: The meeting began at 10:07 with introductions. Susan Psychologist, the district's school psychologist, introduced Ima, and Ima elaborated on that introduction by indicating her involvement with the student. The learning support teacher lead the group in a review of the draft of the report.

At 10:21, Ima began her presentation of results. She began by stating that it was a pleasure to work with the student and noted his cooperativeness and hard work during the assessment sessions. She then prefaced the results with some information regarding classification of scores. She defined the range of standard scores from 90 to 109 as the average range, and added that 68% of the population falls within this range. She went on to describe the below average, above average, moderately below average, moderately above average and significantly below average ranges. She did not define the significantly above average range; however, none of this student's scores fell within that range. She then went on to state that no test score is perfectly accurate and that some factors can cause slight variations in scores. She described the concept of a range around an obtained score without specifically using terms like "confidence interval".

As she moved into the student's specific scores, Ima presented the name of each subtest and a brief (1-2 sentence) description of the task involved before indicating the score. She provided standard scores and percentile ranks. She described phonemic awareness skills as a relative strength and added that "he did pretty well".

At 10:31, Ima noted that she had "covered quite a lot", and moved into a presentation of the GIA score. She briefly noted that the verbal ability score should be given greater weight in considering the student's level of cognitive functioning. She then checked with others in attendance to see if there were any questions. There was no response from the group. Susan then interpreted the information in layman's terms for the group, noting that the results were consistent with past evaluations.

Areas of Strength: Ima began her presentation of results with positive statements about the student. So often, parents are brought into the school setting to hear about their child's difficulties, and beginning on a positive note is important in setting the tone

of the meeting. Ima also demonstrated excellent verbal and nonverbal communication skills. She spoke clearly and at an appropriate rate. She did not use fillers like “um” or “okay”. She looked around at the group members as she spoke (although they were typically looking at the draft of the report). Beyond her communication skills, she presented an accurate clinical picture of the obtained scores. She typically used clinically descriptive terms like “below average” and “average” instead of more subjective terms such as “pretty well” or “okay”. She presented complex concepts such as confidence intervals in simple terms that were meaningful to the meeting participants. Additionally, Ima presented cognitive results in about 10 minutes. Given that most meetings are limited in time to about 45 minutes, she did a nice job of streamlining her presentation to allow others the opportunity to share information with the team.

Suggestions for Improvement: Ima indicated that the standard score range from 90-109 constitutes the average range and that 68% of the population falls within this range. Actually, 68% of the population falls within one standard deviation of the mean or within the standard score range of 85-115. This was the only inaccuracy noted in her presentation of results, but it should be corrected in future presentations. It is important to note a distinction between the general average range (within one standard deviation of the mean) and the Average (with a capital A) range (defined by many test publishers as the standard score range from 90-109). Additionally, she talked about percentile ranks but did not provide information about how to interpret them. Because she presented a number of score ranges, she might consider using a visual chart of scores with corresponding ranges or a normal curve to provide a reference for score interpretation.

Ima has demonstrated skill at presenting a clinical interpretation of results. She is ready to go to the next step and interpret this information in light of other obtained results in a more user friendly format.

Comments/Concerns from student and/or field supervisor: Ima indicated that she has had the opportunity to engage in a variety of activities within her current field placement. Susan indicated that she has been very pleased with Ima’s performance. As a matter of fact, Susan noted that she would welcome the opportunity for Ima to continue with her for the entirety of the school year. In regards to this specific observation, Susan felt that Ima did an excellent job in presenting results. She is ready to allow Ima the opportunity to provide more interpretation of results at future meetings. At present, there are no concerns regarding Ima’s performance in the field.

SAMPLE: RtII TIER II IMPLEMENTATION
Formal Observation Form
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST

Name: Ima Student
Observer: Dr. Shirley Woika
Location: Classroom in Local Elementary School

Date: December 3, 2013
Time: 9:00 – 9:40 a.m.

