Program Level Assessment Report on 2017-2018

PROGRAM NAME, DEGREE NAME: Clinical Mental Health Counseling (CMHC), M.S.

COLLEGE in which PROGRAM is housed: College of Education and Human Services

REPORT PREPARED by: Stephen Fortson

A. ACTIONS TAKEN TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

What actions did you take in 2017-18, based on previous assessment findings, to improve student learning in your program?
(Refer back to plans indicated in "Response to Assessment Findings" in last Assessment Report.)

The following actions were taken for 2017-18: **The graduate faculty have participated in the revision of the key assessments and created new dispositions for the CMHC program. Those measures are currently being implemented and data from these new measures should be available when the 2017-2018 annual assessment review is completed.**

B. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSED AND EXAMINED

Which Program Level Student Learning Outcomes did you assess and examine during 2017-2018? List the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes using the format of "Graduates will be able to _____."

1. Clinical mental health counseling graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of professional counseling orientation and ethical practice (F1).
2. Clinical mental health counseling graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of social and cultural diversity (F2).
3. Clinical mental health counseling graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of human growth and development (F3).
4. Clinical mental health counseling graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of career development theories, models, approaches, and strategies (F4).
5. Clinical mental health counseling graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of theories, models, approaches, and strategies for counseling and helping relationships (F5).
6. Clinical mental health counseling graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of theories, models, approaches, and strategies for group counseling and group work (F6).
7. Clinical mental health counseling graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of methods, procedures, and purposes of assessment and testing in counseling (F7).
8. Clinical mental health counseling graduates will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of research and program evaluation methods, designs, and evidence-based practices (F8).
9. Clinical mental health counseling graduates will demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to address a wide variety of circumstances within the context of clinical mental health counseling (5C).

C. METHODS FOR COLLECTING DATA

Which students were included in the assessment? (For example, all seniors completing Course X in Spring 2017, all graduating seniors, etc.) **All active clinical mental health counseling students were included in this data review. Institutional Research provided data on demographics and GPA. Qualtrics was used to survey the alumni and site supervisors/employers. Practicum and internship supervisors completed the university supervisor reports. Key assessments reviewed include: Social and Cultural Diversity, Group, Assessment and Evaluation, Ethical, legal and professional, Career development, Counseling and helping relationships, Professional dispositions, NCE exam results.**

D. ASSESSMENT MEASURES

What key assessments/assignments/student work did you examine to <u>directly</u> assess the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes listed above?   This is year 1 of the revised assessment plan. All key assessments have been identified, but not all

the assessments have sufficient data collected. The assessment measures assessed were: NCE results, the diversity assessment, the group key assessment, the assessment key, career development key assessment, human growth and development key assessment, site supervisor evaluations of interns.

What, if any, <u>indirect</u> assessments (e.g. exit survey, pre-service teacher survey, alumni survey, focus groups, etc.) did you use to indirectly assess the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes listed above? Alumni surveys, Site Supervisor and Employer surveys, student evaluation of instruction

E. SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS
What did you find from your assessments? What did your data reveal about how well students are achieving the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes that you listed above?

1) National Counselor Examination **2017-18 pass rate 83%**
2) CMHC majors cumulative GPA **3.8**
3) Indirect Measures
- Alumni Survey　　**Feedback from 2018 survey was positive**
- Employers Survey　　**Employer/site supervisor feedback has been positive**
- Student Evaluation of Instruction　　**Student feedback of instruction is positive**
- University Supervisor's Report　　**Positive**

4) Key Assessment: Key assessments were developed in summer 2018. The diversity assessment was developed and implemented first. Data from the diversity key assessment was reviewed. The results of that review did not yield any modifications.

The key assessment data is emerging and the faculty decided that more data is needed to determine if the measures being used are providing usable data for make modifications to teaching and learning. In reviewing the NCE results, it was determined that students are preforming above the national average in the areas of: Career Development, Assessment, Research and Program Evaluation and Professional Practice. The department is either at the national average or slightly below in the following areas: Human Growth and Development, Social and Cultural Diversity, Professional Orientation and Ethical Practice, Professional Counseling Issues, Counseling Process, Diagnostic and Assessment Services, Professional Development, Supervision, and Consultation. There were no areas scientifically below the national average.

F. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS
How were results shared? With whom were they discussed?
The results were discussed. The attendees were Human Services graduate faculty, and college accreditation and assessment director.

G. ACTIONS PLANNED TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING
Based on what you learned from your assessment of the Program Level Student Learning Outcomes, what actions do the faculty in your program plan to take to improve student learning in your program/area? Describe the steps faculty have taken/will take to use information from the assessments for improvement of student performance and the program. List additional faculty meetings or discussions and planned or actual changes to curriculum, teaching methods, approaches, or services that are in response to the assessment findings.
The data review did not reveal any areas of significant weakness in student learning. The faculty decided that additional data is needed to determine trends and if any corrective measures need to be implemented. There were some overall measures adopted, like requiring students to show proof of their program of study, when they register for Counseling Techniques course. This course is typically taken in the first 12 credit hours, and a signed program of study verifies the new student has met with their faulty advisor. Theses meetings are critical for faculty and their ability to evaluate student dispositions.

H. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (recommended)
Please attach minutes of program faculty meetings and/or stakeholder meetings where discussion of results and action planning occurred and any other relevant documents.

Minutes of data review meeting are attached

I. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES

Federal law requires WSU to, prior to implementing new and emerging technologies (e.g. employing new software, distance-learning parameters, etc.) in its academic programs, first evaluate and consider the potential effects of these technologies on students with disabilities. Please respond to the following questions about any proposed changes to technology in your program:

1. **List any changes instituted over the past year regarding the use of technologies in your program.**
2. **Describe any steps you took to ensure accessibility for students with disabilities before instituting these changes.**
3. **Describe any accessibility issues you discovered during the year regarding the technologies and any steps you have taken to resolve these issues.**

No new or emerging technologies were implemented in 2017-2018.

