Slippery Rock University

Department of Counseling & Development

Clinical Mental Health Counseling

Annual Program Evaluation Report

2018/2019

Report Overview

Our program evaluation report is the culmination of our systematic review of program objectives and performance measures. Assessment of students' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions is an integral piece of our program evaluation plan. The evaluation process helps our program reflect on our strengths and target areas of growth and informs are programmatic and curricular decisions. Faculty, administrators, students, site supervisors, employers, and other interested parties are invited to review this self-assessment of our intended program outcomes. The purpose of this report is not only to inform students and other stakeholders, but also to solicit feedback and suggestions around the results of this report. Due to the significant programmatic changes over the past year+, **some context for the current Annual Report is provided.**

Context for 2019 Annual Report

The conclusions from our 2018 Program Evaluation indicated our program needed significant revisions in order to demonstrate the 2016 standards. As a result of our self-evaluation and in line with feedback provided by CACREP, we determined the following actions were necessary (from 2018 evaluation):

- ✓ *Seek out training and consultation regarding 2016 Evaluation and Assessment changes*
- ✓ *Determine program-specific objectives (versus department-wide objectives.)*
- ✓ *Devise a sampling method and identify specific indicators to assess students' knowledge*
- ✓ *Work with Curriculum Committee to align syllabi, instruction, and assessment to 2016 standards.*

This section identifies the programmatic changes, curriculum decisions, and improvements in our program evaluation and student assessment processes resulting from CACREP's feedback and our own analysis of needs in Spring/Fall of 2018.

Programmatic Changes & Curricular Decisions Resulting from 2018 Evaluation Report	
Data:	Program evaluation and student assessment process is not aligned with Guiding Principles for Program Evaluation and Student Assessment- Section 4 of the 2016 CACREP Standards (CACREP site visit feedback)
Planned Action:	Step One--Program/Assessment Committee will seek out training and consultation regarding 2016 CACREP Standards related to evaluation and assessment.
Resultant:	CDEV Assessment Committee Chair (ret.) and Committee Member attend CACREP training-October 2018.
Outcome:	MET
Data:	Program Objectives are actually department objectives—need CMHC-specific objectives to inform program evaluation (CACREP feedback from site visit)
Planned Action:	Determine program-specific objectives; align evaluation processes with objectives.
Resultants:	CMHC faculty collaborated to develop program-specific mission statement and objectives Evidence: CMHC SITE-Mission and Objectives, meeting minutes CMHC
Outcome	**MET**-program mission statement and program-specific objectives posted. Measurable indicators for each objective identified. Evidence: Dept. Work Product Doc

Data:	Need to determine specific, measurable indicators of student knowledge, skills and dispositions to align with 2016 CACREP Standards (CACREP site visit feedback)
Planned Action:	Select sampling method for evaluating knowledge, skills, and dispositions.
Resultants:	Key Performance Indicators (CACREP 2016) identified for 8 core and 1 specialty area, actions and changes incuded;
5/30/18	Faculty discuss and begin selection of key performance indicators EVIDENCE: to EMAIL
8/1/18	Key Indicator's finalized and Assessment Grid Distributed to faculty EVIDENCE: to Assessment Grid & Assessment Indicator Email
8/24/18	KPI Assessment Directions for Faculty Presented (Department Retreat) EVIDENCE:
Outcome:	**MET**: KPI's for 2016 CACREP core content standards measured and reported for Fall 19 classes; Evidence KPI chart/outcomes;

