MARSHALL | COUNSELING DEPARTMENT

AY 2022-2023 Program Evaluation Report

Prepared by Eric T. Beeson, Professor and Chair

Fall 2023

Table of Contents

Program Overview

The vision of Marshall University is to inspire learning and creativity that ignites the mind, nurtures the spirit, and fulfills the promise of a better future.

Marshall University's mission is to:

1. Offer a wide range of high quality, affordable, and accessible undergraduate, graduate, and professional education that prepares students to think, learn, work, and live in an evolving global society.
2. Create opportunities and experiences to foster understanding and appreciation of the rich diversity of thought and culture.
3. Maintain a dynamic intellectual, artistic, and cultural life by promoting and supporting research and creative activities by undergraduates, graduates, and faculty.
4. Contribute to the quality of life of the community, region, and beyond through applied research, economic development, health care, and cultural enrichment.
5. Cultivate the development of an inclusive, just, and equitable community.

The Counseling Department's mission is to prepare aspiring counselors to serve their schools and communities as ethical, competent, and culturally sensitive practitioners.

The Counseling Department offers a Master of Arts degree program in counseling with two specialty tracks: clinical mental health counseling (CMHC) and school counseling (SC). Additionally, the department facilitates one graduate certificate program: Violence, Loss, and Trauma Counseling (VoLT), which is available to students inside and outside of the degree program.

Department Objectives

The department objectives are:

- PO1: Prepare students who represent the program and the profession in ethical practice, advocacy, and professional identity.
- PO2: Provide instruction and opportunity to develop a sense of cultural awareness and sensitivity to underserved populations.
- PO3: Prepare students who are skilled in attending, conceptualization, and providing interventions for individuals, groups, and families.
- PO4: Prepare students to understand, utilize and potentially contribute to the body of research within the counseling profession.
- PO5: Encourage student development and skill in using assessments, resources, and interventions for clients relative to mental health, academic, and career development needs.
- PO6: Promote an understanding of human development and self-awareness, wellness, and resilience throughout the lifespan.

Comprehensive Assessment Plan

The Counseling Department's comprehensive assessment plan (CAP) provides an opportunity to evaluate our overall effectiveness systematically, empirically, and comprehensively in achieving our objectives and mission. Our CAP includes assessment at two levels: (1) aggregate department level and (2) individual student level.

As can be reviewed in Table 1, the department level evaluation includes: demographics and other characteristics across the student lifecycle from admission to graduation; aggregate assessment of knowledge, skills, and dispositions across key performance indicators (KPIs); student evaluations of faculty, sites, and the department as a whole; graduate outcomes; and follow-up studies of key stakeholders.

Table 2 shows the individual student level evaluation, which includes: individual assessment of knowledge, skills, and dispositions using the following: academic course grades; clinical course grades; cumulative GPA; standards of conduct and ethical practice; academic integrity; and KPIs.

Each CAP component includes the following, where applicable: instrument/data; source; how and when data is collected; when data is analyzed; performance targets; intervention triggers; and use of the data for ongoing curriculum, department, and student development. Several instruments, data sources, and analysis tools are used to complete our CAP each year.

Table 3 shows how each KPI is evaluated using at least two different methods during two different times in the student lifecycle with some combination of grades on signature assignments; the Counselor Skill Developmental Assessment (CSDA); Site Supervisor Evaluations; and National Testing. Except for the National counselor Examination (NCE), which is only used for program evaluation, all assessment points are used for both department and individual level assessment.

Department level data is generally analyzed during the fall term in preparation for the completion of the annual Program Evaluation Report (PER), whereas individual student level data is collected and analyzed at a minimum of one time per term. The results of the CAP are used to inform enhancements across all levels of the department as we evolve to meet the needs of our stakeholders and one another.

