



Spring 2016, Summer 2016, and Fall 2016

Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Assessment Plan and Report

(Document student learning outcomes assessment plans and assessment data for each undergraduate and graduate degree program and certificate program, stand-alone minor, and distance education program offered online only.)

College: College of Education

Department: Counseling

Name of Degree or Certificate Program/Stand Alone Minor/Online Distance Education Program: _

School Counseling MA

Reflection on the Continuous Improvement of Student Learning

1. List the changes and improvements your program planned to implement as a result of last year's student learning outcomes assessment data.
2. Were all of the changes implemented? If not, please explain.
3. What impact did the changes have on student learning?

For year 2016, we aligned our Student Learning Outcome (SLO) to the 2016 CACREP standards. These changes required us to identify a new SLO and performance measures. Therefore, the first two data points are assessed using different measures and do not directly related to the outcomes or performance measures from 2015. These changes are fully described in this report. Overall, the changes demonstrate a continued positive impact on student learning for the School Counseling Program.

Student Learning Outcome 1

Professional School Counseling students will be able to use accountability data to inform decision making.

Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan: If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes.

We revised our Student Learning Outcomes Assessment plan since our last submission to align with the 2016 CACREP standards. Therefore, the SLO for this program has also been revised to reflect current knowledge, skills, and abilities that candidates need to possess based on these revised national standards. The effective measure, methodology, and performance outcomes were also revised to ensure the SLO was assessed via multiple measures and multiple points in time. The effective measures now include rubrics in CSLG 7141 and CSLG 7646 and the Praxis II exam.

Effectiveness Measure: Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability.

1. Academic Development and Social/Emotional Data Project: students analyze faux program data to develop SMART goals for students' academic and social/emotional data. (CSLG 7141)
2. Data and Advocacy Project: students analyze school data at their internship sites and develop an intervention to address a student need. (CSLG 7646)
3. Praxis II exam: specifically covers the standard, "knows how to apply data analysis results for program improvement" (p. 10, The Praxis Study Companion).

Methodology: Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data.

1. The first point is in CSLG 7141, when students complete and receive feedback on their data project. Projects were evaluated by detailed rubrics. Students were assessed during their first semester in the program. This is a new measure with different rubrics and scoring than the 2015 portfolio measure.
2. The second point is in CSLG 7646, when students complete and receive feedback on their data and advocacy project. Projects were evaluated by detailed rubrics. Students were assessed during the midpoint of the program. This measure replaces the SFECT from 2015.
3. The third point is in their final semester, when students take the state Praxis II exam. The *PRAXIS School Counseling and Guidance* examination consists of 120 items and is taken during the final semester the candidate is enrolled in the program to measure their professional school counseling knowledge. The results are electronically scored by ETS.Org and disseminated to students and the College of Education Teacher Education, Advising, and Licensure (TEAL). The PRAXIS was revised in 2013 with a new passing score. This measure is consistent with the 2015 measure.

Scores from performance measures in CSLG 7141, cslg 7646, and the PRAXIS School Counseling and Guidance exam are collected using TaskStream data management system, and are analyzed at the college and program level. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by semester at three levels (College, Program and Licensure Area). Once a year results from all assessments administered by the programs are disseminated to the faculty in the College of Education. The data is discussed during a final faculty meeting and next steps are determined to address any needs identified. All strategies determined during this closing the loop discussion are implemented during the next academic year. All data reports created by the Cato College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to all faculty members within the College.

Performance Outcome: Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected.

1. At least 80% of students will meet expectations by scoring a minimum of 3 on the Academic Development and Social/Emotional Data Project scoring rubric.
2. At least 80% of students will meet expectations by scoring a minimum of 3 on the Data and Advocacy Project scoring rubric.

3. At least 80% of students will pass the Praxis II exam.

Assessment Data:

Spring 2016-Summer 2016-Fall 2016 Assessment Data

| PRAXIS II | Percentage of students passing | Percentage of students passing | Percentage of students passing | Percentage of students passing |
|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Spring 2015 | Fall 2015 | Spring 2016 | Fall 2016 |
| Numbers | 5 | 6 | 8 | 0 |
| Number passing | 5 | 6 | 8 | 0 |
| Pass Rate | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0 |

| Portfolio | Percentage that Score a Minimum of 3 | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|-----------------|------------------|
| | Sum 2015 Based on old measure and SLO | Fall 2015 Based on old measure and SLO | Sum 2016 | Fall 2016 |
| Semester | | | | |
| Number | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 |
| Number scoring minimum of 3 | | | 4 | 18 |
| Meets or Exceeds Expectations | 0 | 0 | 100% | 85.72% |

| Data and Advocacy Project | Percentage that Score a Minimum of 3 | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| | Spring 2015 | Fall 2015 | Spring 2016 | Fall 2016 |
| Semester | | | | |
| Number | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| Number scoring minimum of 3 | | | 2 | 10 |
| Meets or Exceeds Expectations | 0 | 0 | 100% | 88.89% |