Activity Observed: Ima worked with three small groups of students to deliver a reading intervention program to each group for about 12 minutes per group. She was interested in gaining information specific to the effectiveness of individualized directives and her use of praise. These areas were the focus of the observation.

Observations: Prior to the start of the first group, Mrs. Titleservices reviewed behavioral expectations for both groups. This set the stage for compliance. As Ima's students took their seats, she greeted them and asked how a student was feeling who had been absent due to illness. She moved right into the lesson and began with "popcorn" reading where one student reads a page aloud then quickly calls on another student to read the next page. Ima chose the student who had been absent to read first. Her next directives included:

Can you read that page again, honey?
Follow along in the book, okay?
Look up here for a second, okay?

Throughout the lesson, each individual directive was coded with a /. If the student complied, the slash was crossed to form an X. If another individual directive was needed, another / would be recorded. Below are the results for the first, second, and third groups:

Group #1	Group #2	Group #3	
A (female):	M (female): XX//X	J (male):	XXX/X
C (male): X	C (male): X///XX/X	R (female):	X (delayed)
S (male): /X	D (male): X/XXXX/XX	S (female):	
	L (female): //X	S (female):	//X

Overall, the first group required the fewest individual directives (3). One was responded to immediately, while the other required two individual directives before the student complied. For the second group, 25 individual directives were delivered with immediate compliance for 9 of the directives. Two directives were needed for compliance in three instances, three directives for compliance in two other instances, and four directives were needed to gain compliance in one instance. For the third group, one student did comply with one directive, but her response was delayed by about 10 seconds. Immediate compliance with one directive occurred three times, two prompts were needed for compliance in one instance, and three prompts were needed before

compliance was attained in another instance. In all, there were 9 individual directives delivered in the third group.

In looking at the chart, several observations can be made. For example, the smallest group required the least redirection. The 5 male students accounted for 25 redirections for an average of 5 redirections per male. The 6 female students accounted for 12 redirections for an average of 2 redirections per female. The most redirections were used in the largest group (4 members) with the greater proportion of males (50%) between the two 4-member groups.

Praise statements were also recorded for the first group. A total of 39 praise statements were made in approximately 12 minutes for a rate of praise of about 3.25 statements per minute. This is a high rate of praise. Ima's praise statements were varied and included:

Excellent.	I love it.
That's right.	Perfect.
Very good.	That's awesome.
Good job.	Good sounding out, C-.
Fabulous job.	Perfect job.
"Hat" is one!	You guys did so fantastic today.
Wow!	Fabulous today, guys.
Thank you for sitting quietly when you're done, C-.	You're right.

Ima also delivered corrective feedback. A few examples follow:

Good job. Make sure that's a lower case p. It needs to go below the line.
Excellent, C-. Make sure you use lower case letters.
Good job, S-. S-, remember your i shouldn't go above the line.
Oops. Look at your d. Which was is it supposed to go?
That's awesome, but you don't need the h after w.

Ima started her second group with the following statements:

Can you guys sit over here today?
Sit down, guys.
Sit down, C--.
D--, honey, come over here and sit down.
C--, I'm sorry. You were too loud. M-- asked quietly so she can start out.
(C-- seemed disappointed that he was not chosen to read, so Ima called on him next.
The following interchange was recorded.)

Ima: *Why don't you read this page?*
C: (No response.)
Ima: *Read this page, C--?*
C: *Refuse.*

Ima: *You refuse to? I will ask someone else.*

(Another student reads.)

Ima: *C--, why don't you move your chair into Time Out? Just for a couple of minutes until you're ready to participate. I'm not going to warn you again, okay?*

As soon as C-- is attending, Ima says, "Very good, C--."

C: *I don't know how to do that.*

Ima: (whispers to C--)

Her use of directives, praise statements, and corrective feedback was similar across all three groups.

Areas of Strength: Ima was prepared and fluent with the instructional materials. She had established procedures for distributing and collecting materials so these brief transitions went smoothly. She delivered praise statements at a high rate and provided individualized feedback to students which resulted in improved performance.