Data:	Need to align CMHC Program curriculum and instruction to 2016 CACREP Standards (CACREP site visit feedback)
Planned Action:	Work with Curriculum Committee to revise syllabi—including course content, objectives, and performance indicators.
Resultants:	Spring 2018-began program-wide curricular revisions, continued into Fall semester 2018, resulting changes/actions included:
10/2&30/18	Dept. Curriculum Committee proposes syllabus template Evidence: Dept. meeting min 10/2 and 10/30
11/20/18	Program Curriculum Map approved & forwarded to Curriculum Committee Evidence: dept. min 11/20
	Assessment Committee proposes CPCE as assessment tool
1/25/19	Request for Revision of Program for Clinical Mental Health Counseling, including a new Program Guide for this program effective fall 2019 EVIDENCE: 1/24/19 ccmm
1/29/19	Request for new course CDEV 644 -Advanced Counseling Theory Evidence: to dpt min 1/29
2/19/18	Crisis Counseling Course proposed Evidence: dept min 2/19
4/23/19	Curriculum Committee directs faculty to use syllabus template for Fall 19 courses
Outcome:	**MET**-Core Courses—with CACREP 2016-aligned syllabi for semester went through curricular process and were approved at Dept., College of Ed, and University Curriculum levels.

Other Significant Changes resulting from CACREP Feedback & Adoption of Guidelines for Program Evaluation & Student Assessment included, but were not limited to:	
11/20/18	Common Assessment Rubric Adopted (Department Meeting)
9/11/10	Program reviewed assessment plan, outcomes, and indicators EVIDENCE: cmhc min 9/11
9/23/19	Program committee reviewed input from outside program regarding priorities in program mission and objectives EVIDENCE: cmhc mtg min 9/23
10/1/19	Alumni outreach effort to collect data on graduates for program assessment EVIDENCE: dept meeting min 10/1
	Revisited/reviewed program objectives EVIDENCE: CMHC program meeting min 10/1
10/22/19	CMHC discussion related to evaluating students' dispositions
11/29/18	Student Review process (targeting disposition assessment) reviewed with Assessment Committee
12/12/18	Revised Student Review of Professional Dispositions plan to Dept. Chair & Assessm't Chair
1/29/19	Revised Student Review plan presented to department. EVIDENCE: to Dept. mtg min 1/29

11/19/19	Additional disposition measurement added at program entry/admissions decision EVIDENCE: ARO mtg min

CMHC 2019 Program Evaluation & Assessment

In the Spring semester of 2018, core faculty, the Department Assessment Committee, and Curriculum Committees began revising our CMHC program to meet CACREP's 2016 Standards. The majority of the revision effort focused on evaluation. Section 4 of the 2016 CACREP Standards and *Guiding Principles for Program Evaluation and Student Assessment* framed our work and input from site reviewers, University Accreditation Officers, core and non-core faculty, and others directed our efforts. Our program's mission and objectives provide the context for understanding the results of the 2019 report.

The mission of SRU's Clinical Mental Health Counseling Program (CMHC) is to prepare competent counseling professionals who respect human dignity and diversity, demonstrate the dispositions of a helping professional, and are grounded in their identity as a professional counselor.

CMHC Program Objectives:

(1) Students will be able to show competence as a counselor in (a) knowledge, (b) skills, and (c) dispositions. *(Evidenced in KP assessment; NCE Content Area scores; Site Supervisor Skill Evaluations; Reviews/Ratings of Professional Dispositions)*

(2) Students will promote respect for human dignity and diversity

(3) Students will demonstrate a professional identity in the counseling field.

Our Program Evaluation-at-a-Glance document EVIDENCE: identifies the data, data collection methods, criteria for assessment, and intentions of the analysis process for each of the broad program objectives. The assessment data, analysis, and conclusions for the current review period are included in this report.

