GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT   Counselling   **DATE**   April 15, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW   MA in Counselling

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW   Surojit Gupta and Casey Ozaki

1.   STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

• Were any goals referenced?	X Yes	No		Qualified Y/N
• If so, were goals well-articulated?	X Yes	No		Qualified Y/N
• Do goals address student learning?	X Yes	No		Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department revised its assessment plan in 2012. It identifies departmental learning and assessment goals. For the M.A. Degree, the plan identifies nine learning goals. In the assessment plan, it was mentioned that three source of data (The Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE), Supervisor Evaluations of Student Clinical Performance, and Annual MA Student Program Evaluations) will be used to access the nine learning goals.

2.   ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?	X Yes	No		Qualified Y/N
• If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?	Yes	No	x	Qualified Y/N
• Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	x Yes	No		Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department reports that it collected and reviewed data related to CPCE and student performance on internship. These methods were not explicitly directly linked to nine learning goals although they may be implicitly connected.

3.   ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	x Yes	No		Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	x Yes	No		Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	x Yes	No		Qualified Y/N
• Were the results tied to goals of student learning?	Yes	No	x	Qualified Y/N

Comments:
The students did very well in the CPCE, and exceeded national mean on all topic areas. The students also did very well in internship, and student average was consistently beyond "meets expectation" on all areas of evaluation.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?   ___x___ Yes   _____ No   _____ Qualified Y/N

- If so, were they based on assessment results?   ___x___ Yes   _____ No   _____ Qualified Y/N
- If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?   _____ Yes   _____ No   ___x___ Qualified Y/N

Comments: .
The Department is consistently evaluating its program, and making changes with respect to closing the loop. For example, the department is consistently monitoring the Appraisal area, and students are performing exceedingly well in that area. Similarly, after analyzing the student performance on internship data, the department observed that the students are performing the lowest in Psychological Diagnostic Tests, and took remedial action by implementing a new class COUN 520, and students showed marked improvement in that area. From a broader perspective, the assessment results are not directly tied to the nine student learning goals listed in the assessment plan.

SUMMARY

Strengths	*Areas for Improvement*
X A specific plan for assessment is in place.	_____ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
X Student learning goals are well-articulated.	_____ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
X Assessment methods are clearly described.	_____ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
_____ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	x Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
_____ Assessment methods are well-implemented.	_____ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
_____ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	_____ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
_____ Results are reported.	_____ No results are reported.
_____ Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	_____ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:
Overall, the Department is doing well in collecting the data and closing the loop. The Department should make sure that they are following the assessment methods listed in the assessment plan, or if they are changing it then the plan should be updated accordingly.

MATERIALS REVIEWED
X Annual assessment report
X Assessment plan (as posted)
X Previous assessment review
_____ Other (please describe)

Reviewers:	Name	Surojit Gupta	Casey Ozaki	
	Department	Mechanical Engineering	Teaching and Learning	
	Phone Number	7-1632	7-4256	
	e-mail	Surojit.gupta@engr.und.edu	Carolyn.ozaki@und.edu	

****

Section 1:   Y   Section 2:   Y   Section 3:   Y   Section 4:   Y

Coding Key:
Y =   yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)

Q =   qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done

N=   no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in _2014-2015_   (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT   Counseling   **DATE**   April 21, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW   School Counseling MA Distance Program

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW   Surojit Gupta and Casey Ozaki

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

	Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• Were any goals referenced?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were goals well-articulated?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• Do goals address student learning?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department revised its assessment plan in 2012. It identifies departmental learning and assessment goals. For the School Counseling MA Distance Program, the plan identifies four learning goals. The student learning plan reflects the accreditation practices of NCATE and ESPB.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

	Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
Were any specific assessment methods referenced?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?	Yes	No	X Qualified Y/N
• Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	Yes X	No	Qualified Y/N

Comments: In the 2015 assessment report, the department reported that it is examining Internship Evaluation Form. More specifically, this evaluation form was created for evaluation purposes, and it is completed by on-site credentialed school counselors who had prior experience in supervising professional activities of graduate students enrolled in school counseling program. This method was not directly linked to the four learning goals although they may be implicitly connected.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

	Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
Were any assessment results reported?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• Were the results tied to goals of student learning?	Yes	No	X Qualified Y/N

Comments:
The Internship form had a five point grading scale to evaluate the performance of students. The evaluation indicated that there is a continued decrease in score in the area of professional identity and some areas of counseling and group intervention skills.

In addition, the Department has taken care of a previous weakness in crises management skill. These results are not explicitly tied to the four learning goals but they may be implicitly tied. All the students have passed the Praxis II School Counseling and Guidance exam, a nationally normed examination, for school counselors.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?	X Yes	___ No	___ Qualified Y/N
• If so, were they based on assessment results?	X Yes	___ No	___ Qualified Y/N
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	___ Yes	___ No	X Qualified Y/N

Comments:
The Department is consistently evaluating its program and making changes with respect to closing the loop, but the remedial actions are not well reported in the report, for example, the report states that the most recent counseling, counseling methods, theories class, and practicum class will address the issues mentioned in the result section but a more specific breakdown of remedial action is not given. From a broader perspective, the assessment results are not directly tied to the four learning goals listed in the assessment plan.

