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Spring 2015
Comprehensive Assessment Report 2015

Over the past several years, Johnson University has responded to the challenge of implementing formalized and strategic program evaluation. Additionally, in accordance with CACREP requirements, the graduate counseling programs at Johnson University have developed a Comprehensive Assessment Plan (CAP), formalized during the 2014-2015 academic year. The CAP describes a continuous, cyclical process that is participative, flexible, relevant, and responsive. The heart of the CAP is to ensure students graduate from their respective program as professionally competent school counselors, clinical mental health counselors, and marriage and family counselors.

The CAP is reviewed annually and revised as necessary to ensure effective assessment is occurring and to maximize quality of student learning; it is a work in progress. This plan informs a public report distributed through the University’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness and published on their website [insert link]. The plan also informs a Comprehensive Assessment Report (CAR) used by the faculty to demonstrate how assessment results are used to monitor and enhance the development of professionally competent counselors.

Evidence-Based Program Improvement

The CAP describes the intention of the faculty to systematically gather evidence and data, comparing this data to program goals and student learning outcomes to make needed adjustments and changes. Program faculty also review current professional literature and state licensure standards to inform program changes. Core and adjunct faculty have a shared responsibility in examining data, suggesting potential courses of action, and implementing needed changes. Full-time Counseling Program faculty typically meet weekly during the academic year, with core faculty meeting multiple times each semester. Most program evaluation and improvement discussion, however, occurs during the annual Counseling Program Review meeting at the end of the spring semester.

2014-2015 Assessment Meeting Summary

Program faculty met 3-4 times per month from August 2014-April 2015 for a total of 28 documented planning and assessment meetings. A majority of these meetings was focused on preparing the CACREP self-study documentation. Highlights include: slight revision of the SACSCOC SLO’s to more easily line up with CACREP standards, establishing SCR protocol and recording procedures, development of the CAP, incorporation of the CPCE exam as a
standardized measure of student competency for the MFT/CMHC program, updated practicum evaluation form, adjusting format and structure of 1hr courses, introduced new format for connecting SLO’s and CACREP standards using the SCR student data, reviewed and adjusted requirements for direct and indirect clock hours for both practicum and internship, shift course rotations somewhat to better accommodate developmental needs of students, and added additional academic coursework in both school counseling and MFT/CMHC programs.

In addition, on May 5, 2015 the faculty participated in the Counseling Program Review annual meeting. The primary purpose of this meeting was to consider program purpose and effectiveness using both anecdotal evidence as well as formal assessment data collected from 2014-2015 school year.

2014-2015 Counseling Program Review (CPR) annual meeting
Initial Notes

- Provided outline for review items below
- Given transitioning of Internship Coordinator roles during 2014-15 academic year, the decision was made by the Graduate Program Director to include all FT faculty within the School of Social & Behavioral Sciences in this meeting. Undergraduate faculty present offered questions/comments as appropriate, while the FT graduate faculty directed the course of the conversation.

1. SACSCOC and general discussion/questions relative to past year
   a. Reviewed report from last year… (see Appendix A: Comprehensive Assessment Report 2014)
      i. Extensive refinement of graduate program took place during self-study procedure
      ii. This has been replaced with Curricular Map
   b. Reviewed Curricular Map… action plan:
      i. Will keep original course SCR
         1. When a student is below standard and completes Remediation Plan, this will be noted in comments section (but tally will remain same)
         2. If a student fails a class, no SCR is needed (since they need to retake course)
         iii. Goals and SLOs… do we want to adjust anything?
            1. Not yet… let’s consider when 2016 Standards come out
            2. Future questions to be considered:
               (a) Keep SLOs?
               (b) Go with 8 domains as new SLOs?
            iv. What might we adapt from this approach and integrate into undergraduate program (good question for future discussion)?
            v. Do we want to use data points outside SCRs for SACSCOC?
               1. Let’s keep these out for now – may revisit
   vi. Clinical (MFT/CMHC) and School Internship
      1. Do not demonstrate competency every single semester
      2. We need to have fewer competencies in practicum
         (a) Make it more developmentally appropriate
      3. “Rolling” SCR that goes with them?
4. Is there a way to tie Internship Evaluation into the SCR?
   (a) We do that somewhat…
   (b) Group supervision needs to be primary context within which competencies are measured

