

Program Learning Outcome (PLO) 5

Rehabilitation Counseling

ANALYSIS AND REPORT

Spring 2021

The Rehabilitation Counseling Program Learning Outcome (PLO) 5 states: Students in the Rehabilitation Counseling master's degree programs within the Department of Counseling and Human Services at the University of Scranton will: *“Apply the specialized knowledge, skills, and attitudes to identify and implement evidence –based practices in collaboration with individuals who live with disabilities to achieve their personal, social, psychological, and vocational goals.”*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A systematic assessment of PLO 5 (RC) was conducted in Fall of 2020. Students are assessed using the *PLO 5 Evaluation Rubric for Rehabilitation Counseling* during their internship experience. The *“PLO 5 Evaluation Rubric for Rehabilitation Counseling”* measures student competency across 3 domains: 1) Comprehensive Case Conceptualization; 2) Implementation of Evidence Based Practice; and 3) Context of Rehabilitation System of Care. Summative evaluation scores are completed throughout each student's internship experience using the rubric (see Appendix A). All domains are scored using a 3-point scale and then entered into the VIA at the conclusion of each semester.

Academic Years 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 were examined. In total, there were data for 10 students across four semesters ($N = 10$). The Fall 2018 semester had 1 student, Spring 2019 had 3 students, Fall 2019 semester had 2 students, and Spring 2020 had 4 students enrolled. A previous report for this PLO was written and approved in Fall 2017. There is a one-year data gap between the first report and the current one as the department was transitioning to VIA for assessment during AY F17-SP18.

No areas of concern emerge from this analysis. Means for all items in every semester as well as aggregate means for all items during the entire evaluation cycle are 2.0 (Proficient) or above

(Outstanding). Results appear to indicate that students are adequately prepared to perform these professional activities.

RESULTS

Results are included in Table 1-4 (below), standard deviations are not noted when N<5. Areas of note are presented in the “Recommendations” section followed by an “Action Report” section to document the department’s ongoing “Closing the Loop” activities.

Table 1: Rehabilitation Counseling PLO 5 Comparison of 3 Domains of Student Competency from Report 1 F2017- Report 2 F2019-S2020

N	Comprehensive Case Conceptualization (max. score of 18)	Implementation of Evidence Based Practice (max. score of 12)	Context of Rehabilitation System of Care (max. score of 15)	Overall Score (max. score of 45)
Last Report F17 N=3	13.67	9.67	14.00	37.33
Current Report F18-S20 N=10	16.33	10.00	13.30	39.63

Due to the increase in data during this period, analysis included a closer look at each element of the 3 domains of student competency. Students were rated on the following scale for each element:

3=Outstanding: Skills and understanding significantly beyond developmental level

2=Proficient: Understanding of concepts/skills evident

1=Unsatisfactory: Significant remediation needed; lacking knowledge/skill

Table 2: Comprehensive Case Conceptualization (AY2018-2019 through AY2019-2020)

	Q1 (1-3 pts)	Q2 (1-3 pts)	Q3 (1-3 pts)	Q4 (1-3 pts)	Q5 (1-3 pts)	Q6 (1-3 pts)	Full Scale (max = 18)
F18 (n=1)	m=3	m=3	m=3.00	m=3.00	m=3.00	m=3.00	m=18.00 SD= 0
SP19 (n=3)	m=2.67	m=3.00	m=3.00	m=3.00	m=3.00	m=3.00	m=17.67 SD=16
F19 (n= 2)	m=2.50	m=2.00	m=2.50	m=2.50	m=2.50	m=2.00	m=14.00 SD=.25
SP20 (n=4)	m=2.75	m=2.00	m=2.75	m=2.75	m=2.75	m=3.00	m=16.00 SD=.38
ALL (n=10)	m=2.70 SD=.48	m=2.40 SD=.52	m=2.80 SD=.42	m=2.80 SD=.42	m=2.80 SD=.42	m=2.80 SD=.42	m=16.33 SD=.19

Q1- Background Information; Q2 Presenting Concern(s); Q3 Client Strengths and Diversity; Q4 Rehabilitation Goals; Q5 Theoretical Orientation and Interventions; Q6 Overall Rehabilitation Case Conceptualization

