

Data Collection and Reporting through “the Feedback Loop” with our Communities of Interest

As an accredited program, we routinely evaluate and assess our program for efficacy and alignment with the field of systemic therapy, the needs of our community, and the lived experiences, values and needs of the various people, agencies or organizations, and systems we have identified as our “Communities of Interest.” COAMFTE Standards Version 12.5 define a “Community of Interest” as follows:

“Communities of Interest are stakeholders of the program that may include but are not limited to students, administrators, program core and non-core faculty, program clinical supervisors, consumers, graduates, germane regulatory bodies, and diverse/marginalized/underserved groups within these communities.” (Pg. 33)

When we say we evaluate for efficacy and alignment – we are specifically discussing the Program Goals, Student Learning Outcomes and evaluation measures that were mentioned previously in this handbook. In addition to those specific measures, tools, and metrics, we also collect and report on various other outcome and data-driven components to triangulate efficacy arguments. This is what is called a “feedback loop”:

- Ask for Feedback or Data
- Analyze the data
 - Interpret and decide what to do with that data for program improvement
 - Close the loop by providing information back to those who initially provided the data leading to programmatic improvement or growth (communities of interest) – this may include follow-up data after implementation.

▼ ***Procedures for Collecting (and sharing) Data for Accreditation and Program Improvement, and Sharing Proposed Improvement Plans, Goals and New Targets***

Data are routinely collected from students, faculty, supervisors, alumni, and other stakeholders as a way to measure outcomes and to improve the quality of the CFT Program. It is important to note that data are aggregated across students, as well as across cohorts, such that no one individual student is identified when creating reports on outcomes. Faculty, supervisors, instructors, and the program administrative assistant may have access to student data, along with the COAMFTE site visit team; anyone who has access to student data is expected to maintain confidentiality. Identifying data will not be released to anyone without the student’s written authorization.

Specifically, the table below outlines the general data collection and reporting timeline in a typical calendar year.

Table 1: Standard Data Collection and Reporting Guidelines

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>What does it Measure?</i>	<i>Collection Time</i>	<i>Metric Used for Evaluation</i>
Readiness for Clinical Work	Faculty and Program Director	Basic skills of systemic therapy, appropriateness for advancement to practicum (professionalism, etc.)	Fall of First Year	Overall Assessment rating of either "Ready to Proceed..." or "Ready with Conditions,..."
<i>Evaluation Process and Interpretation:</i>	13 items, aggregated across all faculty who have had contact with student. Rated as either Yes, Partially, No, or No Basis for Evaluation. Scores converted to numerical representation, averaged, and translated to overall score for each of thirteen items. (1 = Yes, .5 = Partially, 0 = No). Aggregate score outcome is reported as "Ready to Proceed with Practicum" (aggregate score of all items, averaged to be >.50), "Ready to proceed with conditions, noted below." (aggregate score of all items, averaged to be >.25 but < .50, or Not ready to Proceed as any score below .25.			
<i>Data Reported/Shared with... (Closing Feedback Loop):</i>	To student being evaluated, all faculty and onsite supervisors			
Evaluation of Student Therapist	Clinical Supervisors (Onsite and Offsite)	Therapy skills and abilities. Program Goals 1-4, Student Learning Outcomes 1-5.	End of every semester	Individual items and scores provided by supervisors (onsite and offsite), aggregated to align with PG's and SLO's
<i>Evaluation Process and Interpretation:</i>	Scores on individual items. 75% of students will achieve a minimum score of 5 out of 7 on the evaluated item.			
<i>Data Reported/Shared with... (Closing Feedback Loop):</i>	To student being evaluated, all faculty and supervisors overseeing student clinical work. Aggregate tables prepared and disseminated to all current students along with discussion and draft suggestions for program improvement based on data output.			
Evaluation of Supervisor	Clinically Active Students	Supervision skills and ability, efficacy and climate of safety and respect	End of every semester	Individual items and scores provided by students under supervisor's guidance (onsite and offsite supervisors both are evaluated), aggregated scores are also utilized.
<i>Evaluation Process and Interpretation:</i>	Scores on individual items, and overall/average scores. 75% of supervisors will achieve a minimum score of 5 out of 7 on the evaluated item. For individual interpretation, items with a score below 5 are considered growth areas, even if they don't lower overall score.			
<i>Data Reported/Shared with... (Closing Feedback Loop):</i>	To supervisor being evaluated, and discussed by all faculty. Aggregate tables prepared and disseminated to all current students along with discussion and draft suggestions for program improvement based on data output.			
Evaluation of Instructor	All Students	Teaching abilities, efficacy, and proficiency. Climate of safety and respect.	End of every semester	Individual items and scores provided by students enrolled in courses, aggregated scores are also utilized.

