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In this document, the revised Student Learning Outcome (SLO) plan is outlined. The most recent available data on each of the benchmark measures are presented. SLO measures are revisited each August by the counseling area faculty members. An annual executive summary is created and distributed as outlined in the plan below.

**Overall Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan:**

In addition to using key assessments to identify program strengths and weaknesses, each student’s progress was evaluated each semester using these benchmarks as well as a course evaluation form created for Counseling Theories, COUN 633, to measure how well the students feel able to articulate, and, when appropriate, apply the knowledge, practice, and skills from the course. This was a pilot study to determine if the data yielded were equivalent to the amount of work involved in creating, distributing, and compiling the forms and the data. The data we obtained were not worthy of the time spent and will not be utilized in our assessment plan. Our assessment plan consists of the following. Each semester, students meet with their advisers to discuss their progress in the program based on their grades in courses and benchmark evaluations. Please [see Student Progress Evaluation forms for SC and for CMHC](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CStudent%20Progress%20Report.pdf) as examples. Advisors utilize the data collected on the benchmark assessments and interactions with the student, and if needed other faculty members and supervisors, to determine whether the student exceeds, meets, or does not meet expectations. In the current program year, most students received marks of “Meets” on most areas, with some receiving marks of “Exceeds” or “Does Not Meet.” Any mark of “Does Not Meet” triggered a discussion about how the student plans to improve in that area. Ongoing or serious concerns trigger the generation of a remediation plan.

**Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan: Clinical Mental Health Counseling**

[**Oral and written case presentations**:](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CCMHC%20Score%20Spreadsheet.xlsx) This is a comprehensive and developmental assignment students complete three times: once in practicum, once in the first semester of internship, and once in the final semester of internship. The third iteration of this assignment also serves as the capstone evaluation of student work prior to graduation. Students write a comprehensive report about a client from the Norma and William Grosjean Clinic in University Hall in practicum, and from their external internship site during internship. They discuss the client’s background, history, multicultural considerations, and reactions to assessments. The student then uses this information to form a diagnostic impression, create a case conceptualization grounded in counseling and developmental theories, develop a mutually agreed upon and measurable treatment plan, design appropriate interventions, and discuss the client’s progress in treatment.

The CMHC program coordinator compiles students' scores on the oral and written case presentations to determine that students are able to meet expectations in working with clients.

**Results:** Data from academic year 2013-2014 reveal that students generally met faculty expectations on case studies. The average score for the oral case presentation in the practicum was 44.5/50, or 90%. The average score on the written presentation in practicum was 95%. Scores on both measures were comparable or higher in the internship (99% for oral presentation and 93% for written presentation). This is a solid measure of growth in the students’ skills of documentation and concise, accurate presentation of client problems and progress. Scores were lowest on psychosocial history and progress in counseling during practicum. Students tend to score lower on those measures related to gathering client information. This problem appears to be remediated by the end of the internship year. Scores on all items were generally at or just above the category of “meets expectations” with few students receiving marks of “does not meet expectations.” This would be addressed in supervision.

**Recording evaluation forms**: Supervisors utilize the forms to rate the quality of student counseling work during internship. Students submit a total of six recordings across two semesters of internship. The recordings are rated by their university supervisors. We are now collecting the data from these rating forms and aggregating them to look for patterns of student strengths and weaknesses. Beginning this fall, we will be using Qualtrics to rate the students on their recordings.

**Results:** No student was rated as “not meeting expectations” in 2013-2014. No areas of the assessment revealed critical problems. If any area might be considered weaker than others, “effectively manages the counseling stage during the session” was marked as “meets” rather than “exceeds” expectations for 77% of students. This is a developmental issue and was discussed in class to raise student awareness.

**Supervisor assessments:** Supervisor assessments rate students' counseling and professional skills during practicum and internship. The rating forms for the CMHC program are now housed in Qualtrics to make data collection and analysis simpler. A copy of the paper version of the forms and the [COUN 634 Clinic Supervisor Evaluation](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CCOUN%20634%20Clinic%20Supervisor%20Evaluations.docx) and [COUN 739D Site Supervisor Evaluations](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CCOUN%20739D%20Site%20Supervisor%20Evaluation.docx) from 2013-2014 are provided for review.

**Results:** Overall, supervisor evaluations of student work were strong. Interns are evaluated by their onsite supervisors. Practicum students are evaluated by program faculty members who supervise their work in the Norma and William Grosjen Clinic.

Interns in the fall of 2013 were rated as “exceeds” or “meets” expectations in all areas with two exceptions. One student received the mark of “does not meet” expectations relative to “awareness of personal issues that might impact counseling” and one student received the mark of “does not meet” expectations in the question regarding” openness to supervision.” This was addressed with both students in supervision and progress was made by each student.

