

## Academic Program Review

Assessment Year: 2013-2014

<b>Program:</b>	School Counseling MAEd and Counseling EdS—School Counseling and Clinical Mental Health Counseling Concentrations
<b>CIP Number:</b>	13.1101
<b>Department:</b>	Educational Studies, Leadership, and Counseling
<b>College:</b>	Education
<b>Accreditation (if applicable):</b>	CACREP accreditation application submitted (waiting for site visit)
<b>Program Director:</b>	
<b>Contact Name:</b>	Alan Bakes

### Continuous Assessment Planning Process:

Data is collected and organized by individual faculty for assessments that are addressed in specific courses. Faculty collectively review data that is generated through midterm and capstone projects that require grading through rubrics. Other data is collected through a nationally normed comprehensive exam. All data is reviewed by faculty each semester and put into the program’s annual student progress report that is presented and reviewed by the program faculty, department chair and program advisory board. Based on review and input of each party, curriculum or program changes are decided upon.

### Participants in the Planning Process:

Alan Bakes, Counseling Program Coordinator  
 Samir Patel, Clinical Mental Health Coordinator  
 Susana Bloomdahl, School Counseling Coordinator, Accreditation Liaison  
 Rebecca Pender, Internship/Clinical Coordinator

<b>Learning Outcome 1:</b>	Students who complete the program will demonstrate essential interviewing and counseling skills. (CACREP Section II, G.5-c)
<b>FORMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 1:</b>	Relationship Building Skills Rubric
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Foundational relationship buildings skills will be measured in CNS 619 by using a skill rubric based on CACREP standards to assess video-taped counseling sessions submitted by each student at <b>midterm</b> . Data is collected through in-class assessments and graded with a common rubric in terms of proficiency. The rubric describes skill level that “exceeds the standard”, “meets standard”, “below standard” or “does not meet standard”. Emphasis is placed on the formative development of the <b>Relationship Building Skills</b> .
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	At least 80 % of students will “ <i>meet standards</i> ” according to faculty evaluation and application of the skill rubric.
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	Students were assessed across ten basic Relationship Building counseling skills as demonstrated through the midterm video tape. Data from the 2013/14 year reveals that 100% of students met standards. This result indicated that all students are able

## Academic Program Review

**Assessment Year: 2013-2014**

	to demonstrate the foundational counseling skills to build and maintain relationships.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	Grading rubric will be calibrated to better differentiate skill levels between students.
<b>FORMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 2:</b>	Working Stage Skills Rubric
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Foundational working stage counseling skills will be measured in CNS 619 by using a skill rubric based on CACREP standards to assess video-taped counseling sessions submitted by each student at the <b>end of the course</b> . Data is collected through in-class assessments and graded with a common rubric in terms of proficiency. The rubric describes skill level that “exceeds the standard”, “meets standard”, “below standard” or “does not meet standard”. Emphasis is placed on the formative development of the <b>Working Stage Skills</b> .
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	At least 80 % of students will “ <i>meet standards</i> ” according to faculty evaluation and application of the skill rubric (CACREP Section II: G.5.b; G.5.c).
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	Students were assessed across basic Working Stage counseling skills as demonstrated through the Final video tape. Data from the 2013/14 year reveals that 100% of students met standards. This finding indicates that all students were able to demonstrate foundational counseling skills associated with working stages of counseling.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	Grading rubric will be calibrated to better differentiate between working stage skills and relationship building skills.
<b>SUMMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 1:</b>	Oral Defense Presentation/Rubric
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Relationship building and working stage counseling skills will be measured in Internship II (CNS 795) using a skill rubric to assess video-taped counseling sessions presented during an Oral Defense by each student at the end of the course. Data is collected through a formal presentation to two counseling faculty and one non-counseling ELC Department member. Student’s ability to verbally describe and demonstrate intentionally of counseling skills will be evaluated.
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	At least 80% of students will “ <i>meet standards</i> ” for Oral Defense presentation.
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	100 % of students met standard for the Oral Defense presentation. This result indicated that all students were able to demonstrate an ability to build, foster, and maintain relationship with clients, while providing intentional counseling skills during the working stage of their relationship with clients. However, it should be noted that the point system in the rubric was flawed. Though the rubric seems to accurately capture whether or not the student is meeting the standards for the oral defense presentation, the student's overall score on the presentation (which is part of his/her overall grade in the course) was not captured accurately; rather, the rubric utilized raw scores which resulted in low overall scores.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	In light of this finding (the punitive nature of the rubric), a proposal was made to adjust the scoring scale of the rubric, in which the instructor would use a prescribed formula to obtain a standardized score, as opposed to using raw scores. The faculty, as a collective unit, met and discussed the proposal. The proposal was accepted, and it was integrated into the scoring rubric for use in Fall 2014.

