

**Comprehensive Program Evaluation Report  
Academic Year Fall 2021 – Summer 2022**

**1. Graduate Assessment Survey- Data Report and Evaluation**

**2. Graduate Employer Survey- Data and Evaluation**

Data collected from the Graduate Assessment Survey and the Graduate employer Survey since the onset of COVID is insufficient at this time for any viable program evaluation. Efforts underway to gather data for 2022-2023 will be outlined below in Program Modifications.

**3. The Midpoint Review- Data and Evaluation**

The Assessment Committee established a benchmark of 80% pass rate for all students taking the Midpoint Exam in any term. That is, in any term in which less than 80% of all students taking the Midpoint Exam pass the exam, faculty will investigate the specific areas of the exam (i.e., the eight CACREP Core Areas) in which the deficiencies occurred, evaluate the course mapping, course content, and make essential program modifications.

Preliminary examination of Midpoint Exam Data from December 2020-August 2022 reveals the following results:

Date of Midpoint Exam	Total Number	Number Passed	Number Failed	Action
December 2020	9	8	1	None
April 2021	5	5	0	None
July 2021	3	3	0	None
December 2021	5	5	0	None
April 2022	10	10	0	None
July 2022	6	6	0	None

**Analysis and Utilization**

The table above, representing pass/fail rates for the six iterations of the Midpoint Exam (Academic Years 2020-2021 and 2021-2022), shows that each of the three iterations met the benchmark of 80% pass rate on the first attempt.

Should the benchmark on any iteration of the Midpoint Exam not meet the benchmark of 80% pass rate, the faculty Midpoint Administrator will review the exam of the one who failed and identify which of the eight core areas was problematic. Faculty will evaluate course syllabi

and content, as well as the Midpoint Study Guide, for opportunities to strengthen that area. If data from the Midpoint Exam continues to be non-discriminating and thus disallowing significant assessment of aspects of the program, it will be revamped with more discriminating items, or discontinued as an assessment piece. Consideration will be given to implementing the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE) or the CECE as a Midpoint Exam.

**4. The National Counseling Exam- Data and Evaluation**

The Assessment Committee originally established a benchmark of one standard deviation below the national average in any area on the given exam. That is, for our institution, if the aggregate average score in any of the core areas of the NCE is one standard deviation or more below the national average score in that area, faculty will investigate the specific areas of the exam (i.e., CACREP Core Areas) in which the deficiencies occurred, evaluate the course mapping, course content, and make essential program modifications.

**Analysis and Utilization**

During the Spring 2022 administration of the National Counselor Examination for Licensure and Certification (NCE), a total of 3 CMHC students and 2 School Counseling students took the NCE and all 5 passed. The National average score was 108.85. JSU CMHC students scored an average of 103, and the SCO (School Counseling) students scored an average of 109. (This is evidence of monumental progress, as only 27 % passed the NCE only 15 years ago.) On the 8 core areas, the students scored at or above one standard deviation under the national average in all core areas.

Fall 2018						
Program	Core Area	# Questions	JSU Average Correct	Standard Deviation	National Average Correct	Standard Deviation
SCO						
	Research & Prog. Eval	7	4.0	1.00	5.13	1.28

While students in all core areas scored at least within one standard deviation below the national average, it is noted that scoring in the core area of Research & Program Evaluation among those in the SCO program came the closest to not meeting this benchmark of one standard deviation below the national average.

This benchmark of one standard deviation below the national average has enabled faculty to examine course content and other program areas (i.e., NCE Preparation course, etc.) for positive actions that could be taken to improve scoring in these areas. At this point, it is the suggestion

of the Assessment Committee that a new benchmark for the NCE be established: Rather than one standard deviation below the national average in any area on the given exam, the new benchmark will be one half (.50) of one standard deviation below the national average in any area of the given exam.

## **5. Site Supervisors' Assessment of Practicum and Internship Students- Data and Evaluation**

The Assessment Committee established a benchmark of a 2.5 overall mean score on the 26-item survey of the Site Supervisor Assessment of Counseling Practicum and Internship Students. In other words, if/when site supervisors' overall mean score on any survey item reports a 2.5 or below, then the content of that item will fall under scrutiny by the Assessment Committee and will be included in the report to program faculty for further investigation.

A cumulative total of Site Supervisor Evaluations from the past three full academic years (2019-2020, 2020-2021, 2021-2022) revealed that no overall mean score on any item fell below the previously shed benchmark of 2.5.

### **Analysis and Utilization**

The results are as follows:

In the most recent Academic Year 2021-2022, a total of 58 Site Supervisors completed the evaluation on LiveText.

The highest mean score was 3.93 and appeared one time corresponding to the following item:

“Responds appropriately to constructive feedback from supervisor.” This item has consistently scored the highest on the evaluation.

The lowest mean score was 3.29 and appeared one time corresponding to the following item:

“Uses assessment data in making treatment or referral decisions.”