Similar results were found for the interns in spring of 2014. No student was marked below as “does not meet” on any measure. High scores occurred on following items: "is immediate with client" and "is respectful and validated the client." On "challenges the client when appropriate," 64% of students “met” expectation and 36% “exceeded” expectation. The same was true for "appropriate regarding the cultural context of the client."

Practicum students rated in the spring of 2014 appeared to be generally on track. Most scores fell in the “meets expectations” range. Some of the same items came up as needs for reinforcement in the program with this cohort. “Listens carefully and communicates understanding of the client” and” uses interpersonal strengths appropriately” are areas for improvement.

[**Dispositions**](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CCMHC%20personal%20disposition%20assessment.doc)**:** At three points during the program, students are assessed on their professional dispositions. The first assessment is completed by the student, the second by a faculty member, and the third by the internship supervisor.

**Results:** Dispositions are measured on a 3-point scale: does not meet = 1, meets = 2, exceeds expectations = 3. Students appear to make solid progress across data measurement points in the program. During the practicum in 2013, no student was rated as 1 in any area. Most were rated as 2, with some 3’s (self-reflection and commitment to the profession). By the spring of the internship, no student rated 1 on any items, with some 3’s (personal responsibility, commitment to the profession, and self-reflection).

[**Self- assessment of skills**](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CCMHC%20739D%20self%20assessment%20of%20skills%202013-%202014.doc)**:** Students are expected to reflect on their own personal and professional development at regular intervals throughout the program. This is done formally via the self-assessment of skills form at several points during practicum and internship. In practicum, students turn in a self-assessment of skills with their oral and written case presentation documents. In internship, students complete the self-assessment with each of their case presentations for a total of four data collection points in internship, and a total of six across the program.

**Results:**

Students assess their counseling skills once each semester during internship, utilizing a 3-point scale, Exceeds Expectation (3), Meets Expectation (2) and Does Not Meet Expectation (1). In the fall of 2013, the majority of students scored themselves a 2 in all categories. There were limited numbers of 3’s across a range of skills. No areas were self-rated as below a 2. In the spring of 2014, 50% rated themselves a 3 on “ability to demonstrate active listening and attentive behavior” and “ability to develop a professional relationship with client.” These data are consistent with ratings from supervisors and point out strengths in relational capacities among ISU CMHC students.

**Results:**

[**NCE scores**](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5C2014%20%20NCE%20results.pdf): These are examined by the program coordinator when they are received each summer and are discussed in the first faculty meeting in the fall. We view NCE scores as a salient benchmark for overall program efficacy.

The CMHC program has required students to take the NCE prior to graduation since 2007. Students do not have to pass in order to graduate. Out of six administrations, a few students (2 in 2007, 1 in 2008, 4 in 2009, an alarming 7 in 2010, 2 in 2011, and 0 in 2012) have received non-passing scores. Please note that students in the 2007-2010 cohorts were primarily taught by faculty members who are no longer here. The 2011 and 2012 scores reflect the current program and faculty effort. The 2012, 2013, and 2014 administration saw all students pass on the first attempt.

Areas of strength compared to the results from all CACREP programs in 2014 were: “helping relationships” and “assessment.” Both of these areas were at least 1.0 above the CACREP program means. Only one area saw mean scores below the CACREP average: professional orientation and ethics (below CACREP by .12) which is well within one standard deviation of the CACREP means. We have split the 3 credit hour course COUN 738 Professional Seminar into two courses. Students take one hour of COUN 738 their first semester and two hours their last semester. The first course is focused on ethical decision making models. We felt having this early in their program of study would ensure a focus throughout their course of study on ethical codes and decision-making.

**Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan: School Counseling**

**Case Presentations**: This is a comprehensive and developmental assignment students complete three times: once in practicum, once in the first semester of internship, and once in the final semester of internship. Students write a comprehensive report about a K-12 student from their field experience site during practicum and internship. They discuss the K-12 student’s background, history, multicultural considerations, and reactions to assessments. The student then uses this information to develop goals with the K-12 student. On each iteration the students are asked to create a case conceptualization grounded in counseling and developmental theories, to design appropriate interventions, and to discuss the K-12 student’s progress in treatment.

The School Counseling program coordinator compiles students' scores on the case presentations to determine that students are able to meet expectations. The coordinator also collects data on how students are rated by the different instructors in the course to verify [interrater reliability](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CInterrater%20reliability%209-18-14.xls).