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>What does it Measure?</i>	<i>Collection Time</i>	<i>Metric Used for Evaluation</i>
<i>Evaluation Process and Interpretation:</i>	Scores on individual items, and overall/average scores. 75% of instructors will achieve a minimum score of 5 out of 7 on the evaluated item. For individual interpretation, items with a score below 5 are considered growth areas, even if they don't lower overall score.			
<i>Data Reported/Shared with... (Closing Feedback Loop):</i>	To instructor being evaluated, and discussed by all faculty. Aggregate tables prepared and disseminated to all current students along with discussion and draft suggestions for program improvement based on data output.			
Current Student Survey	All Students	All Resources (technology, financial, support, space and environment, physical materials, etc.), general program goals and student learning outcomes, educational goals, and programmatic improvements, program director, clinical director, and faculty effectiveness. Feedback provided and available anonymously.	Every summer	Based on segment of survey – individual items, and groupings of items are utilized for evaluation. Ratings are quantified 1-5. An average score below 3 is considered 'insufficient' or 'ineffective,' depending. Aggregate scores for resource areas are utilized and evaluated in same way.
<i>Evaluation Process and Interpretation:</i>	Data is collected and input into a standardized table, basic analysis is conducted to get univariate statistics – compared against metric, prepared for reporting and sharing templates and then sent for discussion and dissemination first with faculty and then with communities of interest as identified.			
<i>Data Reported/Shared with... (Closing Feedback Loop):</i>	Initial data examined and evaluated by all faculty and shared with university administrators. Current faculty discuss and agree on proposed programmatic improvement based on data. Aggregate tables prepared and disseminated to all current students along with discussion and draft suggestions for program improvement based on data output.			
Exit Survey (Graduating Students) <i>**This is being developed for implementation for Graduating Class of 2023.</i>	All recently graduated students	Student's time in the program, climates and safety/diversity, goals and post-graduation plans, feedback on mission, program goals and student learning outcomes, Program Director, Clinical Director, and faculty effectiveness, clinical and academic training feedback.	January of every year	Based on segment of survey – individual items, and groupings of items are utilized for evaluation. Ratings are quantified 1-5. An average score below 3 is considered 'insufficient' or 'ineffective,' depending. Aggregate scores for resource areas are utilized and evaluated in same way.
<i>Evaluation Process and Interpretation:</i>	Data is collected and input into a standardized table, basic analysis is conducted to get univariate statistics – compared against metric, prepared for reporting and sharing templates and then sent for discussion and dissemination first with faculty and then with communities of interest as identified.			
<i>Data Reported/Shared with... (Closing Feedback Loop):</i>	Initial data examined and evaluated by all faculty and shared with university administrators. Current faculty discuss and agree on proposed programmatic improvement based on data. Aggregate tables prepared and disseminated as appropriate along with discussion and draft suggestions for program improvement based on data output.			

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>What does it Measure?</i>	<i>Collection Time</i>	<i>Metric Used for Evaluation</i>
Alumni Survey	Previous 5 years of Alumni	Current state of professional advancement and achievement, academic and clinical training feedback.	Every Summer	Simple survey of outcomes related to graduate achievement, along with general satisfaction and suggestions for improvement.
<i>Evaluation Process and Interpretation:</i>	Data is collected and input into a standardized table, basic analysis is conducted to get univariate statistics and/or thematic analysis of qualitative data – compared against metric, prepared for reporting and sharing templates and then sent for discussion and dissemination first with faculty and then with communities of interest as identified.			
<i>Data Reported/Shared with... (Closing Feedback Loop):</i>	Initial data examined and evaluated by all faculty and shared with university administrators. Current faculty discuss and agree on proposed programmatic improvement based on data. Aggregate tables prepared and disseminated to all current students along with discussion and draft suggestions for program improvement based on data output.			
Article Reviews Rubric	All students enrolled in the CFT 69600 Course	Program goal 5, Student Learning Outcome 6	Every Fall, during CFT 69600	75% of students will achieve a minimum average score of 70% on the Article Reviews assignment in the CFT 69600 Research Methods in Couple & Family Therapy course.
<i>Evaluation Process and Interpretation:</i>	Data from rubrics are submitted to Director for inclusion in data tracking for accreditation, where it is analyzed with univariate statistics.			
<i>Data Reported/Shared with... (Closing Feedback Loop):</i>	Aggregate results of the combined average of the entire class is presented during data dialogue days, specific data shared includes the percentage of the class that earned a score above 70% on the three article critiques required in the course. If 75% of students achieve the minimum aggregate 70% on the three reviews, than it is considered as achieving the SLO.			

NOTE: All data, output, and programmatic improvements – proposed and realized – are shared with the Office of Assessment, Accreditation, and Growth (OAAG) in the College of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences (CHESS), the Dean’s Office in CHESS, and any Administrators with oversight or evaluation responsibilities.