

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2008-09 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT MA in Counseling **DATE** May 3, 2010

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Cassie Gerhardt & Ruth Paur

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: In the graduate program review, student learning goals, objectives, and educational experiences used to evaluate are included in the assessment unit. Appendix B, which includes a detailed account of the assessment plan, is included in both the MA in Counseling and the PhD in Counseling Psychology documentation, but appears to refer only to the PhD program.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: The evaluation methods for each goal and objective are listed as educational experiences.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>?</u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: The data related to the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE) was included, which is a national standardized exam. The program mean scores were compared to the national mean and eight individual knowledge areas were also used for review.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

- | | | | |
|---|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: It is obvious that the CPCE data and data from student evaluations in practicum and internship are analyzed and changes implemented. The correlation of the assessments to goals and objectives is not clear.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- ☒ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☒ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☒ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☒ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ☒ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ☐ Results are reported.
- ☐ Results are tied to closing the loop.
- ☐ (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- ☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- ☐ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- ☐ No results are reported.
- ☐ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
- ☐ (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

A very sophisticated plan for assessment is in place. The primary data included pertained to the CPCE exam and student evaluations in the practicum and internship. Changes were made (closing the loop) from this data, but correlation to goals and objectives were unclear. The large number of assessment methods is to be commended, but it would be beneficial to synthesize the collection of the data from these assessments, relate the decisions made in the program to this data and then also tie the data and decisions to the program goals and objectives.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☐ Annual report
- ☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- ☒ Other (please describe)
Graduate Program Review, Self Study Compiled in Fall 2009
- ☐ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ☐ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Cassie Gerhardt	Ruth Paur
	Department	Memorial Union	Medical Laboratory Sciences
	Phone Number	777-3667	777-2651
	e-mail	cassiegerhardt@mail.und.edu	ruthpaur@medicine.nodak.edu

Section 1: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 2: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 3: ☐ ? ☐ NA Section 4: ☐ ? ☐ NA

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information reported
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2008-09 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT PhD in Counseling Psychology **DATE** May 3, 2010

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Cassie Gerhardt & Ruth Paur

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: Appendix B, which includes a detailed account of the assessment plan, is included in both the MA. in Counseling and the Ph.D in Counseling Psychology, but appears to refer only to the Ph.D program.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: The activities and data collection were defined well and are tied to the individual goals and objectives.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> ? </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: Information was given from indirect assessment and subsequent changes in the program were included.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: Changes were made from the assessments tools, but the correlation to specific goals and objectives was unclear from section V. Assessment Data.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- ☒ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☒ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☒ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☒ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ☒ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ☐ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ☐ Results are reported.
- ☐ Results are tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- ☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- ☐ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- ☐ No results are reported.
- ☐ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The program has a very detailed discussion of goals and objectives. In Appendix B there were categories for each objective that included competency, activities, assessment, and outcomes. In Section V Assessment data, the correlation to the goals and objectives was unclear. The large number of assessment methods is to be commended, but it would be beneficial to synthesize the collection of the data from these assessments, relate the decisions made in the program to this data and then also tie the data and decisions to the program goals and objectives.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☐ Annual report
- ☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- ☒ Other (please describe)
Graduate Program Review, Self Study Compiled in Fall 2009
- ☐ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ☐ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Cassie Gerhardt	Ruth Paur
	Department	Memorial Union	Medical Laboratory Sciences
	Phone Number	777-3667	777-2651
	e-mail	cassiegerhardt@mail.und.edu	ruthpaur@medicine.nodak.edu

Section 1: ☐Y___ Section 2: ☐Y___ Section 3: ☐?___ Section 4: ☐?___

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information reported
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done