**Results:** During the 2013-2014 internship course, students generally were rated as “meets” or “exceeds” on all scored areas of the case presentations. Scores were slightly lower on “progress in counseling” (1.7) than on other areas. The mean score on the assignment was 22 out of 25 available points, with a range of 17.5 - 25. Students scored highest (3.0) on the “multicultural considerations” section of the assignment, meaning that they identified dimensions that may define the client’s cultural background, thoroughly discussed each, and addressed the implications for the counseling process. This was significant as cultural competency is woven throughout all coursework.

[**Recording Evaluation Forms**:](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CIndividual%20Counseling%20Evaluations%20Internship%20Spring%202014.xlsx) These forms rate the quality of student counseling work during internship. Students submit two recordings, one each semester of internship. The recordings are rated by their university supervisors.

**Results:** Students in internship are rated on a 3-point scale on a wide range of counseling behaviors. These ratings are completed by ISU faculty members. In the 2014 spring internship course, recording evaluations showed that faculty members were exceptionally satisfied with students' counseling skills. No student was marked as “Does Not Meet” on any of the items. Students appeared to be strongest on the following skills, all scored as “Exceeds” expectation: “establishing rapport,” “use of open-ended questions,” “use of reflective statements,” “use of active listening skills,” and “use of appropriate structure and effective communication skill.” Less strong areas included, “match student language” (8 “Exceeds”, 3 “Meet) and “does not impose personal values” (8 and 3 again). Overall, ratings suggest that students are meeting and exceeding faculty expectations for this benchmark assessment.

**Supervisor Evaluations:** Supervisor assessments rate students' counseling and professional skills during practicum and internship. The rating forms for the School Counseling program are collected at the end of each field experience course: Supervised Fieldwork, Counseling Practicum, and Internship. These forms can be completed either in a hard copy or as an electronic form, whichever the on-site supervisor prefers. The [UAS Data Collection](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CUAS%20Data%20Collection%20-%20School%20Counseling%202014.xlsx) notes supervisor evaluations from the past three years.

**Results:**  The results of the recent rounds of supervisor evaluations showed a high level of satisfaction with student work. Almost all areas of the evaluations were marked at the highest levels for the majority of students. Although program faculty members are pleased that site supervisors are satisfied with student work, these results are not useful for data analysis purposes. Other benchmarks, such as the student self-reflection and ISU supervisor-rated scales, are more reflective of students’ work and skill level. We will request that site supervisors be more reflective with these forms in future supervisor meetings. We have diligently sought feedback from COUN 634 Practicum supervisors via bi-weekly emails. Unfortunately, we have not received the feedback we would like at this point and will continue to focus upon this.

**Dispositions:** At three points during the program, students are assessed on their professional dispositions. The first assessment is completed by the student during their first field experience, Supervised Fieldwork. The second assessment is completed by an ISU faculty member during the second field experience, Counseling Practicum. The final assessment is completed by an on-site internship supervisor. The [UAS Data Collection](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CUAS%20Data%20Collection%20-%20School%20Counseling%202014.xlsx) notes dispositional data for five years.

**Results:** The dispositional data are gathered based on our college’s conceptual framework of “Becoming a Complete Professional.” The three pillars of our framework are educator as: (1) expert or mediator of learning, (2) person, and (3) member of communities. On-site supervisors rated our students highest in areas related to educator as person and educator as member of communities. Essentially, educator as person requires our students to be rated on items such as punctuality and being courteous and respectful. Our students rated the highest on these items. For educator as member of communities, students were rated on items such as being trustworthy and serving as a role model.

[**Self-Assessment of Skills:**](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CStudent%20Self-Reflection%20Form%20Internship%202011-2014.xls)Students are expected to reflect on their own personal and professional development at regular intervals throughout the program. Students assess effectiveness of each session spent with K-12 students on every case note. Formal documentation of students’ self-assessment is gathered during practicum and internship when students submit case presentation documents.

**Results:**  Students are asked to rate themselves on a scale from 1-5 with “1” representing “poor” and a “5” representing “effective.” Based on students' own reports, across all items, 38% rated themselves a 5, 45% rated a 4, 14% rated a 3, and 3% rated a 2. Students scored themselves highest on items such as “Introduction,” “Attentiveness,” and “Summarizing.” Students rated themselves lower on items such as “Reflection of Feeling” and “Reflection of Content.”

**Professional Development Presentations:** During Internship, students research a topic, write a formal paper, and are responsible for a 45 minute Professional Development Presentation. Students are scored on scholarly content, handouts, and organization and delivery of presentation. Scores are collected by the Program Coordinator. Scores from the past six years are saved in the [Interrater Reliability](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CInterrater%20reliability%209-18-14.xls) spreadsheet.