5. Perhaps a new Practicum assignment/task…
   (a) Help students develop resources to have something to build upon
      (i) May be able to utilize Cindy’s HSVC2100 rubric/assignment for ideas
      (ii) Clinical Supervisor evaluations
   (b) Record an interview… Transcribe… Make notes when/where you demonstrate these skills
   (c) Create a ‘checklist’ of competencies that need to be demonstrated
   (d) Also reflective piece to assignment… where did I use these, etc.

2. Program Mission & Student Learning Outcomes
   a. Program Mission
      i. Review (facilitated by Assessment Coordinator)
         1. MFT/CMHC
         2. School Counseling
      ii. Action Plan
         1. No action required at this time. Programs seem to be a good fit for the mission.
   b. Goals and Student Learning Outcomes
      i. Review (facilitated by Assessment Coordinator)
         1. MFT/CMHC
            (a) All SLO’s were above the 86.00 benchmark with SLO 1.2 the lowest at 92.67
            (b) SLO’s 3.1, 3.2, & 3.3 sparked discussion
               (i) Action Plan (see Appendix B)
         2. School Counseling
            (a) All SLO’s were above the 86.00 benchmark with SLO 2.2 the lowest at 91.54
            (b) SLO’s 3.1, 3.2, & 3.3 sparked discussion
               (i) Action Plan (see Appendix C)

3. Program Assessment (See Appendix D: Assessment Timeline for Graduate Counseling Program)
   a. Direct Evidence
      i. Course Grades and SCRs
         1. Review (facilitated by Program Director)
            (a) Reviewed process & results
            (b) Very challenging to get all SCR data collected with sufficient analysis time prior to meeting
            (c) (Fall 2015 update-additional data collected)
               (i) There were 5 students who were identified as being below standard in 1 or more areas
               (ii) A remediation plan was provided for each student identified as below standard
               (iii) All plans to date have been successfully completed within the 60-day period and competency has been demonstrated by each student.
         2. Action Plan
            (a) Learning SCR protocol as we go
(b) Remediation Plans appear to be accomplishing task
(c) Likely need to revise meeting schedule to better accommodate collection of data from spring course work

ii. Grand Rounds
1. Review (facilitated by Program Director)
   (a) Eleven students participated in Grand Rounds Fall 2014
   (b) All 11 students passed
   (c) The group mean score was 94.83
   (d) The group range was 92.13-96.95

2. Action Plan
   (a) Great attendance by underclassmen and faculty
   (b) No action required at this time

iii. Standardized Tests-CPCE & Professional School Counselor (PSC) Praxis
1. Review (facilitated by Program Director)
   (a) Reviewed process and results
   (b) All PSC Praxis tests taken by students have been passed in first attempt
      (i) Five students graduated from the School Counseling Program (one in 2014, four in 2015)
      (ii) The group mean was 166.60 and passing score was 156
      (iii) The group range was 156-171
      (iv) Ten degree seeking students who were alumni of the MFT/CMHC Program and were seeking additional licensure as school counselors, have taken and passed the PSC Praxis exam in 2014-15
   (c) The MFT/CMHC program initiated requiring students to take the CPCE during the 2014-2015 year
      (i) Seven students completed the exam, 6 passed on first attempt
      (ii) One student failed but retook the exam and passed
      (iii) The group mean was 83.29 compared with national mean of 86.20
      (iv) Observation that group mean included the student who failed on first attempt and perhaps instead it should be based on the student’s score after passing
   (d) Group range 65-99