Demographics

Program Faculty

The Counseling Department included 11 full-time core faculty in AY 22-23. As can be seen in the Tables 4 and 5, we had more faculty than our historical average, which coincides with our enrollment increases. Table 6 shows that the majority of faculty identified as Female (55%) and had an average age of 49.80. The ratio of male to female faculty was smaller in the core faculty, meaning there were about the same

number of male and female core faculty while adjunct faculty were more predominately female. No data regarding other gender categorization was available during this year. As can be seen in Table 7, adjunct faculty tended to be a little younger than core faculty.

Applicants for Enrollment

As can be seen in Table 8, the Counseling Department had 157 applicants in AY 22-23 with most applying for the CMHC area of emphasis (66%). The percentage of applicants in the SC area of emphasis continues to decrease from our historical average. The largest percentage of applicants identified as White (80%) followed by Black or African American (6%). Most applicants identified as female (84%) and first-generation college students (66%).

Newly Enrolled Students

As can be seen in Tables 9 and 10, The Counseling Department had 160 new enrollments in AY 22-23 with most enrolling for the CMHC area of emphasis (55%). The largest percentage of enrolled students identified as White (81%) followed by Black or African American (6%). Most enrolled students identified as female (84%) and first-generation college students (68%). Table 11 shows that enrolled students lived in 16 states, with the largest percentage being from WV (73%). The average age of applicants and newly enrolled students was 30.97 ($SD = 9.26$).

Graduates

As can be seen in Table 12, the Counseling Department had 87 graduates in AY 22-23 with most graduating from the CMHC area of emphasis (60%). The largest percentage of graduates identified as White (90%) followed by Black (5%). Most graduates identified as female (85%).

On average, students finished the program in 6.41 terms ($SD = 2.03$) with a range of 4 to 13 terms to complete. The average GPA of graduates was 3.78 ($SD = 0.23$).

Aggregate Assessment of Knowledge, Skills, & Dispositions

During the annual department level evaluation period, a KPI Face Sheet was created that shows the following: department mission; relevant CACREP Domain; KPI; relevant department objectives; and results for each method and point in time the KPI was evaluated. Each KPI Face Sheet provided aggregate data to be used for department level evaluation of students' knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be used for ongoing program enhancement.

Each KPI was evaluated using a combination of two or more methods (grades on a signature assignment; CSDA; Site Supervisor Evaluation; and/or National Testing) over two or more points of time.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

The KPIs are linked to various *2016 CACREP Standards* as well as our program objectives (in parentheses) and include a blend of both knowledge and skills:

- KPI 1.1 Students will demonstrate the ability to identify key components of a strong professional identity (2.F.1., PO1, PO3, PO6)
- KPI 1.2 Students will demonstrate ethical reasoning skills. (2.F.1., PO1, PO3, PO6)
- KPI 2.1 Students will demonstrate understanding of the impact diversity has on the counseling process. (2.F.2., PO2)
- KPI 2.2 Demonstrate the ability to incorporate multicultural competencies in counseling skills. (2.F.2., PO2)
- KPI 3.1 Students will demonstrate understanding of developmental theories regarding personality development, learning, and social functioning. (2.F.3., PO4, PO6)
- KPI 3.2 Students will demonstrate skills in identifying developmental barriers that affect client behavior and experience. (2.F.3., PO4, PO6)
- KPI 4.1 Students will demonstrate knowledge and skill in applying career development theories, strategies and techniques to specific career decision-making situations (2.F.4., PO4, PO5)
- KPI 4.2 Students will demonstrate an ability to utilize career assessment instruments and techniques relevant to career planning and decision making (2.F.4., PO4, PO5)
- KPI 5.1 Students will demonstrate an understanding of the structure of the counseling process and how this structure helps determine counseling practices from various theoretical perspectives (2.F.5., PO1, PO2, PO3, PO5)
- KPI 5.2 Students will demonstrate a developing approach to counseling, assessment, diagnosis, supervision, and client advocacy with a clear understanding of counselor functions (2.F.5., PO1, PO2, PO3, PO5)
- KPI 6.1 Students will evaluate the principles of group dynamics, including group process components, developmental stage theories, group members' roles and behaviors, and therapeutic factors of group work. (2.F.6., PO3)
- KPI 6.2 Students will demonstrate skills in planning and implementing an appropriate group intervention/program. (2.F.6., PO3)
- KPI 7.1 Students will demonstrate an understanding of the purpose and process of assessment in counseling. (2.F.7., PO4, PO5)
- KPI 7.2 Students will demonstrate skills in conducting, interpreting, and reporting results for select assessment instruments. (2.F.7., PO4, PO5)
- KPI 8.1 Students will demonstrate the skills necessary to obtain, analyze, and review current literature on a chosen topic. (2.F.8., PO4)
- KPI 8.2 Students will demonstrate skills in basic statistical analysis of data. (2.F.8., PO4)
- KPI 9.1 Students will demonstrate knowledge of the numerous roles and responsibilities of the PK-12 school counselor with regard to assessment, intervention, planning, and implementation of comprehensive school