**Academic Program Review**

**Assessment Year: 2013-2014**

<b>SUMMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 2:</b>	Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE)
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Students will answer 16 questions focusing on skill and professional development in the Helping Relationship section of the nationally normed (CPCE).
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	80% of students will demonstrate competence by scoring higher than national average on the professional Helping Relationship portion of the exam.
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	Results from the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 CPCE Exams revealed that 60% (n = 5) of students scored higher than the national average.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	Upon further review, faculty discovered that counseling skills and theories are measured collectively by the Helping Relationship portion of the CPCE without being separately identified. Faculty are reviewing ways for a better summative assessment of counseling skills.

<b>Learning Outcome 2:</b>	Students who complete the program will demonstrate an ability to understand diverse cultural attitudes, beliefs, understandings, and acculturative experiences, including specific experiential learning activities. (CACREP Section II, G.2-b)								
<b>FORMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 1:</b>	Multicultural pretest and posttest assessment								
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Student's formative development of multicultural counseling awareness and skills will be measured by administering the Multicultural Counseling Awareness, Knowledge and Skills Survey (MAKSS) in CNS 671 as a pretest and posttest. Student growth is documented in each of the three subtest areas.								
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	At least 80% of students will demonstrate growth in the subtest areas of the MAKSS.								
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	<p>The MAKSS-C was designed as a self-assessment (Likert scale ranging from 1 to 4) of multicultural counseling and assess three subscales (10 items per scale): (a) awareness, (b) knowledge and (c) skills. The students were asked to complete MAKSS-C twice during the semester; once at start of the semester in order to establish a baseline and once at the end of the semester in order to measure progression among the three subscales and total score.</p> <p>Collecting periods: Summer 2014 N = 9</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Awareness Pre/Post</th> <th>Knowledge Pre/Post</th> <th>Skills Pre/Post</th> <th>Total Pre/Post</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2.48/2.87</td> <td>2.56/3.67</td> <td>2.06/3.32</td> <td>2.36/3.29</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The results indicated an increase in all areas as it relates to multicultural competence. However, the awareness domain increased minimally.</p>	Awareness Pre/Post	Knowledge Pre/Post	Skills Pre/Post	Total Pre/Post	2.48/2.87	2.56/3.67	2.06/3.32	2.36/3.29
Awareness Pre/Post	Knowledge Pre/Post	Skills Pre/Post	Total Pre/Post						
2.48/2.87	2.56/3.67	2.06/3.32	2.36/3.29						
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	Upon further examination of the Awareness items in the MAKSS, it seems that the students have a strong awareness of themselves in relation to multicultural counseling; however, their awareness of others is not as strong. Thus, this concept will be addressed more soundly via class discussions in future semesters.								

