

## Annual Program Review: 2016

Review Date: October 12, 2016

The LSU Counselor Education program is evaluated on an annual basis and the report is submitted to LSU as part of its Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation. This evaluation involves data collection, evaluation of student learning outcomes for each program objective, and a review of annual progress towards stated goals for each objective. These reports are submitted to the University in the fall of each year. The 2015-2016 report is attached to this program review document (See Appendix A for the Taskstream report).

The results of this program review are discussed at an annual faculty review meeting in October of each year. In addition to our review of SACS report, we also reviewed additional program evaluation data that are collected and compiled as part of our CACREP accreditation. While some of the data collected for SACS overlap with CACREP requirements, CACREP requires additional assessment and evaluation that are not captured in the SACS report. Therefore, this document supplements the SACS report with additional program review data and includes our faculty review of this information.

1. *Review of mission statement and objectives.* Faculty reviewed the mission statement and objectives and believe that it currently reflects our focus on mental health and wellness. We reviewed each objective so that it reflects our program emphasis and CACREP standards. In May we reviewed our overall program effectiveness through our annual report for SACS (located on the University Taskstream database). Please see Appendix A for 2015-2016 program evaluation data reported to the University. Please also note that as of 2016 the program objectives for the Taskstream report have been modified so that they align with CACREP core objectives for both school and clinical mental health counseling programs.
2. *Review of program of study.* We reviewed our planned program of study for both concentrations and made revisions to the order of our fall, spring, and summer courses. During our meeting faculty recognized the need to move the family counseling course to a different semester so that students do not have to take the Counseling Skills and Interventions, Group Counseling, and Family Counseling all at the same time. Further, we decided that in order to reduce the number of Special Topics courses we offer, we agreed to complete New Course Proposals for approval by the LSU Courses and Curricula committee so that all of our regular course offerings will be approved and have course numbers assigned to them. We submitted four courses (Advanced School Counseling, Crisis and Trauma Counseling, Counseling Girls and Women, and Substance Abuse Counseling) to the SOE Director on October 24. WE also discussed new electives we would like to offer in 2017-18 (e.g., Advanced Techniques in Diagnosis and Treatment; Couples Counseling). See Appendix B for a copy of the revised program of study for both concentrations.

3. *Review of program applicant data.* Faculty reviewed Counselor Education applicants from last year. There were more applicants from a variety of majors, undergraduate universities, and underrepresented groups than in previous years. We also had more out of state applicants and accepted more of these students than in previous years. To assist in recruitment, we actively sought to obtain Graduate Assistantships and Tuition Awards for interested applicants from underrepresented groups. Dr. Eberts proposed to form a committee of interested students to generate ideas for recruitment of a more diverse student body, so our program can better represent the population of Louisiana. We will call this group: Advisory Council for Student Recruitment and she will begin soliciting student participation in the spring semester. We also agreed that our admissions process can be improved if we move our application deadline up (February 1<sup>st</sup>) so that students can make decisions sooner. We also decided to incorporate group interviews along with individual interviews as part of our admission process.
  
4. *Surveys of recent graduates and their employers.* Faculty also reviewed our 2014 survey of recent graduates. On a 10-point scale, the graduates scores were all in the 8.5-9.9 range for the 10 graduates who responded to the survey between 2010-2013. On the comments section, noted strengths included faculty knowledge, support, and availability; noted improvements included offering more electives and expanding field site options. Overall graduates reported that they felt well prepared for the field. We only received three (3) employer survey responses during this time period, with scores ranging from 7.9-9.1 (10 point scale); no comments offered by employers. See Appendix C for a copy of the 2014 Graduate/Employer Survey and Results.  
Faculty decided that we need to do a new graduate/employer survey of 2015 graduates. To prepare for this survey, we revised our older forms so they better reflect the kinds of information we want to collect from graduates and employers. We will conduct the new survey in November/December 2016 so that results will be ready for 2017 review.
  
5. *Site supervisor perceptions of program.* Each year during practicum and internship the faculty assess site supervisors' perceptions of our student's level of preparation. We did not have any practicum students during fall 2015 and therefore we have no new results to report.
  
6. *Exit surveys of graduates:* Each year program graduates receive an Exit survey in the month prior to graduation. This survey contains both quantitative as well as qualitative data. We did not have any graduates since our last review so there are no new data to report.
  
7. *Comprehensive Examination (CPCE) results.* All students are required to take the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination prior to graduation. The CPCE covers counselor preparation in all CACREP core areas. Our students have shown improvement in their scores since we instituted the exam in 2011, with a mean score of 105.5 (Summer, 2015). In most areas our students score at least one standard deviation higher than the national mean

