

**STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
SUMMARY FORM AY 2007-2008**

Degree and Program Name: M.S. in College Student Affairs

Submitted By: Dr. Richard Roberts, Chair

Please complete a separate worksheet for each academic program (major, minor) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department. Worksheets are due to CASA this year by **June 15, 2008**. Worksheets should be sent electronically to kjsanders@eiu.edu and should also be submitted to your college dean. For information about assessment or help with your assessment plans, visit the Assessment webpage at <http://www.eiu.edu/~assess/> or contact Karla Sanders in CASA at 581-6056.

PART ONE

What are the learning objectives?	How, where, and when are they assessed?	What are the expectations?	What are the results?	Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared?
1. Candidates will display the required academic preparation and professional disposition necessary to succeed in the graduate program in Counseling and Student Development.	<p><u>How:</u> Admission Applicant Rating Rubric</p> <p><u>Where:</u> Department of Counseling and Student Development</p> <p><u>When:</u> March, 2007</p>	1. Top Scores in GPA (25%), Experience (10%), References (15%), Writing Sample (25%) and Interview (25%).	<p><u>2008-2009:</u> <u>94</u> Total Applications Applied <u>56</u> Interviewed <u>18</u> Accepted for Admission <u>5</u> Withdrew Admission <u>36</u> Denied Admission</p>	<p>CSA Admission Committee will compute composite scores and select the top 20 scores for admission</p> <p>Each admitted student will be tracked to compare admission score to performance in the program.</p>
2. Candidates will display evidence of skills in the area of written, verbal, interpersonal, and technological communication.	<p><u>How:</u> 1) Technological Communication Rubric 2) Written Communication Rubric 3) Verbal and Interpersonal Communication Rubric</p> <p><u>Where:</u> CSD 5490 CSD 5500 CSD 5715</p>	<p>1) Meet or exceed expectations on Technology Rubric (Word-Processing, Email, PowerPoint, Digital Camera, On-Line Use, WebCT, and Technology Terms).</p> <p>2) Meet or exceed expectations on Written Rubric (Writing Proficiency, Scientific Research, Literature Review, and Ethical Research Practice).</p>	<p><u>Technology</u> <u>100%</u> Expectations Met <u>0%</u> Expectations Not Met</p> <p><u>Written</u> <u>100%</u> Expectations Met <u>0%</u> Expectations Not Met</p> <p><u>Verbal/Interpersonal</u> <u>100%</u> Expectations Met <u>0%</u> Expectations Not Met</p>	<p>Instructors in identified classes rate the students. The results are collected by the Department Chair and summarized for review during the fall faculty retreat.</p> <p>Students who do not meet expectations are identified through the student review process and targeted for remediation.</p>