Furthermore, average scores of 3.31 and 3.34, just slightly higher than the low of 3.29 mentioned above, both also relate to testing, assessment, and data usage.

## **6. Standards Outcome Report**

The Assessment Committee established a benchmark of 2.5 or less on any standard outcome. That is, any standard in a term which results in an aggregate score of 2.5 or less, faculty will investigate the corresponding course content, evaluation instruments, and rubrics for the identified CACREP standard and make essential program modifications.

The Assessment Committee had previously noted an aberration in the data report specific to the Standards Outcome Report in previous semesters. Further investigation revealed some inconsistencies in rubric construction. For example, some rubrics were developed using a 3-point scale instead of a 4-point scale and certain elements were weighted whereas others were not. To

neutralize this discrepancy, the Assessment Committee included the average percentages corresponding to the standards in question. Recommendation was made to faculty to review and make corrections as necessary in constructing rubrics to ensure consistency across rubrics and facilitate accurate data interpretation. This evaluation and modification of rubrics is ongoing. The Assessment Committee recommended that for the purpose of interpreting data, the Average Percentage should be used in lieu of the Element Average points. For example, the benchmark of 2.5 or less on a scale of 4.0 corresponded to an average percentage of 62.5%.

### **Analysis and Utilization**

The Standards Outcome Report for previous Academic Years 2018-2019 (Fall 2018, Spring 2019, & Summer 2019) and 2019-2020, revealed only one standard with an aggregate score falling below 62.5%:

5.C.3.a Intake interview, mental status evaluation, biopsychosocial history, mental health history, and psychological assessment for treatment planning and caseload management

To advance the rigor of the evaluation process, the benchmark for the CACREP CORE Standards evaluation was raised to an average percentage of 75%.

For the most recent academic year, 2021-2022 (Fall 2021, Spring 2022, Summer 2022), **though in the aggregate, the % of the following standards may have exceeded the benchmark 75%, a semester-by-semester review reveals that the following standards did not meet the required benchmark of 75% in specific semesters in which the standard was assessed:**

Core Standard 2.F.1.b. the multiple professional roles and functions of counselors across specialty areas, and their relationships with human service and integrated behavioral health care systems, including interagency and interorganizational collaboration and consultation (72%)

Core Standard 2.F.2.g. the impact of spiritual beliefs on clients' and counselors' worldviews (68%)

Core Standard 2.F.5.g. essential interviewing, counseling, and case conceptualization skills (73%)

Core Standard 2.F.5.h developmentally relevant counseling treatment or intervention plans (63%)

Core Standard 2.F.5.i development of measurable outcomes for clients (62%)

Core Standard 2.F.7.1 use of assessment results to diagnose developmental, behavioral, and mental disorders (67%)

Specialty Standard CMHC 5.C.1.a history and development of clinical mental health counseling (61%)

Specialty Standard CMHC 5.C.1.e psychological tests and assessments specific to clinical mental health counseling (61%)

Specialty Standard CMHC 5.C.2.f impact of crisis and trauma on individuals with mental health diagnoses (61%)

Specialty Standard CMHC 5.C.2.g impact of biological and neurological mechanisms on mental health (61%)

Specialty Standard CMHC 5.C.2.j cultural factors relevant to clinical mental health counseling (61%)

Specialty Standard CMHC 5.C.2.m record keeping, third-party reimbursement, and other practice and management issues in clinical mental health counseling (61%)

Note: Several other standards in various sections (2.F.3. a-f, h-i and 2.F.5. a-e, for example) hovered slightly above the 75% benchmark; the faculty was requested to take note of those standards as the next academic year (2022-2023) proceeds.

## **Summary of Academic Year 2021-2022**

The faculty met during early Fall 2022 to discuss findings and review recommendations of the Assessment Committee. It has been noted that efforts to strengthen the core area of assessment do appear to be maintaining a statistically level average over the past three assessment cycles. It is evident that intensive scrutiny needs to be given to a more thorough understanding of the assessment process, interpretation and utilization of data, and counselor-in-training confidence and competence in this area.

## **Program modifications**

The faculty reviewed recommendations of the Assessment Committee and agreed that, in response to the program evaluation outcomes, the following strategies will be implemented in 2022-2023, and results of these implementation will be evaluated at the end of the next data cycle, academic year 2022-2023:

1. A review of CACREP Core Standards Grids, mapping Core Standards to program courses, will seek to ensure that the identified “weak” standards, listed in section 6 above, are covered in the appropriate courses. The same will hold for Specialty Standards, CMHC, and SCO.
2. There are 12 CACREP Standards that need to be enhanced (as listed in Section 6 above). Attention will be given to adding one of the identified twelve standards to one appropriate course for each standard (in addition to the three courses currently tied to each standard in the Mapping

Grid), identify the major artifact that will give students opportunity to reflect proficiency in the standard, modify the scoring rubric to include the added Standard, and collect additional data for the next academic year, (Fall 2022, Spring 2023, Summer 2023), and re-evaluate the 12 Standards.

