Agenda and Evaluation Report for Program Review Face-to-Face Meeting University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Counseling MSE, 2024-2025

Date: 2/27/25

In Attendance: Provost John Chenoweth; Dean Lana Collet-Klingenberg(Education & Prof. Studies); Department Chair Jennifer Betters-Bubon; Program Coordinator Ola Bamgbose; Program Review Team Chair Pavan Chennamaneni; Assessment Representative Katy Casey

- 1) Introductions
- 2) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments:
 - a) The review team shared the overall strengths of the program, including maintaining accreditation in good standing, implementing a rigorous and cohesive curriculum, and interdepartmental collaborations.
 - **b**) The Dean commended the program for navigating staff turnovers and that impact on maintaining accreditation demands.
- 3) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) Do you currently require your students to follow the department's LinkedIn alumni group? Provide clarity on how the program arrived at the reported number/percent of students who find jobs after graduation.

Program feels it is difficult to track. Program will add an embedded assignment into one of the pre-internship courses in which students will create a LinkedIn Profile and follow the department's LinkedIn group. The internship coordinator will prompt students to maintain their pages and suggest uses for networking and professional development. The program will review the LinkedIn page to track student engagement and employment.

b) The CACREP accrediting body is requesting an annual report from the program. What will be reported out to CACREP each year?

The annual report noted in the self-study is a requirement of all programs accredited by CACREP, and not a unique requirement for this program based on the last accreditation review and visit.

c) It seems that there are software systems holding together important components (e.g., EMS SimulationiQ, Anthology, Chalk and Wire). Are there financial "sustainability" plans to make sure these solutions can be afforded?

Lab space to be shared by two departments – plan is to find a common solution. There is a plan in the works.

- 4) **<u>Recommended Actions</u>**: The evaluation report lists two recommended action (see page 7, point 4) related to accreditation and graduate outcomes.
- 5) **<u>Recommended Result</u>**: Continuation without qualification
 - Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
 - Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:
 ☑ Next SHORT self-study will be due to the Dean on May 1, 2031 and to the Assessment Office on August 1, 2031.

6) Adjourn.

•

Review team report is attached below, including Recommended Actions and instructions for Progress Reports (if required).

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Review of Program Review Self-Studies Graduate Programs, 2024-2025

| Date of Evaluation: | 12/2/2024 | Short Self Study (SS*) | |
|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|--|
| Program: Counseling | g MS | | |

Evaluations submitted by: Matt Vick, Tia Schultz, Christine Neddenriep, Pavan Chennamaneni, and Katy Casey **Review meeting attended by:** Matt Vick, Tia Schultz, Christine Neddenriep, Pavan Chennamaneni, and Katy Casey

I. General Program Information

| 1. The program's mission statement reflects the nature and scope | |
|--|--|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |
| | |
| 2. The program is aware and reflective of changes affecting improved Sufficient Evidence | ment since the last review. |
| 2. The program is aware and reflective of changes affecting improved Sufficient Evidence Some/Partial Evidence | ment since the last review. |
| Sufficient Evidence | ment since the last review. 5 0 0 |

3. The program has maintained program-level accreditation in good standing.

| Sufficient Evidence | 1 0 | 8 | 8 | 5 |
|-----------------------|-----|---|---|---|
| Some/Partial Evidence | | | | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | | | | 0 |

General Comments related to Section I:

Succinct and ambitious mission statement. 1.3 Accredited through 2032 with progress reports required.

The program shared the most recent progress report required of the program due to suggestions from the last peer review team visit. The program responded quickly and sufficiently to address the areas requested by the review team, which primarily fell under assessment of KPIs. The program provided a detailed outline to their accrediting body sharing their plans to address the areas noted.

II. Alignment within the University

1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's Mission.

| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
|--|------------------------|
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |
| | |
| 2. The program contributes to goals related to the UWW strategy Sufficient Evidence | c priorities. 5 |
| | ic priorities. 5 |

General Comments related to Section II:

The program highlighted partnerships that have helped provide their students with expanded opportunities.

Strong collaborations across departments to afford unique certificate options.

The program is dedicated to advancing the institution's mission and strategic priorities. Their engagement with accreditation and numerous inter-departmental collaborations is a sign of their commitment to enhancing the student experience.

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

1. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve/advance the program.

| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
|-----------------------|---|
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments related to Section III:

Clear documentation of goals and timelines

Goals are in progress, but well on their way.

Strong goals to continue to advance the program.

IV. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum.

| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
|-----------------------|---|
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments related to Section IV

To best accommodate and meet the needs of students, the program allows for different start dates - this no doubt makes the organization of the course rotation more difficult.

V. Assessment of Student Learning

| 1. The program submitted a completed assessment plan. | |
|---|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. [Graduate] Student Learning Outcomes are aligned with the Master's Level Essential Learning Outcomes from the Graduate School.

| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
|---|--------------|
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |
| | |
| 3. The program's assessment plan includes data collection methods Sufficient Evidence | and results. |
| | and results. |

4. The program's assessment plan includes a description of how the data are used to improve student learning.Sufficient Evidence5Some/Partial Evidence0No/Limited Evidence0

General Comments related to Section V

Detailed assessment plan is presented. Limited results are provided as it looks like the program is planning to collect the data for many of the KPI's in the future.