**Results:** The program faculty have data on this measure from 2008 to the present. The program faculty members have observed steady growth over the last several years on this measure. The overall average score was 14 out of 15 in 2013-2014.

**Use of findings**

Program modifications are made on an as-needed basis when identified by members of the faculty, students, alumni, and community partners and when reviewing the SLO benchmarks annually. Ideas for innovations are brought to counseling area faculty meetings for discussion and consideration. Once a course of action is determined, it is agreed upon by the faculty and enacted. Examples of changes include creating a counseling minor, completing paperwork to re-open the Counselor Education Ph.D. program, and creating an Advanced Internship course. Please review the faculty meeting minutes for examples of program changes.

**Survey Results**

[**Alumni:**](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CAlumni%20Survey.docx) The alumni survey was completed by students in both the CMHC and SC programs. Of the respondents, 68% were from the SC program and 32% were from the CMHC. Of the respondents, 84% were female and 16% were male, 92% were Caucasian and 8% African American. Areas of strengths included: “lectures and class activities presented by faculty were well organized and designed to facilitate understanding” (92% yes), “exhibit cultural competency by incorporating multicultural perspectives” (92%), and “possess knowledge and skills to work with diverse families” (94%). Program feedback was on a 5 point scale, 1 being very low and 5 being very good. Respondents noted strengths as: “professional competency of the program faculty,” and “faculty mentoring students through the program” (40% of students scoring 5). In terms of knowledge, areas scored a 5 included “multicultural counseling” (40% scored a 5), and “ethical and legal issues in your profession” (36% scoring a 5). Students felt extremely prepared for individual counseling with 75% scoring themselves a 4 or 5. Areas for improvement included “developing a program of study.” This is surprising as the SC program is very prescriptive and the CMHC program has electives offered on a rotational basis. Students sign a program of study during their first semester. We will be more intentional on explaining this process. Students also noted the desire for more assistance with financial aid. Students reported 3 (neutral) on the following items: “preparation for careers and lifestyle counseling” and “research and statistics.” Overall, program strengths included “multicultural counseling” and “strong supervision by both faculty and site supervisors.”

[**Employer**](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CEmployer%20Survey.docx)**:** The employer survey was completed by employers of both CMHC and SC graduates. Of the respondents, 72% employed SC graduates and 28% employed CMHC graduates. Overall job performance was scored a 4.17 on a 5 point scale, 1 being very low and 5 being very good. Employers also rated our students high on “responsiveness to supervision” (4.41) and “dependability/conscientiousness/responsibility” (4.44). The lowest score was “leadership skills” (4.04). We were pleased with these results.

[**Graduate Students**](file:///D%3A%5CCACREP%5CInterim%20Report%20Documents%5CGraduate%20Student%20Survey%20spring%202014.xlsx)**:** In the spring of 2014, we surveyed graduate students in both programs. Of the respondents, 67% were from the CMHC program and 33% from the SC program, 94% were female and 6% were male, and 83% were Caucasian, 6% African American, and 11% other. Overall areas for improvement include “financial aid” (58% yes) and “graduation” (50% yes). Ninety-four percent of the respondents exhibited cultural competency by incorporating multicultural perspective into services and 100% felt comfortable working with diverse populations. Overall students reported a 4.14 rating for overall aspects of the programs. Mean scores ranged from 3.41 on academic advising, to 4.39 on facilities, curriculum, and supervision. Relative to preparation and knowledge, respondents’ scores ranged from 3.35 (abnormal psychology) to 4.33 (counseling theories). Overall students scored their preparation and knowledge a 4. Responses to specific skills indicated that respondents felt very prepared for individual counseling (4.44) and least prepared for abnormal psychology (3.5). Overall students scored their skill level at 4 out of 5. Students further noted the following strengths: practicum and internship experiences, supervision, and small class sizes. Areas for improvement: communication among and between faculty and supervisors, ethics earlier in course sequence, and text responses to student inquiries. The ethics course has been modified and students take a 1-hour course at the beginning of the program and a 2-hour course near the end. Both first and second year students complete this survey every two years. Overall, we were pleased with the results.

 **Official Report Distribution**

This Executive Summary of findings is posted on the programs’ homepages and will be emailed to a variety of stakeholders, including: ISU assessment leadership, the Deans of the Bayh College of Education and the College of Graduate and Professional Studies, current site supervisors, and current students. We welcome feedback from all stakeholders about ways to improve student learning and the assessment process. Comments should be directed to the CACREP liaison, Dr. Tonya Balch at Tonya.Balch@indstate.edu .