- score. Students score consistently high in the areas of Professional Orientation and Ethics as well as in Helping Skills and Theories. We did not have any students take the CPCE since Summer, 2015 so we have no new data to report. Starting in 2017 the CPCE will be administered in a computerized format, so we are preparing for our first computerized CPCE administration in March 2017.
8. *Site supervisor evaluation of students.* We use the Counseling and Counselor Skills Scale (CCSS) to evaluate student progress at midterm and final during practicum and internship. We did not offer practicum and internship during fall 2015 or spring 2016, so we have no new data to report.
  9. *Faculty supervisor evaluation of students:* We use the Counseling and Counselor Skills Scale (CCSS) to evaluate student progress at the end of the skills course and then again at midterm and final during practicum and internship. We did not offer practicum and internship during fall 2015 or spring 2016 so we have no new data to report.
  10. *Student site evaluation review:* Each semester during practicum and internship, students have the opportunity to evaluate their sites. Prior to 2015, the evaluation form included questions about both the site supervisor as well as the site. We revised the form to create two separate documents: a Site Evaluation form and a Site Supervisor Evaluation form. In this way we can collect data about both the site as well as the supervisor's strengths/areas for improvement. We did not offer practicum and internship during fall 2015 or spring 2016 so we have no new data to report.
  11. *Student faculty, site supervisor evaluation.* Prior to spring 2015, evaluation of the faculty supervisor was combined with a student's evaluation of the practicum or internship course. In addition, a student's evaluation of his or her site supervisor had been combined with his/her evaluation of the particular site. We felt this was an ineffective evaluation tool because it is much more useful to review student responses to these aspects of their learning separately: evaluation of site, evaluation of site supervisor, evaluation of faculty supervisor, and evaluation of practicum or internship course. We have corrected this problem by creating 4 separate forms for students to complete at the end of practicum and internship. We implemented these new forms during internship, 2015. We did not offer practicum and internship during fall 2015 or spring 2016 so we have no new data to report.
  12. *Student Practicum, Internship class course evaluation:* See explanation for #11 above for our rationale in creating a separate course evaluation form for practicum and internship starting in 2015. Our current course evaluation form for both practicum and internship is now the official LSU Course Evaluation forms that are distributed and compiled by LSU each semester. These summaries are distributed to faculty and kept on file in the School of Education office. We did not offer practicum and internship during fall 2015 or spring 2016 so we have no new data to report.
  13. *CACREP Core Standards and Core Course Rubric Templates.* To demonstrate how Student Learning Outcomes are specifically tied to CACREP Core

Standards, we created a master chart of all CACREP Core Standards and the associated course in which that standard is specifically addressed and assessed. For each core course we created a Course Rubric that lists each CACREP standard addressed in the course and how that standard is specifically assessed. Rubrics for all core courses are included in Appendix D. A rubric is completed for each student at the completion of the course. All rubrics are reviewed and compiled by the faculty member at the end of each semester and are reviewed annually at our Faculty Review meeting. Because this is the first year in which we are implementing these rubrics, this year we reviewed the rubric scoring guides and actual scores to ensure better faculty consistency. There was variation among faculty in terms of how scores were assigned, so we all agreed on the following scoring system: 1 = did not meet expectation; 2 = meets expectations (demonstrated learning and mastery of material; 3 = exceeds expectations (demonstrated learning and mastery of material beyond what would be expected for a course at this level). We also decided that instead of using paper copies, we will now record these data onto Excel spread sheets so that course means for each standard can be easily totaled.

14. *Review of CACREP School, CMHC Standards:* To demonstrate how Student Learning Outcomes are specifically tied to CACREP Specialization standards (School, Clinical Mental Health Counseling), we created a master chart of all CACREP specialization standards for School and Clinical Mental Health Counseling. In addition, for each course we created a Course Rubric that lists each CACREP specialization standard addressed in the course and how that standard is specifically assessed. Specialization Rubrics are also located in Appendix D. All rubrics are reviewed and compiled by the faculty member at the end of each semester and are reviewed annually at our Faculty Review meeting. Because this is the first year in which we are implementing these rubrics, this year we reviewed the rubric scoring guides and actual scores to ensure better faculty consistency. There was variation among faculty in terms of how scores were assigned, so we all agreed on the following scoring system: 1 = did not meet expectation; 2 = meets expectations (demonstrated learning and mastery of material; 3 = exceeds expectations (demonstrated learning and mastery of material beyond what would be expected for a course at this level). We also decided that instead of using paper copies, we will now record these data onto Excel spread sheets so that course means for each standard can be easily totaled.
15. *Review of Student Review Forms.* To consistently address student academic, professional, and personal growth across the entire program, the Student Review Form was created and was first implemented in Spring 2016 with all students. Prior to that time, we had assessed student development primarily through the CCSS in the practicum and internship courses only. We recognized that students should receive systematic feedback about their growth across the entire program. Therefore, advisors will review the form with students in Spring of their 1<sup>st</sup> year, Spring of their 2<sup>nd</sup> year (prior to practicum), and Spring of their 3<sup>rd</sup> year (prior to graduation). See Appendix

E for a copy of the Student Review Form. We conducted meetings with students and kept copies of these forms and meetings in student files. In our review meeting we reviewed each student separately to discuss concerns and progress in the program.

16. *Review of the Comprehensive Assessment Matrix.* To assist with future data collection, our review process was formally documented in table form and was reviewed this year. See Appendix F for a copy of the Comprehensive Assessment Matrix. It includes items under the following headings: General Program Assessment, Professional Identity Assessment, Professional Practice Assessment, and Student Formative and Summative Assessment.