## Academic Program Review

**Assessment Year: 2013-2014**

<b>FORMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 2:</b>	The Midpoint Clinical Application Exam
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	The Midpoint Clinical Application Exam measures basic clinical knowledge of building clinical relationships, <b>multicultural awareness</b> , theoretical awareness and ethical and professional understanding according to CACREP standards. The exam is taken when students have completed their first 30 credit hours to measure their understanding of these foundational clinical skills. It consists of two clinical case studies. The rubric describes adherence to the aforementioned CACREP standards that “exceeds the standards”, “meets standards”, “below standards” or “does not meet standards”.
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	80 % of students will “ <i>meet standards</i> ” according to faculty evaluation and application of the Midpoint Examination Rubric for the Social and Cultural Diversity Standards (CACREP Section II, G.2).
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	Overall, 2 of 9 students passed the midpoint in their first attempt. Of those 7 students, none of them passed the multicultural section. 5 of the remaining 7 students passed the retake examination. The final 2 students passed their final attempt at the exam.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	Due to the low passing rates, a proposal was made to adjust the rubric. The proposed rubric was reviewed by faculty and the Counseling Program Advisory Board. The proposed rubric was accepted, and will be utilized for the 2014-2015 academic year.
<b>SUMMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 1:</b>	Oral Defense Presentation/Rubric
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Theoretical competence will be measured in Internship II (CNS 795) using a skill rubric to assess video-taped counseling sessions presented during an Oral Defense by each student at the end of the course. Data is collected through a formal presentation to two counseling faculty and one non-counseling ELC Department member. Student’s ability to verbally describe and demonstrate theoretically based counseling skills will be evaluated.
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	At least 80% of students will “ <i>meet standards</i> ” for Oral Defense presentation.
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	100% of students met standard for the Oral Defense presentation. This result indicates that all students were able to demonstrate multicultural counseling competence. However, it should be noted that the point system in the rubric was flawed. Though the rubric seems to accurately capture whether or not the student is meeting the standards for the oral defense presentation, the student’s overall score on the presentation (which is part of his/her overall grade in the course) was not captured accurately; rather, the rubric utilized raw scores which resulted in low overall scores.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	In light of this finding (the punitive nature of the rubric), a proposal was made to adjust the scoring scale of a rubric using a prescribed formula to obtain standardized scores, as opposed to using raw scores. The faculty, as a collective unit, met and discussed the proposal. The proposal was accepted, and it was integrated into the scoring rubric for oral defenses beginning Fall 2014.
<b>SUMMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 2:</b>	Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE)
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Students will answer 16 multicultural specific questions on a nationally normed comprehensive exam (CPCE).

## Academic Program Review

**Assessment Year: 2013-2014**

<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	80% of students will demonstrate competence by scoring higher than national average on the Social and Cultural Diversity portion of the exam.
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	Results from the Fall 2013 & Spring 2014 CPCE Exam revealed that 80% (n = 5) of students scored higher than the national average for the Social & Cultural Diversity section of the CPCE.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	As a result of our students meeting the target for success, the faculty discussed and increased target criteria for success to 85% of students scoring higher than the national average on the Social & Cultural Diversity section of the CPCE,

<b>Learning Outcome 3:</b>	Students who complete the program will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of counseling theories (CACREP Section II, G.5-d).
<b>FORMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 1:</b>	Class Paper/Rubric
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Students will submit Individual Theory papers in CNS 624, Theories of Counseling. The papers will be evaluated using a common rubric to determine student's accurate understanding and application of counseling theories. The rubric describes skill level that "exceeds the standard", "meets standard", "below standard" or "does not meet standard".
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	At least 80% of students will " <i>meet standards</i> " according to faculty evaluation and application for personal theory application.
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	Students were assessed according to a set rubric that assessed writing quality and depth of understanding of theory. According to the results, 54% of students "met standards" for effective writing and appropriate understanding of a counseling theory, 20% are "developing standards" which indicates writing issues and lack of depth in understanding of counseling theory and 26% did not meet standards, indicating poor writing and weak understanding of counseling theory.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	Faculty reviewed and amended rubric to ensure that students are demonstrating accurate understanding and application of counseling theory.
<b>FORMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 2:</b>	Midpoint Clinical Application Exam
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	The Midpoint Exam measures basic clinical knowledge of building clinical relationships, multicultural awareness, <b>theoretical awareness</b> and ethical and professional understanding according to CACREP standards. The exam is taken when students have completed their first 30 credit hours to measure their understanding of these foundational clinical skills. It consists of two clinical case studies. The rubric describes adherence to the aforementioned CACREP standards that "exceeds the standards", "meets standards", "below standards" or "does not meet standards".
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	80% of students will " <i>meet standards</i> " according to faculty evaluation and application of the Midpoint Examination Rubric for the Professional Orientation and Ethics Standards (CACREP Section II: G1j).
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	2 of 9 students passed the midpoint in their first attempt. Of the 7 remaining students, only 1 passed the theoretical awareness portion of the exam. 4 of the remaining 6 did pass the theoretical awareness portion of the exam in the retake examination. The remaining 2 passed their final attempt at the exam.