Annual Review of Data for Human Services Graduate Programs

Meeting Date: March 13, 2019, 1 to 3 pm (minutes)

Faculty Present: Tara Hill, Leslie Neyland-Brown, Mary Huber, Josh Francis, John Conteh, Donna Tromski-Klingshirn, Adrianne Johnson, Huma Bashir, Stephen Fortson, Chair; Tammy Kahrig, Assistant Dean for Assessment and Accreditation, Greg Webb, Data Analyst

The first order of business was to review the data from the Key Assessments. It was noted that most students were exceeding expectations on the social cultural Diversity key assessment. Based on that information, the discussion focused on are the expectations on key assessments too low, or are faculty possibly being too generous. Another potential solution was including more questions in key assessment assignment directly related to standards that students would be required to explore while completing the assignment. More questions would provide faculty with more data on how well students have mastered concepts. Another possible option would be to include a multiple choice exam with questions that specifically address the standards that could be used to verify the learning believed to be taking place with the existing assignments.

There was also a discussion about appropriate courses of action that could be taken when the key assessments identify weaknesses in a content area. Most faculty thought that adding additional content in the area where weaknesses were found was the appropriate action.

The key assessment data that was reviewed included, the social cultural diversity, professional counseling orientation and ethical practice, assessment and evaluation in counseling, group work, Content knowledge (re: NCE results, CRCC results, School Counselor licensure exam results). In CNL 7230 Assessment and Evaluation, there was a discussion about the assessment key assessment. Looking at the differentiation of the data from this key assessment, there is not much differentiation. Most students either met or exceeded the assessment standard. Professor were able to explain how their efforts impact student outcome on key assessment. In the case of CNL 7230, a lot of instructional effort was devoted to the final self-assessment report and professors reported students exceeding the standard was expected. Because most students are exceeding expectations for CNL 7230, there was some discussion regarding making the "exceeding expectations" more rigorous. It was noted during the discussion that students tend to evaluate their skill acquisition by their course grades and licensure exam results. Faculty raised the possibility that in some cases, using exams as key assessment measures may be better than some of the written assignments being used. Using exams would probably create more variability in results. It was noted the CNL 6220/7220 Group Counseling key assessments did have some variability in the key assessment results. Group counseling was an area that students were actually below the national

average on the NCE results. One suggestion to obtain more information about how students are doing with group is to ask more specific questions of site supervisors. It was noted that one change that had already been implemented, which was changing CNL 7220 Group Process course from pass/fail to a letter grade. Faculty anticipate that assignment letter grades for this course, will allow faculty to further differentiate student performance. Faculty also discussed giving further clarification to the CNL 7220 syllabus to show that students are required to do more than participate in group, they also have content focused assignments. There was a general discussion on how the key assessments were developed, and in most cases one assignment was as key assessment. Typically, that assignment had multiple standards imbedded.

Regarding the NCE results, the area where our students are scoring below the national benchmark was used as a measure of acceptable output. The department wants our students to be either at or above the national averages on NCE. We identified the areas of helping relationships and professional orientation and ethical standards were a point below the national average. There was a discussion about what faculty believed was happening. It was suggested that there be a syllabus review to assess how well the current content informs the students in the areas identified as below the national average. There was also a discussion about the strong areas on NCE, career development and professional practice. All agreed that nothing needed to be adjusted in these areas. Looking at the NCE results overall, students lifted their performance from 2017-18 to 2019-19 from 111.7 to 112.7. The 2018-19 overall score is 2 points above the national average. Faculty did say that a good way to verify students are actually performing well is to review their student evaluations from site supervisors. So overall, the data reveals that student learning is trending in a positive direction and faculty should be pleased. That said, faculty would like all of the NCE areas to be above the national average. The school counseling program director stated that she is continually reviewing the curriculum in her area based on how the school counseling students are performing on their licensing exam. She said she added an additional assignment in the area of life span and she reported her score went up afterwards. It was pointed out that if faculty identify where the standards are located in their syllabi, it would make it easier to them to focus on those areas when preparing for licensing exam.

In discussing the data for the CRCC exam, it was noted that the data was limited because on 9 students have taken the test under the period reviewed. We determined with such a low N, more results would be needed to have a statistically relevant data set.

There was also a discussion about specific feedback from alumni (Survey of Graduating Students) on their concentrations. It was noted that many of the questions on these surveys were general and not specific to the content. Given this, it was suggested that the narrative comments of program completers may contain more valuable information than the data from objective questions. There was also a survey sent to alumni about more specific content knowledge feedback. The

feedback from school counseling graduates ask for more school counseling specific coursework. It was noted that this program and other school counseling programs face this issue. It was suggested that some general counseling classes should adopt a bifurcated approach with some specific assignments geared to school counseling students.

There was also a discussion about the student dispositions. Faculty were concerned about the difficulty getting students to come to campus and meet with them in their offices. Different ideas were explored on how to get students and faculty better connected regarding dispositions. The problems of new students entering our programs at multiple times during the year and how this complicates the disposition process was also discussed. This issue makes it more difficulty for faculty to identify how far along students are in their programs. It was suggested that the department admin should require students to show proof of their program of study before being allowed admission into CNL 6020 Techniques of Counseling. This course is typically taken in the first 12 credit hours of admission.

Summary
It was decided from the meeting that the minutes from this meeting would be disseminated to faculty to further consideration to any potential program modifications for the 2019-2020 academic year.