Suggestions for Improvement: Ima, on occasion, phrased directives as a question by adding tag words such as "okay" at the end of an otherwise clear directive. Although this was the exception and most directives were clearly phrased, she resorted to requests instead of directives when a student was uncooperative and refused to complete tasks. This suggested a lack of confidence in her ability to control the student's behavior, and this lack of confidence was conveyed to the student. In such situations, it is particularly important to use clear directives such as "Move your chair to Time Out now" instead of questions such as "Why don't you move your chair into Time Out? Just for a couple of minutes..." The latter sounds much more like bargaining than a clear directive.

It is not unusual for beginning professionals to regress in their assertive use of directives when confronted with a noncompliant student. Ironically, these are the situations when a clear directive delivered assertively is most important. As Ima successfully navigates more difficult situations, her skills in trying situations will improve.

A suggestion made following an earlier observation was that Ima take a minute or two at the start of each group to remind students of behavioral expectations and to set the stage for good behavior. Although Mrs. Titleservices did this for the first group, Ima did not reiterate behavioral expectations for each of her subsequent groups. Interestingly, the first group also required the fewest individual directives. This continues to be a suggestion Ima should consider implementing.

Comments/Concerns from student and/or field supervisor: Ima talked about her involvement in observations, ADHD screenings, evaluations, and consultation in addition to her experiences in the Rtl process. The on-site school psychologist, Susan Psychologist, will be completing a formal evaluation of Ima's performance in practicum within the next month. She has been very happy to have Ima available to assist with her caseload, and she has no concerns about her performance. Additionally, Mrs. Titleservices shared that Ima has done a great job with her Rtl groups.

SAMPLE: CONSULTATION
Formal Observation Form
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST

Name: Ima Student

Observer: Dr. Shirley Woika

Location: Resource Room – Local Middle School

Date: October 27, 2013

Time: 8:15 – 8:45 a.m.

Activity Observed: Ima has been providing consultative services to a learning support teacher regarding improving homework completion rates for a male student. This observation focused on a follow-up conference between Ima and the teacher.

Observations: The meeting began at 8:15. Ima defined her objectives for the conference as determining if the goals of the program had been achieved; to determine the effectiveness of the treatment plan; to make a decision regarding whether the plan should be continued, modified, or terminated; and to schedule an additional meeting or decide to terminate the consultation process.

Ima asked about the effectiveness of the reinforcement menu and whether or not homework was being completed. The teacher's responses were quite detailed and lengthy, but Ima sometimes had to ask follow up questions to obtain specific information as the teacher had the tendency to veer off topic. For example, Ima asked if the student made up his work when he was absent. The teacher responded, "He's supposed to." Ima had to ask several questions to ascertain if he actually did what he was supposed to do. She also had to clarify if comments regarding no homework meant that no homework had been assigned or that no homework was completed. The teacher also noted that the student had been absent on Thursdays in order to avoid Homework Club.

The teacher shared a chart that she has used as part of the intervention program to ensure that assignments are clearly communicated to the student and his parents. She also shared a note that had been sent home for the parents. She felt that homework completion had significantly improved after a parent conference where she had the chance to clearly articulate where assignments were located and how the parents could assist at home.

At the end of the meeting, Ima and the teacher mutually determined that the student was making progress towards his goals; however, the gains had not been in place for very long. Thus, the two agreed to continue with the plan with Ima checking in again in another week.

Areas of Strength: Ima had specific goals for the conference established prior to the conference which set a tone of professional consultation rather than that of an informal chat. She was able to structure questions to get information regarding the attainment of goals, the effectiveness of the plan, next steps, and whether or not to continue the consultation relationship. Ima maintained a professional demeanor throughout the meeting, but she was friendly and approachable. She complimented the teacher on the

development of a very detailed homework chart. Her most challenging task was to sift through a great deal of information that the teacher shared with her to pull out the specific information of interest. She also had to ask clarifying questions on several occasions, and she did so when warranted.

