

Assessment done 2013/2014 for 2012/2013 academic year	Data: Fall 2012 through Summer 2013	Data Source	Assessment Review	Disposition and Action if necessary	Report location/link
1. Admissions Assessment					
a. Academic data – GPA mean for admitted and enrolled students	School – 3.02	Submitted application materials and faculty applicant evaluation rubric scores	Faculty meeting	GPA’s are slightly improving over the years. In most, but not all, cases undergraduate GPA predicts academic performance	Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php
	CMHC - 3.42				
	MCFC – 3.06				
b. Academic data- MAT mean for admitted and enrolled students	School - 391	Submitted application materials and faculty applicant evaluation rubric scores	Faculty meeting	MAT test scores appear to be an adequate predictor of academic performance.	Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php
	CMHC - 394				
	MCFC - 397				
GRE mean combined scores for admitted and enrolled students	School - 292	Submitted application materials and faculty applicant evaluation rubric scores	Faculty meeting	GRE test scores appear to be a relatively good predictor of academic performance	Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php
	CMHC - 296				
	MCFC - 292				
c. Application Materials (personal statement) rating means for admitted and enrolled students	School – 32.24/40	Submitted application materials and faculty applicant evaluation rubric scores	Faculty meeting	Personal statement seems to be a valuable element of the application process demonstrating writing skills and indicating level of personal reflection. Continue to use as currently constructed.	Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php
	CMHC – 33.45/40				
	MCFC - 32.90/40				

d. Admissions interview ratings for admitted and enrolled students	School – 39.95/50	Submitted application materials and faculty applicant evaluation rubric scores	Faculty meeting	Interview questions and rating forms require revision to include information not included in CACREP standards to provide a better assessment of applicants' potential for study.	Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php
	CMHC – 33.45/50				
	MCFC – 32.90/50				
2. Professional Identity - Knowledge Outcomes					
a. Mean total rubric scores by standard for each CACREP Professional Identity - Knowledge standard	3.69/4.0	Outcomes assessment reports for core CACREP standards	Faculty meeting	Rubric ratings across core courses are continuing a gradual increase. Instructional outcomes indicate a strong and improving curriculum along with effective instruction and an effective admissions process.	Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/documents/cacrep_core_standards.pdf

3. Clinical/Professional Skills Assessment: Professional Skills and Practices					
a. 559 Skills assessment - video and transcription rubrics (IIG5c) – mean total rubric ratings for all students 2012/2013	3.57/4 Fall 2012 3.82/4 Spring 2013	Skills evaluation forms in student files	Faculty meeting	Students appear to be developing satisfactory skills at conclusion of the semester, but ratings appear to be higher than actual skill level observed by faculty. Skills assessments in CNS 559 will now be done with all instructors of clinical courses.	Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php
b. 590/591 Transcription – mean total rubric ratings for 2012/2013	School Spring 2013 590 4.0/4 CMHC/MCFC Summer 2013 591 3.92/4	Transcription rubrics	Faculty meeting	Skills do not appear to be retained at an acceptable level at the beginning of practicum. Perform skills review session at start of semester.	Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php
c. 590/591 & 595/596 site supervisor mid-term evaluations – mean total rubric ratings for 2012/2013	School 590 – 4.49 595 – <i>School Counseling students in the 2009 standards program began internship Fall 2013</i> CMHC/MCFC Summer 591 – 5.28/6 Fall 596 – 4.58/6 Spring 596 – 5.23/6	Site supervisor evaluation forms in students' practicum and internship portfolios	Faculty meeting	Conversations with site supervisors regarding student performance and results of evaluations are not consistent. Programs will convene site supervisor meetings each fall with the intent of doing additional training on evaluation and supervision.	Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php