SUMMARY

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

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:
Overall, the Department is doing well in collecting the data and closing the loop. The Department should make sure that they list the assessment methods in the assessment plan which they are following.

MATERIALS REVIEWED
X Annual assessment report
X Assessment plan (as posted)
X Previous assessment review
___ Other (please describe)

Reviewers:	Name	Surojit Gupta	Casey Ozaki	
	Department	Mechanical Engineering	Teaching and Learning	
	Phone Number	7-1632	7-4256	
	e-mail	Surojit.gupta@engr.und.edu	Carolyn.ozaki@und.edu	

Revised 9/2015

****

Section 1: __Y__   Section 2: __Q__   Section 3: __Q__   Section 4: __Q__

Coding Key:
- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N= no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

Revised 9/2015

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Counselling   **DATE** April 15, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW   B.S. in Rehabilitation and Human Services

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW   Surojit Gupta & Casey Ozaki

1. **STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**
   - Were any goals referenced?   X Yes ____ No ____ Qualified Y/N
   - If so, were goals well-articulated?   X Yes ____ No ____ Qualified Y/N
   - Do goals address student learning?   X Yes ____ No ____ Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department has an assessment plan placed in October 15, 2012. The assessment plan has a well-defined mission statement, and six student learning goals, namely: (a) To develop the skills, knowledge, and values of students that will enable them to provide quality rehabilitation services, (b) To teach students to empower consumers in their development of personal and vocational resources and opportunities, (c) To prepare students to participate as an integral member of multidisciplinary networks providing services to consumers, (d) To help students develop a commitment to lifelong learning and professional growth, (e) To prepare students for graduate education in a variety of rehabilitation fields, and (f) To enable students to become informed citizens who are supportive of the full inclusion of people with disabilities in society.

In addition to program goals, please also consider UND's institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses). Identify UND/Essential Studies goals which are similar to the referenced program goals.

x _____ 1. Communication – written or oral ("able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience")
_____ 2. Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
_____ 3. Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage)
_____ 4. Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("apply empirical data…analyze graphical information")
_____ 5. Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluate…for effective, efficient, and ethical use")
_____ 6. Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding…")
_____ 7. Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning")
_____ 8. Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for their communities and for the world")

Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals: RHS 493 (Senior Capstone Seminar – Fall 2014, Spring 2015, and Summer 2015) is an approved Essential Studies Capstone course, and ES advanced communication course.

2. **ASSESSMENT METHODS**

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   X Yes ____ No ____ Qualified Y/N
   - If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?   ____ Yes ____ No x Qualified Y/N
   - Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?   ____ Yes X No ____ Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department collects data from, (a) Students in Required Courses (it provides student's perspective of what they perceive to be their improvement in knowledge and skills in their required course work), (b) in Capstone course (RHS 493) (it provides Program Coordinator's perspective about the skills in the areas of oral and written communication and in their mastery of the professional literature in the field of rehabilitation and human services), and (c) inRehabilitation Internships (it provides on-site internship supervisors perspective of how students improve over the course of their 400 h internships). Indirect assessment was used in all the cases with a 4-point scale (1- Very limited understanding of the topic, 2- some understanding of topic, 3 – moderate understanding of the topic, and 4 – a great deal of understanding of topic) or a 5-point scale. In addition, the data collection did not directly referenced the collection explicitly to six student learning goals referenced in Section 1 although it may be implicitly embedded in the data collection, but it is not clearly stated.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• Were the results tied to goals of student learning?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department reported the results of survey. Overall, the results indicated positive growth and students mastering the course content, for example while assessing RHS 250 (Contemporary Rehabilitation Issues – Spring 2015 semester) – the overall mean (N = 30) improved from 2.33 (beginning) to 3.67 (end) . Similarly, student performance in Senior Capstone Seminar RHS 493) showed positive results – the overall mean (N=16) during midterm and end were 2.99 and 4.54, respectively. On-site reviewer rating also showed remarkable improvement where mean (N=16) increased from 2.92 (midterm) to 3.58 (final).

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Please identify those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings below.

x	1. Communication – written or oral ("able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience")
	2. Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
	3. Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage)
	4. Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("apply empirical data…analyze graphical information")
	5. Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluate…for effective, efficient, and ethical use")
	6. Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding…")
	7. Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning")
	8. Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for their communities and for the world")

Comments regarding results and the application of results to programmatic, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:
In the RHS 493 – students showed improvement in effective and high-quality communication from a mean of 3.26 (midterm) to 4.80 (end).

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were they based on assessment results?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N

Comments:
The Department took corrective actions based on the assessment results. For example, 2014 assessment showed that RHS 455 (Rehabilitation Process) needed improvement in two areas (explaining the principles of independent living and applying these principles in various rehabilitation settings, and analyzing common therapeutic approaches used in the field) – the Department took the required remedial action by inviting guest speakers to the address above mentioned issues, and the assessment in 2015 showed improvement where the mean improved from 3.40 and 3.20 to 3.65 and 3.52 on the above mentioned two assessment issues. Similarly, the Department also reported that RHS 250 will need improvement in 2015 assessment, (a) how people with disabilities are affected with political processes, and (b) consumer involvement in rehabilitation. The department reported that in future it will take action by performing class presentations and inviting guest speakers who will emphasize on the above mentioned topics. The assessment committee is looking forward to these results. The department also mentioned that it will monitor productivity and independent component in the Rehabilitation Internship as the supervisor rating in these parameters showed lower scores, but the supervisors did not think it was a cause of major concern when compared with new employees trained at bachelor's level.