Program Evaluation-Objective 1 (Knowledge, Skills, & Dispositions)
Aggregate student assessment data is used to evaluate program objective 1 regarding knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

2019 Aggregate Student Assessment Data (Knowledge & Skills)				
Students will be able to show competence as a counselor in (a) knowledge, (b) skills, and (c) dispositions.				
Key Performance Indicator	Semester	Measures *S-Skill* *K-Knowledge*	Benchmark	Data 2018/2019 (Student Avg.)
1. Students will use ethical standards of professional counseling organizations and credentialing bodies, and applications of ethical and legal considerations in professional counseling (CACREP F.1-i)	3rd	CDEV 628-Case Analyses/Online Discussion/Reflection Assignment (K/S)	> 3.6	3.48 Met
2. Students will be able to identify the effects of power and privilege for counselors and clients. (CACREP F.2-e)	2nd	CDEV 621-Critical incident media presentations (K) STUDENT ASSESSMENT rel to div objective	Rubric >3.6	3.63 Met
3. Students will understand theories of individual and family development across the lifespan (CACREP F.3-j)	2nd	CDEV 610-Assessment Papers (K)	≥ 3.6	3.17 Not Met
4. Students will learn theories and models of career development and decision making (CACREP F.4-a)	2nd	CDEV 603-Exam (K)	> 3.6	3.21 Not Met

5. Students will use essential interviewing, counseling, and case conceptualization skills (CACREP F.5-g)	2nd	CDEV 614-Final Video (S)	> 3.6	3.86 Met	
6. Students will demonstrate competence in leadership role/skills as participates in small group activities (CACREP F.6-h)	3rd	CDEV 612-Leadership Role Assignment (S) Grades from leadership role (skills evaluation rubric)	≥ 3.6	3.86 Met	
7. Students will understand statistical concepts, including scales of measurement, measures of central tendency, indices of variability, shapes and types of distributions, and correlations (CACREP F.7-g)	2nd	Exam (K)	≥3.6	3.86 Met	
8. Students will use ethical and culturally relevant strategies for conducting, interpreting, and reporting the results of research and/or program evaluation (CACREP F.8-j)	1st	CITI Completion/Pass	=100	Met	
9. Principles, models, and documentation formats of biopsychosocial case conceptualization and treatment planning (CMHC 1.c)	4th	CDEV 607-Case Analysis (K/S)	≥3.6	3.70 Met	

Aggregate Student Assessment Data (Knowledge & Skills) Analysis

CMHC students were assessed using Key Performance Indicators as measures of knowledge and skill across 9 core and specialty areas. Students' performance on each indicator was analyzed against a pre-determined benchmark. Conclusions from the analysis of the Spring 2019 KPI data suggest that students are acquiring skill competencies. The aggregated data analysis indicates students' met or exceeded expected knowledge and skill outcomes in 7 of the 9 areas assessed. Knowledge related to theories of individual and family development across the lifespan (CACREP F.3-j,) and theories and models of career development and decision making (CACREP F.4-a) did not meet expected knowledge performance outcomes. Faculty noted that the two measures of concerns are both in students' first year of the program.

Identified Changes &/or Program Improvements Resulting from Analysis

In terms of content areas to focus specifically on for the coming faculty year, the faculty determined that any content area with scores falling below the benchmark (3.6) for two (2) or more assessment cycles would be targeted for review.

2019 National Counselor Exam Data-Fall Administration				
Students will be able to show competence as a counselor in (a) knowledge, (b) skills, and (c) dispositions.				
NCE Content Area	CMHC Average	Above+ Below- National Mean	Benchmark: CMHC will score within 1 standard deviation below the national mean. (% above/below target)	
Human Growth & Development	7.6	-0.52	29%	MET
Social & Cultural Diversity	8	0.75	21%	MET
Helping Relationships	21.2	-2.05	23%	MET
Group Work	10.9	-0.44	21%	MET
Career Development	13.5	0.54	20%	MET
Assessment	12	-0.22	23%	MET

Research & Evaluation	7.8	-0.94	35%	MET
Professional Orientation	19.1	-1.85	18%	MET

2019 National Counselor Exam Data-Spring Administration
EVIDENCE: to score report Spring 19

NCE Content Area	CMHC Average	+ - Nat'l Mean	Benchmark	
Human Growth & Development	8.75	0.63	25%	Met
Social & Cultural Diversity	8.75	1.5	19%	Met
Helping Relationships	21	-2.25	23%	Met
Group Work	11.5	0.16	20%	Met
Career Development	12.25	-0.71	22%	Met
Assessment	11.25	-0.97	25%	Met
Research & Evaluation	8	-0.74	35%	Met
Professional Orientation	20.75	-0.2	17%	MET