counseling and guidance programs as it relates to the ASCA National Model to address all student's academic, career and personal/social needs while following the ASCA Ethical Standards, applicable WVDE Policies, and appropriate legal statutes. (5.G.)

- KPI 9.2 Students will demonstrate skills in planning, delivering and evaluating comprehensive school counseling and guidance programs for PK-12 students following the ASCA National Model, ASCA Ethical Standards, applicable WVDE Policies, and appropriate legal statutes (5.G.)
- KPI 9.3 Students will illustrate the impact of technology in the numerous roles and responsibilities of the PK-12 school counselor with regard to assessment, intervention, planning, and implementation of comprehensive school counseling and guidance programs.
- KPI 10.1 Students will demonstrate skills in intake, assessment, diagnosis, treatment planning, and implementation of evidence-based practice in counseling. (5.C.)
- KPI 10.2 Students will demonstrate understanding of the duties, roles, and expectations in clinical, agency, hospital, and private practice environments (5.C.)
- KPI 11 Students will demonstrate self-awareness, integrity, and professionalism in relation to peers, faculty, staff, and supervisors. (4.G.)

Methods

Signature Assignments

Table 13 shows the 20 signature assignments that provide students the opportunity to demonstrate the requisite KSDs, which are then assessed using the assignment grades.

CSDA

The CSDA is an 11-item scale which measures the key dispositions of a professional counselor: professionalism, therapeutic aptitude, maturity/integrity, and multicultural competence. The items are scored on a scale of 0 (no information available) to 4 (exceeds expectations). A mid-term and final CSDA is completed in Tevera on every student in five courses (600, 607, 608, 691/698). Total scores and individual items are used to assess various KPIs, so disposition assessment is infused across KPIs as well as with a dedicate KPI #11.

Site Supervisor Evaluation

The Site Supervisor Evaluation Form has three parts: (1) Demographic Information with 8 items; (2) Practice of Counseling with 11 items ranked from 1 (not met), 2 (met), and 3 (exceeds); and (3) Candidate Effectiveness with 12 items ranked from 1 (not met), 2 (met), and 3 (exceeds), four yes/no questions, two open-ended

questions, and 1 final grade-level evaluation. The Site Supervisor Evaluation Form is completed during the mid-term and final of three courses (608, 691/698)

National Testing

All students are required to take the CPCE before they graduate, and school counseling students are also required to take the Praxis II prior to enrolling in their school counseling internship. Students can also take the NCE and NCMHCE according to their state licensure requirements.