2. Action Plan
   (a) Both standardized exams (PSC Praxis & CPCE) allow for comparison with other similar programs
   (b) Faculty was pleased with the positive results and favorable comparison with other training programs
   (c) Faculty will continue to use both the PSC Praxis and the CPCE
   (d) In future, initial group mean score will continue to be reported but also adjusted group mean based on any students who retake and pass the exam

iv. Oral Exam
1. Review (facilitated by Program Director)
   (a) Eleven students completed oral exam Spring 2015
   (b) All 11 students passed
(c) The group mean score was 93.81
(d) The group range was 90.27-95.34

2. Action Plan
   (a) Breaking up in to two groups seemed to work well
   (b) No action required at this time

v. Skills Data – Practicum/Internship Evaluations
1. Review (facilitated by Internship Coordinator)
   (a) Reviewed data
2. Action Plan
   (a) Questions for further discussion:
      (i) What if, for every 100hrs of clinical work they received an ‘internship’ hour (is there a way to allow practice to drive academic hours)?
      (ii) Graduating students… are they doing excessive hours?
         1. Is there a way to allow students to complete the internship requirement, then utilize any remaining coursework toward electives?

b. Indirect Evidence
   i. Surveys
      1. Review (facilitated by Program Director)
         (a) Reviewed Fall 2014 Alumni Survey (past 5 years)
         (b) Ninety percent of respondents were employed in counseling field
         (c) Forty-seven percent have taken licensure exam and passed all but 1 passing on first attempt
         (d) Two respondents obtained LPC license. Five obtained LMFT license
         (e) One respondent obtained clinical supervision certification and one is a supervisor in training
         (f) Five percent of the respondents have continued on to doctoral studies
         (g) Respondents indicated a much higher level of supervision satisfaction with the University Counseling Center site as opposed to other sites off-campus
      2. Action Plan
         (a) Appoint Core faculty as Internship Coordinator
            (i) Develop a more effective Supervisor Training procedure
            (ii) Improved communications with and support of off-campus supervisors
            (iii) Expand site visits and contact with field supervisors
   ii. Field Placement Data
      1. Review (facilitated by Internship Coordinator)
         (a) Reviewed survey & data
      2. Action Plan
         (a) Not all data has been collected/organized at this point. Internship Coordinator will get the remaining data compiled and send to Program Director.
         (b) Program Director will distribute to Graduate Faculty at later date (BOY meeting?) and discuss then
   iii. Student Focus Groups
      1. Review (facilitated by Program Director)
         (a) Reviewed survey and discussed results
         (b) SC students… generally thought of as a ‘after-thought’ by instructors
      2. Action Plan
(a) Need to meet and discuss with School Program faculty our intentionality in embedding SC students into culture, or adjusting culture to welcome SC students
(b) Program Director will take the lead in starting that conversation this summer, which will extend into Fall 2015

iv. Exit Interview
   1. Review (facilitated by Program Director)
      (a) Reviewed process and results
   2. Action Plan
      (a) No plan to change anything at this time.

v. Institutional Data
   1. Review (facilitated by Program Director)
      (a) Reviewed data online
   2. Action Plan
      (a) Concerns that Office of Institutional Effectiveness utilized data from survey without our knowledge
      (b) Will contact Office of Institutional Effectiveness to ensure only appropriate data is disseminated

4. Discussion of anticipated 2016 CACREP Accreditation Standards
   a. Review
      i. Draft #2 is still most recent update
      ii. Initial thoughts/responses discussed
      iii. Counselor Dispositions is likely coming as an assessment point
   b. Action Plan
      i. Tabled until official version comes out

5. Discussion of shifting the calendar for program assessment
   a. Review
      i. Many of the of data points occur in the spring semester (e.g., CPCE, Praxis, Oral Exam, spring SCRs)
      ii. Compiling the data in time for the annual Comprehensive Program Review is challenging and impossible in some cases
   b. Action Plan
      i. Beginning 2015-2016 the annual CPR will be scheduled during fall semester to allow time for data collection from the previous school year (2014-2015) to be compiled
      ii. Subsequently, the annual CAR will be compiled and presented to the faculty for review early in January, allowing time for reporting to various accrediting bodies (e.g., SACSCOC, CACREP)
      iii. This schedule shift will allow time for program changes to be conveniently implemented for the following school year

Admissions Screening
- During 2014-2015, eleven individuals applied for the MFT/CMHC program and 9 individuals applied for the School Counseling Program.
- Following a review of admission material (GRE/MAT, GPA, Writing Sample, References), 12 students were invited to attend an interview day.