3. Faculty members will review these 12 Standards considering his/her courses to identify which Standard (s) could appropriately be added to his/her course (s) based upon the Standard matching that specific Course Content.
4. All relevant rubrics tied to major artifacts in identified courses need immediate attention. A rubric work session will be scheduled in the current Fall 2022, where faculty will work together to edit, update, or revise the identified artifacts and assessment rubrics that address the standards. Content of rubrics as well as consistency of form will be sought.
5. The faculty will explore the creation of specific learning modules that would address weak scoring on specific CACREP Standards and use these learning modules in several strategic and applicable courses to ensure that the Standard is being met.
6. Special scrutiny is given to the area of assessment, as indicated in the Site Supervisors' evaluation. This will include the content of the ECG 501 Assessment course, as well as other courses in which assessment and data interpretation and utilization are included. This also addresses the one area from the NCE that was identified as the weakest- Research and Program Evaluation.
7. The faculty adopted a new benchmark for the NCE of one-half (.50) standard deviation below the national average. That is, any average score on any of the eight core areas assessed on the NCE, of students from JSU who take the NCE in any administration, that falls .50 standard deviations below the national average on that administration, will subject that content area to faculty evaluation and subsequent modification. (This is a change from the benchmark of one standard deviation below the national average.) While we are incredibly pleased that JSU students are at or slightly above the national average recently, it remains our goal to reach the point where all JSU counselor education students will score above the national average in aggregate, as well as in each of the 8 core areas.
8. To collect the forever elusive graduate and employer evaluation data, the following actions will be taken:
  - a, The JSU Alumni Office will be enlisted to provide contact information for all program graduates for the past 5 years. A link to the Graduate Assessment Survey will be sent to stakeholders.

b. Links to the Graduate Assessment Survey and the Graduate Employer Survey will be posted on the Counselor Education website.

c. both surveys will be presented to members of the Advisory Council in the Spring of 2023. The Council is comprised of both program graduates and employers.

Additional Note: Faculty have begun work on modifications that attempt to address deficiencies in the identified core and specialty standards in specific courses. Examples include the following standards and corresponding courses:

Core Standard 5 C 1 a history and development of Clinical Mental Health Counseling

ECG 553 Theory and Process of Counseling

Create a Learning Module on the History/Development of CMHC and modify the course Rubric to include the Added Standard.

Core Standard 2.F.1.b the multiple professional roles and functions of counselors across specialty areas, and their relationships with human service and integrated behavioral health care systems, including interagency and inter-organizational collaboration and consultation

ECG 588 Crisis Counseling

Discussion and role-play scenarios of Crisis Response Teams and Critical Incident Stress Management Teams. This is an important topic when talking about law enforcement responses to mental illness and crisis and how programs like The Stepping-up Initiative are having an impact in communities.

Core Standard 2.F.2.g The impact of spiritual beliefs on clients' and counselors'

worldviews ECG 588 Crisis Counseling

Group assignments to explore how different groups or cultures react and live with trauma.

Examples might include growing up in areas like Iran, Palestine, Israel, Afghanistan and now Ukraine. Lecture, discussion, and group presentations incorporating current events.

Core Standard 2.F.5.k strategies to promote client understanding of and access to a variety of community-based resources.

ECG 588 Crisis Counseling

Students will create a resource list of community resources to share with peers.

Specialty Standard CMHC 5.C.2.f impact of crisis and trauma on individuals with mental health diagnoses.

ECG 588 Crisis Counseling

Crisis and trauma can create, confuse, and complicate a mental health diagnosis. By using scenarios and “back-to-back” role plays we can help the student understand better this dynamic.

Core Standard 2.F.5.1 Suicide prevention models and strategies

ECG 593/594 Internship

Students will conduct a classroom guidance of Suicide Prevention Models and Strategies. This will be recorded and presented to the professor and classmates. The assignment should include current statistics and strategies.

Specialty Standard CMHC 5.C.2. impact of crisis and trauma on individuals with mental health diagnoses

ECG 589 Psychological First Aid

Disaster Crisis Interview Assignment

1. Interview/assess a person who has experienced some form of disaster.
2. Using the attached page of Core Actions for direction, create a report addressing each of the 8 areas (1 paragraph/core area).
3. Use at least 2 screening assessments to support your report, you can summarize the results within one of the 8 paragraphs or have a separate paragraph(s) for assessment results.
4. Using counseling skills you have learned and acquired, and the knowledge you have obtained about PFA/Disaster Mental Health, conduct an interview/assessment and make an audio recording of the event. The audio should be at least 10 minutes in length.
5. Have an introductory paragraph(s) with descriptive information about the interviewee and the specific incident they experienced.

An effort to identify and strengthen each of the identified standards within the 2022-2023 Academic Year. Rubric data will again be evaluated in the Fall of 2023