Results

Table 14 shows each KPI, method of assessment, and comparison to our department level thresholds for analysis. The following KPIs had at least one measure and point in time that was below threshold:

- Professional Orientation:
    - KPI 1.1: 1 of 5 methods (NCE content section scores)
    - KPI 1.1: 1 of 5 methods (NCE content section scores)
- Social and Cultural Diversity:
    - KPI 2.1: 2 of 5 methods (574 Term Paper and NCE content section scores)
    - KPI 2.1: 2 of 5 methods (574 Case Study and NCE content section scores)
- Career:
    - KPI 4.1: 1 of 4 methods (NCE content section scores)
    - KPI 4.2: 1 of 4 methods (NCE content section scores)
- Assessment:
    - KPI 7.1: 1 of 4 methods (605 Assessment PowerPoint and NCE WB 2 & 4)
    - KPI 7.2: NCE WB 2 & 4)

CSDA Deeper Dive

As a result of previous PERs, we conducted a deeper dive into our CSDA data. In AY 22-23, a total of 638 ratings were completed on 229 students by 13 different instructors. The raw data was exported from Tevera into an excel spreadsheet for analysis.

We calculated two metrics to guide our evaluation:

1. Average Quarter Growth (AQG) = Difference in Avg. Final and Mid-Term Ratings per Item and Total Score and per Class (how much can we expect scores to increase from mid-term to final evaluations?)
2. Average Program Growth (APG) = Difference in Avg. Final Rating in 698 and Mid-Term Ratings in 600 per Item and Total Score (how much can we expect scores to increase from the beginning to the end of the program?)

As can be seen in Tables 15 and 16, the AQG for all items, the total score, and all courses showed positive gains. The largest total score gains were observed in COUN 607 (18.41), and the lowest total score gains were observed in COUN 691/698 (2.47), which could be the result of ceiling effect since this is the internship course.

For AY 22-23, the APG for all items, courses, and total scores showed positive gains. The largest gain was in CSDA1 (0.96), and the lowest gain was in CSDA 10 (0.60). The average program growth of the CSDA total score was 6.15.

Although AQG and APG show increases, the course-to-course changes were inconsistent. For example, Table 17 shows the final total scores increased from 600 to 607, but consistently decreased from 607 to 608 before increasing again in 691/698.

Table 18 shows that the only course that had any student miss the department threshold of 1 was in 608, and that was only 1 student.

Site Supervisor Evaluation of Students Deeper Dive

As a result of previous PERs, we conducted a deeper dive into our Site Supervisor Evaluation data. In AY 22-23, a total of 211 students were evaluated with the Site Supervisor Evaluation form. The raw data was exported from Tevera into an excel spreadsheet for analysis.

The average scores for all items in all courses were relatively high, all above 2, which led to somewhat of a ceiling effect when evaluating growth over the course of the program.

We calculated two metrics to guide our evaluation:

1. Average Quarter Growth (AQG) = Difference in Avg. Final and Mid-Term Ratings per Item and Total Score and per Class (how much can we expect scores to increase from mid-term to final evaluations?)
2. Average Program Growth (APG) = Difference in Avg. Final Rating in 691/698 and Mid-Term Ratings in 608 per Item and Total Score (how much can we expect scores to increase from the beginning to the end of the program?)

As can be seen in Table 19, the AQG for all items, the total score, and all courses showed positive gains. The largest item gains in 608 were in group counseling (0.23) and academic advising (0.20), in 691 were in educational planning (0.38) and consulting (0.22), and in 698 were career counseling and records identification.

The lowest AQG item gains in 608 were accepts supervisor's feedback (0.00), performs additional duties in an acceptable and professional manner (0.00), and appearance is appropriate for setting (dress, hygiene, etc.) (-0.03), but all were above 2.64 on average. The lowest item gains in 691 were appearance is appropriate for setting (dress, hygiene, etc.) (0.04) and career counseling (-0.08), but both were above 2.48. Eleven items in 698 had a AQG of 0 or below, however, all scores were relatively high at mid-term, which could account for a ceiling effect.

For AY 22-23, the APG for CMHC was 0.22 and SC was 0.25. The highest gains in CMHC were in group counseling (0.36), consulting (0.35), and coordination (0.34). The highest gains in SC were in career counseling (0.44), coordination (0.39), and identifies own professional and personal strengths and weaknesses (0.37).