	<p><u>When:</u> Fall 2006 – Spring 2007</p>	<p>3) Meet or exceed expectations on Verbal/Interpersonal Rubric (Basic Listening Skills, Student Development Theory, Interpersonal Skills, and Writing Skills).</p>		
<p>3. Candidates will display evidence of critical thinking and problem solving skills by demonstrating the application of theory to practice.</p>	<p><u>How:</u> Critical Thinking/ Problem Solving Rubric.</p> <p><u>Where:</u> CSD 5880</p> <p><u>When:</u> Fall 2006 – Spring 2007</p>	<p>Meet or exceed expectations on Critical Thinking/Problem Solving Rubric (Working Relationship, Consultation, Intervention, Supervision, Professional/Ethical Behavior, and Writing).</p>	<p><u>Critical Thinking/Problem Solving Rubric</u> <u>100%</u> Expectations Met <u>0%</u> Expectations Not Met</p>	<p>Instructors in identified class rate the students. The results are collected by the Department Chair and summarized for review during the fall faculty retreat.</p> <p>Students who do not meet expectations are identified through the student review process and targeted for remediation.</p>
<p>4. Candidates will display evidence of maintaining professional dispositions, academic rigor, and legal and ethical practice while in the program.</p>	<p><u>How:</u> Student Review Rubric</p> <p><u>Where:</u> Department of Counseling and Student Development</p> <p><u>When:</u> Fall /Spring mid-semester</p>	<p>Meet or exceed expectations on Student Review Rubric (Motivational Appropriateness, Personal Maturity, Flexibility, Emotional Stability, Engagement in the Learning Process, Collegiality, Academic Rigor and Legal/Ethical Behavior).</p>	<p><u>Fall 2007</u> <u>33</u> Good Standing <u>14</u> Warning <u>0</u> Retention Process</p> <p><u>Spring 2008</u> <u>34</u> Good Standing <u>10</u> Warning <u>0</u> Retention Process</p>	<p>Faculty rate their advisees based on personal observation and feedback from faculty.</p> <p>Students identified for the first time receive a warning and participate in an informal discussion with advisor. Students identified a second time enter a formalized retention process to target needed change.</p>
<p>5. Candidates will display evidence of advanced scholarship through research and/or creative activity.</p>	<p><u>How:</u> Research Rubric</p> <p><u>Where:</u> CSD 5950</p> <p><u>When:</u> Fall 2006 – Spring 2007</p>	<p>Meet or exceed expectations on Written Rubric (Writing Proficiency, Scientific Research, Literature Review, and Ethical Research Practice).</p>	<p><u>Research</u> <u>100%</u> Expectations Met <u>0%</u> Expectations Not Met</p>	<p>Instructors in identified class rate the students. The results are collected by the Department Chair and summarized for review during the fall faculty retreat.</p>

				Students who do not meet expectations are identified through the student review process and targeted for remediation.
<p>6. Candidates will display evidence of content knowledge that meets or exceeds the criteria set forth by the Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS).</p>	<p>1. Thesis Completion 2. E-Portfolio 3. Exit Interview Survey 4. Alumni Survey 5. Supervisor Survey 6. Employer Survey</p>	<p>1. 100% Completion Rate 2. 100% Pass Rate 3. 3 -6. 75% Adequately/ Well Prepared</p>	<p><u>Thesis</u> <u>39%</u> Completed <u>61%</u> Not Completed</p> <p>Completed Portfolio (<u>No Data Available</u>)</p> <p><u>Exit Interview</u> <u>87%</u> Foundational Studies <u>58%</u> Student Dev. Theory <u>81%</u> Student Characteristics <u>100%</u> Indiv/Group Intervention <u>94%</u> Org/Adm of Student Aff. <u>31%</u> Assessment, Evaluation, and Research <u>92%</u> Supervised Practice <u>69%</u> Academic Advisement <u>77%</u> Assistance Obtaining Professional Position <u>92%</u> Overall Evaluation</p> <p><u>Alumni Survey</u> <u>91%</u> Foundational Studies <u>76%</u> Student Dev. Theory <u>90%</u> Student Characteristics <u>80%</u> Indiv/Group Intervention <u>80%</u> Org/Adm of Student Aff. <u>89%</u> Assessment, Evaluation, and Research <u>87%</u> Supervised Practice <u>87%</u> Academic Advisement <u>74%</u> Assistance Obtaining Professional Position <u>93%</u> Overall Satisfaction</p> <p><u>Supervisory Survey</u> (No Data Available)</p>	<p>The results are collected by the Assessment Committee and summarized for review during the fall faculty retreat.</p>

			<u>Employer Survey</u> <u>94%</u> Foundational Studies <u>100%</u> Student Dev. Theory <u>100%</u> Student Characteristics <u>100%</u> Indiv/Group Intervention <u>100%</u> Org/Adm of Student Aff. <u>92%</u> Assessment, Evaluation, and Research <u>100%</u> Supervised Practice	
--	--	--	--	--

(Continue objectives as needed. Cells will expand to accommodate your text.)

PART TWO

Describe what your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

The Master’s of Science in College Student Affairs is assessed based on data that aligns with the our National Professional Standards published by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), the Department’s learning goals, and the Graduate School Student Learning requirements. Because of this we have left our objectives unchanged and intentionally broad to cover the maximum amount of constituents.