Suggestions for Improvement: Ima was well prepared for the conference. Because this teacher was very talkative and sometimes veered off task, Ima might have changed her questioning tactic. In most instances, interviewers ask broad questions to elicit detailed responses then follow up with more specific questions. For very talkative individuals who may need to be reigned in, questions may need to be narrowed in order to help the interviewee keep the conversation more on target. It is important that the interviewer maintain control of the interview.

Comments/Concerns from student and/or field supervisor: Ima indicated that she has had the opportunity to engage in a variety of activities within her current field placement to include record reviews, observations, testing, and attendance at meetings. Susan Psychologist, the cooperating school psychologist, indicated that she has been very pleased with Ima's performance. Ima is very quick in completing tasks. She is thorough and produces excellent written work. Susan has no concerns about Ima's performance in the field at present.

SAMPLE: CLASS PRESENTATION
Formal Observation Form
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST

Name: Ima Student

Date: December 16, 2013

Observer: Dr. Shirley Woika

Time: 9:15 – 10:45 a.m.

Location: Classroom – Nearby Elementary School

Activity Observed: Ima and the guidance counselor were presenting an activity focusing on differences to a class of elementary students. This was in response to some issues related to bullying.

Observations: Ima and the guidance counselor had met prior to the presentation to plan. Ima had prepared a script to guide the lesson. Ima began the transition by saying, “Hi, boys and girls. How was computer lab?” Then she introduced herself. The lesson began by having the two adults stand in front of the class while students listed their differences. Because Ima did not know the students’ names, she relied on her observations of students to call on them to participate. For example, she said, “How about the Notre Dame fan here” when calling on a young man wearing a Notre Dame shirt. Students were praised for their keen observations with statements like “You guys are good. You got sharp eyes. Nothing gets past you guys.”

There was an awkward transition from making comparisons between two people to the next phase of the lesson. Ima transitioned by saying “So, can you tell me something that you inherited from your parents?” Students did catch on right away to the types of responses she wanted.

Students sometimes engaged in sidebar conversations. The regular classroom teacher was in the classroom seated behind the students who were gathered in a circle in the back of the classroom. The teacher twice intervened with specific students instructing them to “shhh” or to listen.

When students were asked to put their chairs in a circle, Ima reinforced them and thanked them for compliance. She said, “You guys did that very quickly. Thank you.” Ima and the counselor then had an activity where everyone who shared some characteristic raised their hands to emphasize similarities and differences. For example, everyone who was a big brother or big sister raised their hands. When this activity was over, students called out, “Let’s do it again. Make up some more.” This suggested that they very much enjoyed the activity.

At the end of the activity, Ima praised the group for being “awesome listeners” and had the students “give yourself applause”. The students were happy to clap for themselves.

Areas of Strength: Ima appeared very comfortable in front of the group. She displayed a lot of energy and enthusiasm throughout the lesson. Her praise statements sounded genuine, and she praised student responses as well as behavior. She

presented just as competently as the more experienced counselor who worked alongside her. She took the time to specifically plan out the activities beforehand, but she was not glued to the script.

Suggestions for Improvement: The transition from the first activity to the second activity was abrupt; however, students caught on right away. I would suggest trying to segue from one topic to the next.

There were two occasions where the regular classroom teacher jumped in to correct students due to talking or not listening. As school psychologists are often guests in a teacher's classroom, it is important to note when a teacher chooses to intervene with the group. This often provides a good idea of the teacher's specific tolerance for extraneous conversation and other behaviors, and it cues the guest to the level of order that is expected in the classroom. Once a teacher steps in, follow her lead and note the expectations she has. A teacher should not have to step in a second time if the guest speaker is in control of the group.

Comments/Concerns from student and/or field supervisor: Ima has expressed that she has been very satisfied with her practicum experience in Nearby. Her field supervisor, Susan Psychologist, has shared that she is very pleased with Ima's performance in all aspects of the practicum experience. She would gladly welcome Ima back into the district for additional special practicum should the opportunity present itself. Additionally, Susan has completed a formal evaluation of Ima which is available in her practicum file.