The lowest gains in CMHC were in career counseling (0.13), accepts supervisor's feedback (0.11), and appearance is appropriate for setting (dress, hygiene, etc.) (0.04). The lowest gains in SC were in positive in demeanor and temperament. (0.14), accepts supervisor's feedback (0.11), and appearance is appropriate for setting (dress, hygiene, etc.) (0.11).

For individual student assessment, the Site Supervisor Evaluation results are exported for every student and reviewed by item, collection point, and class to show development within courses and throughout the program.

In AY 22-23, 96% of students were above threshold with a 2 or higher. Only five students received ratings below a 2 at any point during this evaluation. Only two students, one in 608 and one in 698 received a C, and all but one student, separate from the previous two received a mark that they would not recommend them for professional employment in the 608 final evaluation.

All students were followed up with according to the department retention and remediation policies.

Individual Student Assessment

Academic Probation and Performance

Three students were on academic probation in AY 22-23, all were within the first 12 hours of coursework. There were 73 course withdrawals, two NCs, three Ds, and four Fs in AY 22-23. No trends were observed for variance in courses. All students were followed up with according to the department retention and remediation policies.

Dismissal rates

No students were dismissed from the program in AY 22-23.

Current Student Evaluations

Student Evaluation of Faculty

Prior to AY 23-24, student evaluation of faculty using the end of term teaching evaluations were only available to individual faculty. The University is currently building policies to allow for aggregate evaluation of courses and faculty, but at this point, it is only included in annual evaluations as well as evaluations for promotion and tenure.

Student Evaluation of Sites and Supervisors

In AY 22-23, 128 sites were evaluated using a survey distributed via Tevera. Students completed a 27-item questionnaire that assesses their experiences across several domains with a ranking from 1 (not met), 2 (met), and 3 (exceeds). The results were exported to Microsoft Excell for analysis.

As can be seen in Table 20, the average of all items was 2.73 ($SD = 0.46$). The highest rated domain was Item 32 (My faculty supervisor provided me with helpful information when needed; $M = 2.91$, $SD = 0.29$), and the lowest was Item 25 (Family/Couple Counseling; $M = 2.32$, $SD = 0.46$)

Three sites had an average rating under 2, the clinical training coordinator followed up to evaluate the viability of the sites for future students.

Graduate Outcomes

Graduate Exit Survey

The Counseling Department had 87 graduates in AY 22-23 with most graduating from the CMHC area of emphasis (60%). The largest percentage of graduates identified as White (90%) followed by Black (5%). Most graduates identified as female (85%).

On average, students finished the program in 6.41 terms ($SD = 2.03$) with a range of 4 to 13 terms to complete. The average GPA of graduates was 3.78 ($SD = 0.23$).

We identified a technical glitch; the survey link in Tevera was not functioning, which led to a 0% response rate in the Graduate Exit Surveys for AY 22-23. This has been corrected and will be ready for analysis in AY 23-24.

Credentialing Pass Rates

National Counselor Exam

In AY 22-23, 34 students took the NCE. The pass rate for MU was 90% (85% for SC and 100% for CMHC) compared to the national norm of 77%.

As can be seen in Table 22, only three content domain areas were below national norms (Professional Counseling Orientation and Ethical Practice, Social and Cultural Diversity, and Career Development), but all were less than one SD below the mean. Counseling and Human Relationships and Assessment and Testing had the highest scores above the national mean.

Praxis

In AY 22-23, 29 students took the Praxis and only one failed, making a total pass rate of 97%.

NCMHCE

IN AY 22-23, 4 students took the NCMHCE, and we achieved a 67% pass rate compared to the national pass rate of 65%

CPCE

In AY 22-23, 88 students took the CPCE Exam. Although there is no pass rate, this assessment helps with individual and program assessment as a final method of assessment and intervention prior to graduation. As can be seen in Table 23, all domains measured by the CPCE were below the national average. The domains that were the most different from the national norms were research/program evaluation, group counseling, and human growth and development. Interestingly, the CPCE scores do not reflect the NCE scores, where most domains were near or above national average.

