

Assessment done 2014/2015 for 2013/2014 academic year	Data: Fall 2013 through Summer 2014	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 – 3.17	Submitted application materials and faculty applicant evaluation rubric scores	Faculty meeting	GPA’s are continuing to increase 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 – 3.37				
	MCFC – 3.08				
b. Academic data- MAT mean for admitted and enrolled students	School - 392	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 - 400				
GRE mean combined scores for admitted and enrolled students	School – 293.17	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 - 293				
	MCFC – 293.14				
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 – 34.5				
	MCFC – 32.53/40				

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 – 39/50				
	MCFC – 38.8/50				
2. Professional Identity - Knowledge Outcomes					
a. Mean total rubric scores by standard for each CACREP Professional Identity - Knowledge standard	3.78/4.0	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/evaluationdata.php

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 2013/2014	3.15/4 Fall 2013 3.71/4 Spring 2014	Skills evaluation forms in student files	Faculty meeting	Students appear to be developing satisfactory skills at conclusion of the semester.	Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php
b. 590/591 School: case conceptualization paper MCFC/CMHC Theoretical concept and app paper mean total rubric ratings for 2013/2014	School Fall 2013 590 4/4 Spring 2014 590 4/4 CMHC/MCFC Summer 2014 591 3.75/4	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. Consider more stringent evaluation procedure for school counseling.	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 2013/2014	School 590 – Fall (No data for 6 students) 4.6/5 (n=6) Spring (no data for 6 students) 4.75/5 (n=6) Spring 595 – Fall – 4.66 Spring – 4.8 CMHC/MCFC Summer 591 – 5.28/6 Fall 596 – 4.9/6 Spring 596 – 5.1/6	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. Site supervisor training on evaluation and supervision is planned for 2014/2015.	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 2013/2014</p>	<p>School Fall 590 (no data for 6 students) – 4.9 (n=6) Spring 590 (no data for 5 students) - 4.8/5 (n=6) Fall 595 -4.52 /5 Spring 595 – 4.65/5</p> <p>CMHC/MCFC Summer 591 – 5.59/6 Fall 596 – 5.65/6 Spring 596 – 5.94/6</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 2013/2014</p>	<p>School Fall 595 - 4/4 Spring 2014 – 3.74/4</p> <p>CMHC/MCFC 596 3.85/ 4 Fall 3.85/4 Spring</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 – 3.73/4</p> <p>CMHC – 3.83/4</p> <p>MCFC –3.79 /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 report 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 2013/2014 to students enrolled in School, CMHC, & MCFC programs regarding dispositions and feedback from all their instructors:</p> <p>Good progress: 87</p> <p>Advisory meeting regarding program progression is necessary: 2</p> <p>Remediation plan is necessary: 1</p> <p>Dismissal: 1</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 = 32 Failing scores = 4 2013/2014 Pass rate = 89%</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 2013 – 11 of 13 passed Spring 2014 – 17 of 18 passed Summer 2014 – 6 of 6 passed 2013/2014 Pass rate = 92% (Those who did not pass the initial essay portion of the comps successfully completed comp on their second attempt.)</p>	<p>Mean rubric scores for essay exams</p>	<p>Faculty meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual revisions of essay questions are effective and should be continued. • Persons who do not pass essay exam will take another essay exam. Procedure is: those not successful on the second essay exam will take oral exams. Those not passing the orals will be dismissed. To date there have been no dismissals. 	<p>Department assessment report http://www.wku.edu/csa/evaluationdata.php</p>

7. Follow-up assessment					
a. Graduating Student Surveys	Total ratings mean: 4.19/5.0 Ratings Range: 3.48 to 4.46 Total Items: 18	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/evaluationdata.php
b. Supervisor/ Employer Surveys	no data	Survey in revision Graduate assistants are currently (2014/2015) contacting recent graduates to compile contact information for employers and supervisors and to verify contact information for graduates.	Faculty meeting	Implement new survey of Supervisors/Employers of Graduates spring 2015/2016.	No report