## Academic Program Review

**Assessment Year: 2013-2014**

<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	Due to the low passing rates, a proposal was made to adjust the rubric. The proposed rubric was reviewed by faculty and the Counseling Program Advisory Board. The proposed rubric was accepted, and will be utilized for the 2014-2015 academic year. Furthermore, a case study component will be added to CNS 624 in Fall 2014 to help better conceptualize a case within a theoretical framework.
<b>SUMMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 1:</b>	Oral Defense Presentation/Rubric
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Theoretical competence will be measured in Internship II (CNS 795) using a skill rubric to assess video-taped counseling sessions presented during an Oral Defense by each student at the end of the course. Data is collected through a formal presentation to two counseling faculty and one non-counseling ELC Department member. Student's ability to verbally describe and demonstrate theoretically based counseling skills will be evaluated.
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	At least 80% of students will <i>"meet standards"</i> for Oral Defense presentation.
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	100% of students met standard for the Oral Defense presentation. This result indicates that all students were able to demonstrate a theoretically-grounded approach to counseling skills. However, it should be noted that the point system in the rubric was flawed. Though the rubric seems to accurately capture whether or not the student is meeting the standards for the oral defense presentation, the student's overall score on the presentation (which is part of his/her overall grade in the course) was not captured accurately; rather, the rubric utilized raw scores which resulted in low overall scores.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	In light of this finding (the punitive nature of the rubric), a proposal was made to adjust the scoring scale of a rubric using a prescribed formula to obtain standardized scores, as opposed to using raw scores. The faculty, as a collective unit, met and discussed the proposal. The proposal was accepted, and it was integrated into the scoring rubric for the oral defense.
<b>SUMMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 2:</b>	Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE)
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Students will answer 16 theory specific questions on a nationally normed comprehensive exam (CPCE).
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	80% of students will demonstrate competence by scoring higher than national average on the Theory portion of the exam.
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	Results from the Fall 2013 & Spring 2014 CPCE Exams revealed that 60% (n = 5) of students scored higher than the national average.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	Upon further review, faculty discovered that theories and counseling skills were both measured collectively in the Helping Relationship portion of the CPCE without being separately identified. Thus, faculty will no longer use the CPCE to assess Learning Outcome 3, as it was not a valid measure for counseling theory. Counseling theory comprehension will now be assessed via CNS 625 paper and final (Formative assessments) and midpoint and CNS 795 oral defense (Summative assessments); these points of assessments will capture student learning on a developmental continuum and thus provide the program with a more clear understanding of counseling theory comprehension.