SUMMARY

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

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Overall the Department has an excellent job in collecting the data. The committee is looking forward to seeing some direct methods to evaluate the student learning. In addition, the Department should make sure that they are addressing the student learning goals listed in the assessment plan when they are implementing the assessment methods. The assessment plan also stated that CORE, the Council on Rehabilitation Education, Inc. (http://www.core-rehab.org/) has recently begun accrediting undergraduate rehabilitation and disability studies education programs. No update was given on this in the assessment plan.

X Annual assessment report
X Assessment plan (as posted)
X Previous assessment review
___ Other (please describe)

Reviewers	Name	Surojit Gupta	Casey Ozaki	
	Department	Mechanical Engineering	Teaching and Learning	
	Phone Number	7-1632	7-4256	
	e-mail	Surojit.gupta@engr.und.edu	Carolyn.ozaki@und.edu	

****

Section 1: ___Y___   Section 2: __Y__   Section 3: __Y__   Section 4: __Y__

Coding Key:
        Y =   yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s)

reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)

Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done

N= no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in   __2014-2015__   (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT   Counseling   **DATE**   April 21, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW   PhD Program in Counseling Psychology

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW   Surojit Gupta and Casey Ozaki

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

• Were any goals referenced?	X	Yes		No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were goals well-articulated?	X	Yes		No	Qualified Y/N
• Do goals address student learning?	X	Yes		No	Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department has well-defined learning and assessment goals for the PhD program. According to the plan, the broader goal of the PhD program in Counseling Psychology is to prepare entry level counseling psychologists to be trained and competent in both the practice and science of the profession. Within the broader goal,, the program has developed a set of specific training goals, each of which is related to several objectives and competencies. This is collectively referred to as the Comprehensive Multi Dimensional Assessment of Doctoral Competencies (CMDA). More specifically, the CMDA follows the competencies and benchmarks for professional psychology which is also adopted by American Psychological Association.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?	X	Yes		No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?	X	Yes		No	Qualified Y/N
• Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	X	Yes		No	Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department uses well defined assessment methods for assessing its doctoral students. In the 2015 assessment report, the department reported that it is examining Foundational Professionalism (written and oral evaluation of students' competencies in the following areas: reflective practice, self-care/self-assessment, professionalism, scientific mindedness, interpersonal skills, affective skills, expressive skills, individual and cultural differences, legal-ethic knowledge, and ethical conduct), 360-degree evaluations (360-degree evaluations are designed to gather input from multiple sources who work with an individual professional in a variety of ways), and student's performance in the national exam.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	X	Yes		No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	X	Yes		No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	X	Yes		No	Qualified Y/N
• Were the results tied to goals of student learning?	X	Yes		No	Qualified Y/N

Comments:
The 2014-15 assessment plan reported that 21 students completed the professional benchmark, out of which 20 students passed and 1 student dropped out of the program. The Department also reported that 33 students were expected to complete 360-degree evaluations, out of which only 9 students completed, and 4 students are showing progress, The data was not available for the remaining 20 students. The Department also reported that the pass rate for national licensure exam increased slightly from 71.1% to 71.4% but it is lower than the national average among accredited programs.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were they based on assessment results?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	X Yes	No	Qualified Y/N

Comments:
The Department is consistently evaluating its program and making changes with respect to closing the loop in all the assessment method sections. More specifically, the Department is taking positive actions to increase the National passing rate in licensure exam by constitution revisions in the curriculum. The department expects that these changes will be reflected in 3-5 years timeframe. In addition, the Department is also reviewing the 360-degree results and taking remedial actions by initiating several steps, like developing an on-line repository for all materials, student should develop the 360 with advisor consultation, and providing early peer feedback in the program.

SUMMARY

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

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:
Overall, the Department is doing well in collecting the data and closing the loop. The committee is looking forward to better performance in 360º evaluations and increase in Counseling Psychology passing rates by following changes in the curriculum.

MATERIALS REVIEWED
X	Annual assessment report
X	Assessment plan (as posted)
X	Previous assessment review
	Other (please describe)

Revised 9/2015

Reviewers: Name   Surojit Gupta   Casey Ozaki
             Department   Mechanical Engineering   Teaching and Learning
             Phone Number   7-1632   7-4256
             e-mail   Surojit.gupta@engr.und.   Carolyn.ozaki@und.edu
                             edu

****

Section 1:   Y   Section 2:   Y   Section 3:   Y   Section 4:   Y

Coding Key:
    Y =   yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s)
          reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with
          additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
    Q =   qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that
          this is completely and appropriately done
    N=   no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to
          student learning