National Counseling Exam Data Analysis

NCE content area scores inform our evaluation of our program objective #1. Consistent with other CACREP-accredited institutions, our benchmark is that in all NCE content areas, our students will score within one standard deviation of the National mean. For the current reporting period, benchmarks in all content areas were met: Zero (0) of the eight (8) content area scores fell 1 SD below the National average. An analysis of the results indicates that Social and Cultural Diversity content scores were above the national mean in both administrations, indicating our program prepares our students particularly well in this area. While all scores fell within one standard deviation of the National mean, several concerns were noted for further consideration. Scores in three (3) content areas were 23%-35% of one (1) standard deviation below the national mean: Helping Relationships, Assessment, and Research & Evaluation. Human Development scores were nearly 30% of one standard deviation below the mean in the Fall administration, but exceeded the National mean in the spring administration.

Identified Changes &/or Program Improvements Resulting from Analysis

As Human Development content was one identified area of concern in the KPI assessment, we will continue to closely monitor student learning and achievement in CDEV 603. As agreed upon by the department, when knowledge areas. In terms of content areas to focus specifically on for the coming faculty year, the faculty determined that should this, or any content area fall below the benchmark for two or more assessment cycles the course will be targeted for review. The Curriculum Committee would begin this process by reviewing the course syllabi and content areas addressed.

Our program's ability to students' competence in counseling and consulting skills is assessed through in aggregated student assessment (KPI-skills) and by site-supervisor evaluation. Site supervisors were provided with hard copies of the Site Supervisor Evaluation form (EVIDENCE:) and asked to evaluate students' counselling and related skills on 10 items by indicated a number 0-7 with 0 indicating unacceptable; 3-4 acceptable, and 7 superior.   The Assessment Committee collected and analyzed 14 site supervisor evaluation forms according to our pre-determined criterion for success—that by end of internship, site supervisor ratings will meet or exceed the "acceptable" rating of 4.

Skill Area Assessed by Site Supervisor	End of Program Average	Criterion Score>4	Comparison Data 2018	Remark
Conveying Genuineness	6.4	MET	6.6	Consistently highest
Conducing Conditions	6.1	MET	6.6	
Acceptance	6.6	MET	6.7	Consistently highest

Clarity	6.3	MET	6.5	
Intentional use of theory/technique	6.0	MET	6.5	Lower than other ratings
Group Counseling Skills	6.0	MET	6.7	
Integration of theory/practice	6.0	MET	6.5	Lower than other ratings
Treatment planning/record keeping	6.0	MET	6.7	
Consultation-Professionals	6.3	MET	6.6	
Consultation-Others	6.0	MET	6.3	Lower than other ratings
Average Rating	6.2	MET		

Site Supervisor Evaluation Data Analysis

Site supervisors evaluated students' counseling skills at the end of internship. The average score across students and skill area was 6.2 on a scale of 0-7 where 0 indicates 'unacceptable' and 7 indicates "superior" counseling/consulting skill demonstration. All scores were in the acceptable range or higher and exceeded our criterion of success, indicating that our CMHC program prepares students to demonstrate competence in counseling skills. The strongest ratings for this graduating cohort were in demonstrating acceptance of clients, although site supervisors rated students as nearly superior on all items. While not of significant concern, the Assessment Committee notes that skills in integrating theory and practice and skills in consulting with others in clients' system were consistently lower than other ratings.