<b>Learning Outcome 4:</b>	Students who complete the program will demonstrate professional orientation and ethical practice relating to professional roles, functions and relationships (CACREP)
----------------------------	---

## Academic Program Review

**Assessment Year: 2013-2014**

	Section II: G1j).
<b>FORMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 1:</b>	Case Study Assignment/Rubric
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Student knowledge and understanding of ethical issues in counseling will be measured by evaluating a case study assignment in CNS 617, Intro to Counseling. Data is collected through in-class assessments and graded with a rubric based on the CACREP standards for professional orientation and ethics (CACREP Section II: G1j). The rubric describes skill level that “exceeds the standard”, “meets standard”, “below standard” or “does not meet standard”.
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	At least 80% of students will “ <i>meet standards</i> ” for professional orientation and ethics.
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	No data collected; outcome will be reassessed for 2014/2015 review.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	Faculty will ensure that data is collected and recorded for the 2014/2015 academic year.
<b>FORMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 2:</b>	Midpoint Clinical Application Exam
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	The Midpoint Exam measures basic clinical knowledge of building clinical relationships, multicultural awareness, theoretical awareness <b>and ethical and professional understanding</b> according to CACREP standards. The exam is taken when students have completed their first 30 credit hours to measure their understanding of these foundational clinical skills. It consists of two clinical case studies. The rubric describes adherence to the aforementioned CACREP standards that “exceeds the standards”, “meets standards”, “below standards” or “does not meet standards”.
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	80% of students will “ <i>meet standards</i> ” according to faculty evaluation and application of the Midpoint Examination Rubric for the Professional Orientation and Ethics Standards (CACREP Section II: G1j).
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	7 of the 9 students met standards for the ethical and professional understanding section of the midpoint clinical application exam. This result indicated that 78% of the students are able to discuss ethical issues and concerns at a satisfactory level.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	Since target for success was not reached, faculty reviewed midpoint rubric. Consensus was reached that the midpoint rubric did not accurately measure counseling ethics. As such, rubric was amended to promote validity of rubric, and has since been adopted.
<b>SUMMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 1:</b>	Oral Defense Presentation/Rubric
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Theoretical competence will be measured in Internship II (CNS 795) using a skill rubric to assess video-taped counseling sessions presented during an Oral Defense by each student at the end of the course. Data is collected through a formal presentation to two counseling faculty and one non-counseling ELC Department member. Student’s ability to verbally describe and demonstrate theoretically based counseling skills will be evaluated.
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	At least 80% of students will “ <i>meet standards</i> ” for Oral Defense presentation.
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	100 % of students met standard for the Oral Defense presentation. This result indicated that all students were able to demonstrate ethical counseling. However, it should be noted that the point system in the rubric was flawed. Though the rubric

## Academic Program Review

**Assessment Year: 2013-2014**

	seems to accurately capture whether or not the student is meeting the standards for the oral defense presentation, the student's overall score on the presentation (which is part of his/her overall grade in the course) was not captured accurately; rather, the rubric utilized raw scores which resulted in low overall scores.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	In light of this finding (the punitive nature of the rubric), a proposal was made to adjust the scoring scale of a rubric using a prescribed formula to obtain standardized scores, as opposed to using raw scores. The faculty, as a collective unit, met and discussed the proposal. The proposal was accepted, and it was integrated into the scoring rubric for the oral defense.
<b>SUMMATIVE INSTRUMENT/TEST 2:</b>	Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE)
<b>Instrument/Test Procedures and Description:</b>	Students will answer 16 Professional Orientation & Ethics specific questions on a nationally normed comprehensive exam (CPCE).
<b>Criteria for Success:</b>	80% of students will demonstrate competence by scoring higher than national average on the Professional Orientation and Ethics portion of the exam.
<b>Results and Analysis:</b>	Results from the 2013-2014 CPCE Exam revealed that 60% of students scored higher than the national average for the Professional Orientation & Ethics position.
<b>Changes Made in Response to the Assessment Process or Results:</b>	Faculty reviewed the material being tested in the Professional Orientation and Ethics portion of the CPCE to better prepare students for the CPCE exam. CPCE study guides have been purchased and placed in the CoEHS Curriculum Library and MSU office in Madisonville. Study guides are available for checkout by counseling students.