<p>d. 590/591& 595/596 site supervisor final evaluations – mean total rubric ratings for 2012/2013</p>	<p>School 590 - 4.50/5 595 - <i>School Counseling students in the 2009 standards program began internship Fall 2013</i></p>	<p>Site supervisor evaluation forms in students' practicum and internship portfolios</p>	<p>Faculty meeting</p>	<p>Conversations with site supervisors regarding student performance and results of evaluations are not consistent. Programs will convene site supervisor meetings each fall with the intent of doing additional training on evaluation and supervision.</p>	<p>Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php</p>
<p>e. 595/596 critical performances – mean total rubric ratings for 2012/2013</p>	<p>School 595 - <i>School Counseling students in the 2009 standards program began internship Fall 2013 – no data until that time</i></p>	<p>Outcomes assessment reports for skills and practices</p>	<p>Faculty meeting</p>	<p>Students demonstrate sufficient program area knowledge in an applied setting.</p>	<p>Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php</p>
<p>4. Program Area Knowledge Outcomes</p>					
<p>a. Mean total rubric scores for CACREP program area standards</p>	<p>School – 3.75/4</p>	<p>Outcomes assessment reports for program area CACREP standards</p>	<p>Faculty meeting</p>	<p>Rubric ratings across program area courses are continuing a gradual increase. Instructional outcomes indicate a strong and improving curriculum along with effective instruction and an effective admissions process.</p>	<p>Department assessment outcomes reports and department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/documents/cacrep_mcfc_standards.pdf http://www.wku.edu/csa/documents/cacrep_cmhc_standards.pdf http://www.wku.edu/csa/documents/cacrep_school_counseling_standards.pdf http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php</p>

5. Professional Performance Reviews					
<p>a. Professional Performance Reviews completed each semester for all students in all classes.</p>	<p>Letters sent fall and spring 2012/2013 to students enrolled in School, CMHC, & MCFC programs regarding dispositions and feedback from all their instructors:</p> <p>Good progress: 139</p> <p>Advisory meeting regarding program progression is necessary: 0</p> <p>Remediation plan is necessary: 2</p>	<p>Professional Performance Reviews completed by faculty members for all students enrolled in their classes during the fall and spring semesters</p>	<p>Faculty meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional Performance Review process is a good way to provide students feedback from the faculty about their dispositions. Admissions process is helping to identify applicants with necessary dispositions 	<p>Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php</p>

6. Exit Assessment					
<p>a. Passing score rates on CPCE using department defined passing score</p>	<p>Passing scores = 28</p> <p>Failing scores = 2</p> <p>2012/2013 Pass rate = 93%</p>	<p>CPCE Results</p>	<p>Faculty meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While CPCE is an efficient assessment with national norms, the faculty suspect there may be some validity concerns because of the differences in CPCE scores and class academic performance. • Investigate other standardized exam possibilities or program developed objective exams. • Professors should consider using more multiple choice exams to prepare students for CPCE. 	<p>Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php</p>
<p>b. Passing rates on departmental comprehensive essay exam</p>	<p>Fall 2012 – 9/9 passed</p> <p>Spring 2013 – 15/17 passed (Those who did not pass the initial essay portion of the comps successfully completed comp on their second attempt.)</p> <p>Summer 2013 – 4/4 passed</p> <p>2013/2013 Pass rate = 93%</p>	<p>Mean rubric scores for essay exams</p>	<p>Faculty meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essay questions are effective but will now be revised annually. • Persons who do not pass essay exam will take another essay exam. Those not successful on the second essay exam will take oral exams. Those not passing the orals will be dismissed. 	<p>Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php</p>

7. Follow-up assessment					
a. Graduating Student Surveys	Total ratings mean: 4.20/5.0 Ratings Range: 3.52 to 4.61 Total Items: 32	Survey completed by each student during or after final internship	Faculty meeting	Overall, survey results indicate students are very satisfied with educational experiences.	Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/student_satisfaction_survey_results.pdf
b. Supervisor/ Employer Surveys	Insufficient data	Survey sent to supervisors/employers of graduates every other year	Faculty meeting	Insufficient response rate to merit consideration of survey results. Recommend revising survey 2014/2015.	Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php