Identified Changes &/or Program Improvements Resulting from Analysis

The 2019 site supervisor evaluations are consistent with last year's report. Strengths and potential skills to target are identified above.   In the last program evaluation period, Student Review data was also used to measure counseling skills. While revising our program evaluation plan, the assessment and CMHC program faculty found that the student review process did not adequately evaluate students' skills. Our intention is to begin collecting and analyzing site supervisor evaluation of students' counseling and consulting skills at 3 points in students' fieldwork: the completion of practicum, after 300 hours of internship, and after the completion of internship or 600 hours. In the Fall of 2019, the CMHC chair proposed changes to the current site supervisor evaluation form to improve accuracy in skill assessment. The Assessment Committee and CMHC faculty have identified a plan for moving forward that includes soliciting input from site supervisors and researching additional tools for measuring skill development in counselors-in-training to better inform this program objective.

Program Evaluation Related to Student Dispositions

Aggregate dispositional data is compiled annually by the Assessment Committee and used to evaluate program effectiveness around this component of objective 1. Professional disposition data on 8 key indicators is collected at three points in the students' program: upon completion of 9 credits (Degree Candidacy Review,) just prior to entry into fieldwork (Pre-Fieldwork Review,) and at program completion. Dispositional data available for analysis at this time includes average score across dispositional items for the May 2019 graduating cohort.

Professional Dispositions (Aggregate Data for Program Evaluation)				
Data Point	May 2019 Data	Criteria Assessment	May 2018 Data	May 2017 Data
Degree Candidacy	3.59	MET	3.36	3.70
Pre-Fieldwork	3.79	MET	3.79	4.00

End of Program	4.8	MET	not avail	4.40
Criteria: Avg. Indicator > 1 at Degree Candidacy; > 2 at Pre-Fieldwork; > 3 at End of Fieldwork				
Rating Scale: 1-absent; 2=somewhat emerging; 3=emerging; 4=somewhat evident; 5=evident				

Professional Disposition Data Analysis

The CMHC grading in May of 2019 demonstrate the dispositions of a professional counselor. Students were evaluated specifically on the dispositional measure twice since they began the program: (1) Upon successfully completing 9 credits and applying for degree candidacy; just before beginning fieldwork. Data from the final dispositional measurement was not available for this cohort. Students' scores on dispositional measurements improved from degree candidacy to graduation. Data from the 2018 and 2017 graduating cohorts was available for comparative analysis and show similar growth across time.

Identified Changes &/or Program Improvements Resulting from Analysis

In response to feedback offered by site reviewers and in consultation with program faculty and the Assessment Committee, the Student Review Coordinator began revising the process for collecting, analyzing and reporting professional disposition data. In the Spring semester of 2019, the proposed revisions were presented to the department. As other programs (Student Affairs in Higher Education) in our department utilize the current Student Review process to meet their assessment and evaluation requirements, this process has been complicated and has moved slowly. To align our assessment of student disposition process with 2016 CACREP standards related to assessment of students and admissions decisions, a number of potential improvements were identified:

Program Improvement Target	Progress Report-May 2019
1. Review disposition-like assessments needed by other programs in department	Completed 11/19
2. Provide students with dispositional expectations earlier in the program	To be added to agenda for Spring 2020 Orientation
3. Make professional disposition info more accessible	Current Disposition rating form on D2L-will post revision by 12/2019
4. Use the orientation process and ongoing consultations with their advisors to discuss/provide feedback in dispositional areas	In progress…Student Review Coordinator developing guides for faculty/coaching model
5. Add additional disposition measurement at the at the application and interview phases of admission to the program	Completed 12/2019—Approved revisions sent to University Graduate Admissions office-will be available for next set of applicants
6. Consider additional data collection point between pre-field and end of program	Approved-added evaluation after 300 hours of fieldwork
7. Revise current disposition assessment instrument	Revised and gone to CMHC program faculty for approval for use in Jan. 2020.

Program Evaluation-Objective 2 (Cultural Competence)

Data related to our program's ability to produce counselors who can provide culturally competent and effective services in an increasingly diverse society included Student Review ratings and the diversity subscale score on the NCE. Unlike previous annual report, aggregate data related to the Social and cultural Diversity Indicator (CDEV 621) is also considered in this evaluation of objective 2.