Admissions Interview Day
- Twelve students attended one of two interview days (fall or spring).
- As a result of the interview days, 7 students were admitted to the MFT/CMHC program and 1 student were admitted to the School Counseling program without any stipulations for 2015-2016.
- In addition, 3 students were admitted to the MFT/CMHC program with stipulations for 2015-2016.

Student Competency Record (SCR)
- SCRs were used for the first time during 2014-2015 school year.
- The majority of students were considered competent in all their coursework, practicum, and internship experiences.
- There were 5 students who were identified as being below standard in 1 or more areas.
- A remediation plan was provided for each student identified as below standard.
- All plans to date have been successfully completed within the 60 day time frame and competency has been demonstrated by each student.
- SCR records were compiled and used to inform the Assessment of Student Learning for both the MFT/CMHC and School Counseling programs (see attachment).

COUN5581 Coun Skills & Techniques
- Eight students attended COUN5581 summer 2015.
- One student was found below competent in 1 area and was provided a remediation plan to demonstrate competency within 60 days.

Practicum
- Twelve students were enrolled in practicum. One student failed to pass and was required to repeat practicum.
- Additionally, 1 student was below standard in 1 area, a remediation plan was provided, competency was achieved, and the student was able to continue on to internship.
- Students provided 524.30 hours of direct services to clients with a mean of 43.69/student.
- Students provided 1330.25 hours of indirect clock hours with a mean of 110.85/student.

Internship
- Eleven students were enrolled in internship (including one student in 1-hr internship). All passed with a "B" or better.
- Students provided 916.80 hours of direct services to clients with a mean of 86.75/student (excluding the 1-hr student).
- Students provided 1654.60 hours of indirect clock hours with a mean of 154.41/student (excluding the 1-hr student).

Grand Rounds
- Eleven students participated in Grand Rounds. All 11 students passed.
- The group mean score was 94.83. The group range was 92.13-96.95.

Standardized Assessment/ Exam
- The MFT/CMHC program initiated requiring students to take the CPCE during the 2014-2015 year. Seven students completed the exam, 1 student failed but retook the exam and passed. The group mean was 83.29 compared with national mean of 86.20. Group range 65-99.
- Since inception, 5 students have graduated from the School Counseling Program (one in 2014, four in 2015). The group mean was 166.60 and passing score was 156. The group range was 156-171. Additionally, two non-degree seeking students who, were alumni of the MFT/CMHC Program and were seeking additional licensure as school counselors, have taken and passed the Praxis exam in 2014-15.

Oral Exam
- Eleven students completed oral exams Spring 2015. All 11 students passed.
- The group mean score was 93.81. The group range was 90.27-95.34.

Alumni Follow-up
- Survey sent to alumni of past 5 years. Ninety percent of respondents were employed in the counseling field.
- Forty-seven percent have taken licensure exams and passed with all but 1 passing on first attempt.
- Two respondents obtained LPC license. Five obtained LMFT license. One obtained supervisor certification and one is a supervisor in training.
- Five percent of the respondents have continued on to Ph.D. studies.
Appendix A: Comprehensive Assessment Report 2014

The following timeline has been developed by the Graduate Counseling Faculty at Johnson University. This sequence of events, which includes both information gathering events as well as programmatic assessments and evaluations, has significantly contributed to the faculty’s desire to pursue CACREP accreditation for the Graduate Counseling Programs. This Report is a precursor to the forthcoming annual Comprehensive Assessment Report.

In addition to the more dramatic changes listed below, minor adjustments are routinely made as a result of the weekly meetings and evaluative procedures. These are most often related to course management and delivery (e.g., how to engage students in online learning as an instructor, etc.). While these types of changes are less monumental, faculty believe these adjustments are equally meaningful in creating a culture of continual program improvement.