Additional NCE CNSL Spring 2016 Data

UNCC Results

CACREP Results

| Eight Core Areas | Items | Mean | Std Dev | N | Mean | Std Dev | N |
|---|-------|--------|---------|---|--------|---------|------|
| Human Growth & Development | 12 | 8.80 | .84 | 4 | 8.57 | 2.14 | 3171 |
| Social & Cultural Diversity | 11 | 7.80 | 1.64 | 4 | 7.08 | 2.01 | 3171 |
| Helping Relationships | 36 | 28.40 | 3.29 | 4 | 25.42 | 4.39 | 3171 |
| Group Work | 16 | 10.80 | 3.63 | 4 | 11.85 | 2.17 | 3171 |
| Career Development | 19 | 14.20 | 3.19 | 4 | 14.63 | 2.50 | 3171 |
| Assessment | 20 | 14.20 | 2.39 | 4 | 14.43 | 2.76 | 3171 |
| Research & Program Evaluation | 16 | 10.40 | 3.44 | 4 | 9.98 | 2.71 | 3171 |
| Professional Orientation & Ethical Practice | 30 | 23.80 | 1.10 | 4 | 20.96 | 3.42 | 3171 |
| Score | 160 | 118.40 | 16.33 | 4 | 112.91 | 16.86 | 3171 |
| Five Work Behavior Domains | | | | | | | |
| Fundamental Counseling Issues | 32 | 23.40 | 3.85 | 4 | 22.74 | 3.86 | 3171 |
| Counseling Process | 45 | 34.60 | 5.37 | 4 | 33.68 | 5.25 | 3171 |
| Diagnostic & Assessment Services | 25 | 16.40 | 3.44 | 4 | 16.31 | 3.59 | 3171 |
| Professional Practice | 38 | 27.40 | 4.83 | 4 | 25.84 | 4.63 | 3171 |
| Prof. Dev. Supervision & Consultation | 20 | 16.60 | 1.82 | 4 | 14.34 | 2.66 | 3171 |
| Score | 160 | 118.40 | 16.33 | 4 | 112.91 | 16.86 | 3171 |

Additional NCE CNSL Fall 2016 Data

UNCC Results

CACREP Results

| Eight Core Areas | Items | Mean | Std Dev | N | Mean | Std Dev | N |
|---|-------|--------|---------|---|--------|-----------|------|
| Human Growth & Development | 12 | 9.33 | 1.75 | 5 | 8.57 | 2.14 | 3171 |
| Social & Cultural Diversity | 11 | 9.50 | 1.64 | 5 | 7.08 | 2.01 | 3171 |
| Helping Relationships | 36 | 27.33 | 2.80 | 5 | 25.42 | 4.39 | 3171 |
| Group Work | 16 | 13.50 | 1.38 | 5 | 11.85 | 2.17 | 3171 |
| Career Development | 19 | 13.17 | 1.17 | 5 | 14.63 | 2.50 | 3171 |
| Assessment | 20 | 13.67 | 2.80 | 5 | 14.43 | 2.76 | 3171 |
| Research & Program Evaluation | 16 | 10.17 | 1.47 | 5 | 9.98 | 2.71 | 3171 |
| Professional Orientation & Ethical Practice | 30 | 24.00 | 2.10 | 5 | 20.96 | 3.42 | 3171 |
| Score | 160 | 120.70 | 7.61 | 5 | 112.91 | 16.86 | 3171 |
| Five Work Behavior Domains | | | | | | | |
| Fundamental Counseling Issues | 32 | 23.33 | 3.27 | 5 | 22.74 | 3.86.5.25 | 3171 |
| Counseling Process | 45 | 38.00 | 2.68 | 5 | 33.68 | 3.59 | 3171 |
| Diagnostic & Assessment Services | 25 | 17.00 | 2.68 | 5 | 16.31 | 4.63 | 3171 |
| Professional Practice | 38 | 27.17 | 2.14 | 5 | 25.84 | 4.63 | 3171 |
| Prof. Dev. Supervision & Consultation | 20 | 15.17 | 1.72 | 5 | 14.34 | 2.66 | 3171 |
| Score | 160 | 120.70 | 7.61 | 5 | 112.91 | 16.86 | 3171 |

Changes to be implemented Fall 2017: Based upon the 2016 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome?

Students continue to meet the expectations for the School Counseling Portfolio. One positive trend we noticed was at the first data point, 88% of students scored a "3" or higher on the rubric. This assignment was using a hypothetical data set. When students move on to CSLG 7646 and have to do an actual data project in a school setting, 100% of students met the standard. Although we met our goal of the percentage of students meeting the standard in CSLG 7141, we would like to increase that to 90% for next year. Faculty who teach CSLG 7141 will examine the assignment and directions for clarity, will examine what aspects of the assignment students are having difficulty with, provide appropriate classroom support, and make changes accordingly.