Diversity/Cultural Competence (Aggregate Data for Program Evaluation)			
Student Review Evaluation	Degree Candidacy	Pre-Fieldwork	End of Program	Outcome
	3.86	4.59	4.94	MET

Criteria: Avg. Indicator > 1 at Degree Candidacy; $\geq$ 2 at Pre-Fieldwork; $\geq$ 3 at End of Fieldwork

Rating Scale: 1-absent; 2=somewhat emerging; 3=emerging; 4=somewhat evident; 5=evident

NCE-Diversity Subscale	CMHC Fall	National Average/SD	CMHC Spring	National Average/SD
	8	7.25/1.70	8.75	7.25/1.70

Criteria: Students mean score will be within 1 standard deviation of the National Mean	MET
Key Performance Indicator (CDEV 621) — Average Score on KPI (now 2nd semester)=3.63	MET

Criteria: Score $\geq$ 3.5 (between emerging & evident)

Formal Student Review data were gathered two key points in the program; upon the students' completion of 9 credits/degree candidacy and just prior to beginning fieldwork. The mean number was compared to the criterion to determine if our objective was met. All items were assessed on a five-point scale as follows: 1= absent, 2= somewhat emerging, 3= emerging, 4 = somewhat evident, 5 = very evident. According to the criterion of assessment, the expected outcome was achieved at each data point. The results indicate an increase in average competency from DC to FW. These results suggest this program was effective in moving students from emerging cultural competence to somewhat evident cultural competency between start of program and entry into fieldwork.

The NCE criterion for success related to this program objective was met. This cohort scored above the National mean on the Social and Cultural Diversity content area in both the fall and spring administrations of the exam.

To strengthen our understanding of performance related to this program objective, we evaluated students' collective performance on the KPI for Diversity. Scores on the indicator were above the criterion benchmark.

Program Evaluation-Objective 3 (Professional Identity)

New: Our evaluation plan indicates two indicators related to our program's ability to meet objective 3: students will develop a professional counseling identity:

Professional Identity Indicator		2019 Data
Job Placement Rate	Percentage of program graduates working in professional counseling-related field Alumni Surveyed every 3 years.	Job Placement Rate (Avg. 3 yrs) =86% *Criteria-yet to be determined*

Steps toward Licensure	Percentage of students taking the NCE prior to or within 1 year of program completion.	*New-beginning with Fall 2020 cohort.*
Professional Affiliations	Membership in professional organizations & honor society *(Beginning Spring 2020).*	*New-beginning with Fall 2020 cohort.*

Report Summary

The results of the present program evaluation indicate that program objectives are being met, and in some cases exceeded.

- Number of May 2018 CMHC Graduates: 16

- Licensure or certification pass rate: 10

Conclusions

To do after Reviewing 2019 Report:
In order to measure development over time (Phase 2), at the end of Fall or beginning of spring semesters (TBD) CMHC students will be given the CPCE, an examination administered by the NBCC that carries CACREP related student performance indicator standards. The results of the CPCE can then be compared with the Fall semester results to decipher student academic growth from early stages of graduate work to mid and later stages.

- In order to assess later stage growth (Phase 3), the department will rely on site supervisor evaluations of students' internship work, therefore acting as the third measure through time of students in the CMHC program
- Revisit 4-point rubric used to translate scores on measures/assignments where 0=not met (versus 1=not met).
- Identified student dispositions will continue to go through the student review process and given performance review forms and will be interpreted using the rubric scoring system listed above for continued uniformity of data.
  1. Compare KPIs from 18-19 AY with Phase 2 & 3 data collection
  2. Phase 2 & 3 student data collection would be aligned with the same KPIs collected in Phase 1—consider using CPCE testing of the same CMHC students for Phase 2 and site evaluations for students in their 3rd year of the CMHC program to strengthen data.