Significant milestones in over the previous 5 years in the life of the Graduate Counseling Program:

2009
The Counseling Department underwent an extensive departmental evaluation culminating in a Comprehensive Departmental Evaluation and Review (CDER) in January 2009. Relevant to the Graduate Counseling Program, the following commitment was articulated:
- An evaluation of the graduate curriculum that has produced the possibilities of condensing courses, creation of new courses, and the pursuit of accreditation by organizations such as the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) while maintaining a commitment to train students for clinical licensure as either Licensed Marital & Family Therapists (LMFT) or Licensed Professional Counselors, Mental Health Service Providers (LPC-MHSP). (CDER, p. 2)

2009 ACES Annual Conference was attended by the Departmental Chair, Dr. Sean M. Ridge. The purpose and focus of this attendance was to further investigate and inform the Department’s pursuit of CACREP accreditation.

2010
New courses were identified, proposed and added to the Graduate Counseling Program curriculum:
- Theories of Counseling & MFT I
- Theories of Counseling & MFT II
- Contemporary Trends in Theory & Technique
- Addiction Etiology & Counseling
- Social & Cultural Diversity
- Career Assessment & Development

2011
A new School Counseling Master of Arts degree was proposed and added to the Graduate
Counseling Program. Highlights from this proposal included:

- Adding a part-time Program Faculty member, Dr. Laura Hebert
- Developing a curriculum consistent with 2009 CACREP Accreditation Standards as well as Tennessee Licensure Standards for Professional School Counselor PreK-12
- Adding new coursework in:
  - Foundations in School Counseling
  - SC Practicum and Internship Coursework

2012

Transitioning all Graduate Counseling Program coursework to a hybrid delivery format. This new format provided more flexibility for students in course scheduling and attendance while accommodating more diverse internship sites. This transition to the hybrid modality was implemented across the 2012 and 2013 academic years.

2013

Revision of the Graduate Counseling Program Mission, Goals and Objectives. The program mission, goals and objectives were evaluated within the context of the overall School of Social & Behavioral Sciences Mission, which resides within the University Mission.

2014

Revision of practicum/internship coursework for the MFT/CMHC program and creation of new coursework for the MFT/CMHC program, including:

- Graduate Counseling Orientation
- Contemporary Trends in MFT/CMHC
- Counseling Skills & Techniques
- Testing & Appraisal I
- Testing & Appraisal II
- Psychopharmacology for Counselors
- Crisis Intervention & Psychological First Aid

Creation of new coursework for the School Counseling program, including:

- Graduate Counseling Orientation
- Contemporary Trends in School Counseling

Renaming of the Master of Arts in Marriage & Family Therapy/Professional Counseling (MFT/PC) to the Master of Arts in Marriage & Family Therapy/Clinical Mental Health Counseling (MFT/CMHC) to more accurately reflect training provided in curriculum.

Newly implemented assessment protocol, including specifically defined meetings and an annual report each spring.
Appendix B: Assessment of Student Learning (MFT/CMHC)

## School of Social & Behavioral Sciences
### Assessment of Student Learning Objectives
#### Graduate Program in Marriage & Family Therapy/Clinical Mental Health Counseling

The School of Social & Behavioral Sciences met on 5/5/15 to discuss the assessment results from 2014-2015. There were a number of changes in the graduate programs during 2014-2015 due largely to the school’s pursuit of professional accreditation with CACREP. A Comprehensive Assessment Plan (CAP) was established and incorporated into the self-study submitted to CACREP February 2015. A part of this plan included identifying CACREP standards with Student Learning Objectives (SLO) that were established the previous year (2013-2014). As a result, the language of a few SLOs was modified slightly to better address CACREP standards. Student Competency Records (SCR) were created for every course and each CACREP standard and associated SLO was identified with at least one SCR. The result was an extremely thorough and comprehensive assessment of SLOs and associated CACREP standards. There are a total of 56 core/“professional identity” standards and 101 “professional practice” standards that are assessed within the MFT/CMHC program. This new assessment process began Fall 2014 and will require 2 full academic years to complete the first cycle of courses and SCRs.