Since the last CASA report we have met several times to discuss the data collected from last year and made concerted efforts to refine the program based on the findings. We have also collected new data from alumni, supervisors and employers in compliance with CAS standards. The data is reported in aggregate form and will be shared with the faculty at our August retreat and with our alumni advisory groups.

PART THREE

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

Changes and/or improvements in curriculum, instruction, and learning will be implemented as a result of discussing the data collected over the last year.

1. The following changes were made based on the 2007 MAP:
 - The CSA program was awarded First Choice designation and received a Graduate School Leadership Award.
 - Created Thesis Manual and meet on a regular basis with Housing and other CSA professionals to increase time to completion on all Thesis projects.
 - Worked to improve relationships with departments who hire CSA students for GA positions. This included a thank you lunch and a future presentation to be given this fall.
 - Continue to work on training materials to help Internship supervisors work with CSA students.
 - Continue to work on an Internship manual including a formal contract.
 - Improved our management of CSA days including formal fall meeting with departments who hire CSA students for GA positions.
 - Increased participation in assessment process by students, alumni and employers.

2. The following will be shared with faculty at the upcoming fall retreat based on the latest data collected in 2007-08:
 - Objective 1: A critical goal for our program. Based on the data our admission process is working well. Using the four written measures and our extensive interview process, we are able to select candidates that meet our objectives and insure our learning community thrives.
 - Objective 2: Our current method of teaching technology and verbal skills are being met. We continue to see some students struggle in the writing area. Our remediation plan which includes extensive faculty mentoring/editing and having students visit the writing center are helping.
 - Objective 3: Internship is designed to teach critical thinking/problem solving skills and is working well. Feedback from internal assessment along with alumni and employers suggests our students are well-prepared in this area. Based on our 06-07 MAP, we are working on improving internship including a manual and contract for all students.
 - Objective 4: We spend considerable time insuring our students maintain a professional disposition throughout the program. The remedial process we have in place is working given that none of the students flagged with a warning were asked to enter our retention phase. However, we continue to have a high number of warnings about student falling

behind on their theses. Because of this, we have begun meeting regularly with Housing administrators to support students with the process. We recently met to establish new benchmark timelines both in class and outside of class to encourage better time to completion. We will continue to monitor this issue closely.

- Objective 5: We continue to improve our research course and the data suggest we need to continue improving this area. We have assigned a new instructor to the Research course. Writing continues to be a minor issue as mentioned under objective 2.
- Objective 6: Our most extensive data collection indicates that our candidates are meeting criteria for content knowledge and accreditation standards. The following observations will be shared with faculty: 1) Although the exit survey indicated our overall rating for the CSA program is higher than last year, some individual areas were below expectations: Foundational Studies, Student Development Theory, Student Characteristics, Assessment, Evaluation, and Research, Academic Advisement, and Assistance obtaining a professional position; 2) Alumni surveys indicated strong ratings in some areas but other areas need investigation such as Theory, Organization and Administration and obtaining a first position; 3) Employer surveys indicated strong evaluations on all areas. The result is a less than favorable rating by current students that appears to increase once they are out of the program. Employers appear to be satisfied with our graduates. We will need to explore more the discrepancy in evaluation between the students leaving the program and those in the field.

Strengths are summarized as follows: Supportive faculty, expertise of faculty (especially EIU administrators), cohort size (limited admission), student diversity, night classes, flexibility, presentations, guest speakers, thesis requirement, internship.

Improvements are summarized as follows: more information needed on how to find internships, scholarships, awards and direction on the thesis, research course needs improving, more electives, better teaching methodology needed, add case study competitions into theory class, more balance between lecture and self-taught, more time on class topic and less diversions, Finance and Budget, Multicultural and Consultation class lack focus, summer internship class was not helpful, teaching tends to lose focus in some classes, CSA faculty fail to utilize proven learning styles studied in College Teaching, WebCt is not always helpful, drop off in academic rigor during second year, better focus in internship discussing what occurred during the week, poor quality of advising and instruction.