The accreditation report clearly maps the outcomes to KPIs and KPDs as well as measured activities. Only part missing is a summary of the results

Strong use of a variety of measures to inform changes in the program.

The program's Assessment Plan is very thorough.

The program has a detailed assessment plan demonstrating student growth on KPIs throughout the program. In addition, the program has a set schedule of data collection and analysis. They review student dispositions regularly during monthly meeting. The program also reviews survey responses to make program modifications.

VI. Student Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation

1. The program's enrollment is consistent/stable and at a level appropriate to meeting student learning needs.

| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
|-----------------------|---|
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. The program regularly evaluates student progress toward successfully completing the program, including a review of student retention.

| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
|-----------------------|---|
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments related to Section VI

The method of reviewing the students' programs of study sounds like a good model to balance student needs/interests with resources available.

Low enrollments in courses which require them to take independent studies in a concern.

The program closely tracks student progress through the program in order to plan for course offerings and support to students who veer from their program of study.

The program can accommodate up to 135 students, and is roughly 12-16 below depending on the year. Retention does not seem to be an issue and the program is working to increase marketing of the program to boost numbers.

VII. Demand for Graduates

1. Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment after graduation.

| Sufficient Evidence | 2 |
|-----------------------|---|
| Some/Partial Evidence | 3 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.

| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
|-----------------------|---|
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

3. The program described unique features that set it apart from competing programs in the UW System or other comparable colleges and universities.

| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
|-----------------------|---|
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments for VII:

I am curious as to why the program found only 79% placement in the last academic year. If the program found 100% placement in the past, why do they now have to rely on anecdotal evidence to postulate higher actual placements than the reported placements in 23/24?

The Winther Counseling lab is indeed a valuable and unique feature of the program.

The counseling program's commitment to the CACREP process and standards is especially valued and demonstrates the quality of the program.

This program has three clearly unique features that make it attractive to those interested in the counseling field-accreditation, WCS, and community engagement.

VIII. Faculty and Staff Characteristics

1. Information is provided about anticipated staffing changes and areas of need (since last Audit and Review).

| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
|-----------------------|---|
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. The program identified factors impacting their ability to recruit and retain outstanding faculty.

| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
|-----------------------|---|
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments related to section VIII

Could list potential ways to address (with our resources) the limitations.

The program's ability to recruit outstanding faculty amidst these challenges is commendable.

IX. Student Resources

1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, technological, and library resources to effectively serve its students and provide high-quality programming.

| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
|-----------------------|---|
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments for IX

The program is planning ahead for anticipated changes in resources.

IX. The program noted some changes in space due to the Winther remodel. I would like to know more about how the program sees programming continuing with the disruption in physical space? How has the program been advocating for space needed so as not to be too disruptive to student learning?

X. Conclusions and Recommendations

| 1. Areas of strength are discussed. | |
|---|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |
| 2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed. | |
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |
| 3. Recommendations and resources are discussed. | |
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments for X

The specificity of needs makes for more intentional advocacy.

XI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

Strong accredited program. While undersubscribed, the program has a strong potential to grow.

The curriculum is intentional and very rigorous, as required by CACREP. The program takes its commitment seriously to implementing those standards. Even with turnover, the faculty have remained strong scholars and practitioners.

-Accreditation standards leveraged especially well to ensure a comprehensive and meaningful assessment system which informs program changes -Ability to recruit outstanding faculty amidst faculty retirements and changes - Innovation in certifications as well as the grant-funded educator to counselor program -Use of e-portfolio to ensure data is collected and used -Winther Counseling Lab

The program provides multiple opportunities for students to apply their skills and extend their knowledge through campus and community partnerships. The program has a thorough program assessment plan, and is proactively planning ahead for upcoming changes to program resources.

The program has staff dedicated to the social justice mission of the program, which is clearly articulated and reinforced in the curriculum. The program maintains program level accreditation which increases the administrative burden on the department.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

Better tracking of graduates

It seems that there are software systems holding together important components (EMS StimulationiQ, Anthology, Chalk and Wire). Are there financial "sustainability" plans to make sure these solutions can be afforded? -Fully enrolling students to ensure class sizes "make" and don't require independent studies for students to maintain progress toward their degree -Maintaining contact with alumni

3. Other comments/questions

The CACREP accrediting body is requesting an annual report from the program. What will be reported out to CACREP each year?

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

- 1. Share the program's progress in meeting accreditation requirements, specifically those standards that required a progress report and annual monitoring.
- 2. Provide an update on how you maintain contact with alumni.

5. Recommended Result

| Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit. Select if report is not submitted in time for the review team meeting. | 0 |
|---|---|
| Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report. | 5 |
| Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team. | 0 |
| Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns | 0 |
| Report not submitted; refer to Provost for action. | 0 |