Table 3: Implementation of Evidence Based Practice (AY2018-2019 through AY2019-2020)

	Q1 (1-3 pts)	Q2 (1-3 pts)	Q3 (1-3 pts)	Q4 (1-3 pts)	Full Scale (max = 12)
F18 (n=1)	m=3.0	m=3.00	m=3.00	m=3.00	m=12.00 SD= 0
SP19 (n=3)	m=2.67	m=2.67	m=3.0	m=2.00	m=10.33 SD=.42
F19 (n= 2)	m=2.00	m=2.50	m=2.50	m=2.00	m=9.00 SD=.29
SP20 (n=4)	m=2.00	m=2.50	m=2.75	m=2.50	m=9.75 SD=.31
ALL (n=10)	m=2.33 SD=.48	m=2.60 SD=.52	m=2.80 SD=.42	m=2.33 SD=.68	m=10.00 SD=.25

Q1 Shared EB article to be discussed; Q2 Presentation of EB practice; Q3 Review of previous case presentation with rationale for the EB practice; Q4 Application of the EB practice

Table 4: Context of Rehabilitation System of Care (AY2018-2019 through AY2019-2020)

	Q1 (1-3 pts)	Q2 (1-3 pts)	Q3 (1-3 pts)	Q4 (1-3 pts)	Q5 (1-3 pts)	Full Scale (max = 15)
F18 (n=1)	m=3.0	m=3.0	m=3.00	m=3.0	m=3.0	M=15.00 SD=0
SP19 (n=3)	m=3.0	m=2.67	m=2.67	m=2.33	m=2.33	m=13.00 SD=.28
F19 (n= 2)	m=2.50	m=2.00	m=3.00	m=2.00	m=2.00	m=11.5 SD=.45
SP20 (n=4)	m=3.00	m=3.00	m=3.00	m=2.50	m=2.50	m=14.00 SD=.27
ALL (n=23)	m=2.90 SD=.32	m=2.70 SD=.48	m=2.90 SD=.32	m=2.40 SD=.52	m=2.40 SD=.52	m=13.3 SD=2.5

Q1 Agency Overview; Q2 Context of Agency (local, state, federal); Q3 Required Networks; Q4 Agency/Administration Issues and Concerns; Q5 Agency Planning and Program Evaluation

Areas of note are presented in the “Recommendations” section followed by an “Action Report” section to document the department’s ongoing “Closing the Loop” activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Follow up from previous report:

Follow up on Recommendation #1 from the previous report (SP17) included a suggestion to “develop a systematic plan to collect evaluation data” for this PLO. This prompted the department to adopt the VIA software system. Working with the PCPS Dean’s office and Associate Dean Ray Schwenk, those who teach COUN 596: RC Internship now receive an e-mail at the start of each semester with a reminder to

enter all associated data for this PLO into VIA at the conclusion of the semester. The Department Chairperson follows up on any unfulfilled requests a few weeks after the semester has ended. As noted above, data entry for this PLO was paused during the AY17-18 period in order to establish this systematic plan. All data has been entered into VIA for analysis since developing the plan. Recommendation 2 encouraged further changes/review of the rubric pending the results of another assessment cycle.

New Recommendations:

1. Continue to monitor as stability with assessment platforms, administration, and reporting cycles emerge. The next report will be written in AY23-24 and will for the first time include 3 years of data for this PLO from AY20-21 to AY22-23.
2. Although all items in every semester as well as aggregate means for all items during the entire evaluation cycle are 2.0 (Proficient) or above (Outstanding) monitor for trends across time with the next report.
3. Review the rubric for areas all items with means below a 2.5 – (specifically the second Case Study – EBP)
4. Consider moving the rubrics to a 4 point scale to be consistent with the other PLO 5 report.

ACTION REPORT

1. Preliminary working draft sent to Standards Work Group via e-mail (12/29/20) for preview and subsequent discussion at an upcoming meeting (1/15/20).
2. The Standards Work Group discussed the report at the April 22, 2021 meeting. The group added recommendation 4 to the report and decided to move the report toward a department discussion and vote.
3. The report was reviewed and voted on in the May 6th, 2021 and passed unanimously.