Seven Year Completion Rates

Since students have a seven-year time limit from first quarter of enrollment to graduation, we evaluated enrollments to graduation from Fall 2012 to Fall 2016. As can be seen in Table 21, 72.70% of those who enrolled, graduated from the program. The average completion rate for the CMHC emphasis was 76.40% and the average completion rate for the SC emphasis was 71.50%. Students identifying as White (76.32%), and Female (73.52%) were the largest groups of students and also had the highest completion percentages. It is notable that completion rates are lower for all other race/ethnicity and gender categories, but the small number of students limits the interpretation of this observation. Nonetheless, future recruitment and retainment efforts will need to evaluate this discrepancy and retain a diverse group of students.

Job Placement Rates

Since the Exit Survey had no response rate, we are unable to report on job placement rates for AY 2022-2023.

Follow-Up Studies of Key Stakeholders

Alumni Survey

The Alumni Survey was revised and is scheduled to be completed until AY 2023-2024.

Site Supervisor Survey

The Site Supervisor Survey was revised and is scheduled to be completed until AY 2023-2024.

Employer Survey

The Employer Survey was revised and is scheduled to be completed until AY 2023-2024.

Summary of Results

Results from our AY 22-23 CAP can be found in Table 24 and 25. In summary, only four content areas were below our thresholds, but even those were very close; therefore, our responses to this year's program evaluation are primarily focused on refinement of the language in our KPIs and the instructions in the signature assignments to better align with one another. We will also spend some time evaluating our in-house measures and rubrics to enhance validity in our measurement points. We are confident that we are meeting our program objectives and with our modifications and changes, our outcomes will increase even more.

Subsequent Program Modifications

1. Retire the on-ground delivery method (Effective Spring 2024).
2. Develop a replacement to the CPCE assessment point (Goal = Spring 2025).

Other Substantial Program Changes

1. Correct data collection errors in the Graduate Exit Survey and missing Blackboard LMS alignment feature to enhance data collection efforts.
2. Complete a thorough review of program non-completers and stop-outs, with a special emphasis on the supports needed among students of color.
3. Evaluate student perception of asynchronous and synchronous learning activities.
4. Explore experimental designs to compare outcomes of sections with different instructional methods and frequency of synchronous learning exercises.
5. Decide on the creation of a doctoral program after CACREP reaffirmation decision.
6. Create named leadership positions to enhance program operations.
7. Enhance community building opportunities like regional meetups, townhalls, and new student meet and greets.
8. Build a prototype for more efficient individual student assessment processes.
9. Create ad-hoc individual student assessment reporting process (e.g., Navigate, DegreeWorks).
10. Increase opportunities for live review of student skill demonstration.

11. Create a faculty database survey to capture other CACREP requirements and more inclusive diversity statistics.
12. Create an enrolled student survey to assess department threats to inclusivity and more inclusive diversity statistics.
13. Outreach to associate's and undergraduate degree programs, including HBCU's, to explore potential academic partnerships.
14. Revamp all stakeholder surveys for follow-up study and administration in AY 23-24:
    a. Alumni Survey
    b. Employer Survey
    c. Site Survey of Department
15. Revamp all in-house assessment measures, with a specific focus on expanded diversity and inclusivity constructs:
    a. CSDA
    b. Site Supervisor Evaluation of Students
    c. Student Evaluation of Sites and Supervisors
    d. Enrolled Student Survey
    e. Graduate Exit Survey
    f. Faculty Database Survey
    g. 607 Counseling Skill Evaluation Instrument
    h. Signature Assignment Rubrics
16. Build course leadership model to enhance consistency across courses and integrity in data collection.
17. Adjust thresholds based on performance.
18. Review recruitment strategies for the school counseling specialty.