The SSBS faculty decided at the previous annual assessment meeting (2013-2014) that we would begin a “3-year assessment rotation” for each goal and associated SLO. The focus for this year was Goal #1 “Graduates provide counseling that is informed by ethical and professional best practices.” Results and discussion are summarized below. However, since this was the first full year of assessment using the new process, all the Goals and associated SLOs are identified in the tables below. This comprehensive attention to all goals and associated SLOs will continue for at least the next two years until an adequate baseline can be established.

### Goal 1 “Graduates provide counseling that is informed by ethical and professional best practices.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Objective</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Results of the Measurement</th>
<th>Faculty Discussion of the Results</th>
<th>Actions Taken by the School Faculty</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Graduates competently employ a variety of counseling skills and modalities as they engage clients in therapy.</td>
<td>Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 5 core/“professional identity” standards and 3 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 1.1. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 5 courses as well as internship experiences.</td>
<td>93.68 mean score for 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from 4 courses or internship settings during this first year.</td>
<td>The mean value of 93.68 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00. The faculty was pleased with this value but is eager to see review additional data as it becomes available.</td>
<td>No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as 1 remaining course is taught and additional internship experiences occur. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Graduates develop treatment plans and counseling strategies that are comprehensive</td>
<td>Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 6 core/“professional identity” standards and 30</td>
<td>92.67 mean score for 2014-2015 school year.</td>
<td>The mean value 92.67 exceeded the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00. The faculty was pleased with this value but is eager to</td>
<td>No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
including thorough assessment, accurate diagnosis, and well-articulated goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1</th>
<th>1.2 Graduates have a clear sense of mental health/marriage and family counselor identity and adhere to high ethical standards in all relationships, including clients and their families, peers, and staff.</th>
<th>“professional practice” standards that inform SLO 1.2. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 11 courses as well as practicum and internship experiences.</th>
<th>Data was collected from 5 courses as well as practicum and internship settings during this first year.</th>
<th>see review additional data as it becomes available. Faculty recognizes that this particular SLO covers a number of skill development areas and is crucial to preparing students to be professional.</th>
<th>collected as 6 additional courses are taught as well as additional internship experiences. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Graduates have a clear sense of mental health/marriage and family counselor identity and adhere to high ethical standards in all relationships, including clients and their families, peers, and staff.</td>
<td>Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 10 core/“professional identity” standards and 18 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 1.3. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 4 courses as well as practicum and internship experiences.</td>
<td>93.59 mean score for 2014-2015 school year. Data was obtained from all 4 courses used as collection points. In addition data was obtained from practicum and internship experiences.</td>
<td>The mean value of 93.59 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00. Faculty felt good about the mean value especially since it represented data from almost all collecting points.</td>
<td>No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as the remaining 5 courses are taught. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal 2 “Graduates synthesize theory, research, and systemic understanding into professional practice.”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2</th>
<th>2.1 Graduates accurately describe counseling theories and select relevant theoretical approaches when working with clients.</th>
<th>Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 12 core/“professional identity” standards and 8 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 2.1. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 9 courses.</th>
<th>93.85 mean score for 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from 4 of the courses with 5 courses yet to have data obtained.</th>
<th>The mean value of 93.85 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00 and the faculty is eager to continue the process as additional courses are taught.</th>
<th>No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as the remaining 5 courses are taught. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as the remaining 5 courses are taught. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table showing assessment of skills:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3 “Graduates demonstrate self and other awareness as they provide culturally relevant counseling.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Graduates express a significant appreciation and respect for differences and diversity within the clients they serve.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2.2 Graduates understand and apply research, evaluation, and professional inquiry to the practice of counseling.** | Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 8 core/“professional identity” standards and 12 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 2.2. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 2 courses. | 94.69 mean score for 2014-2015 school year. Both courses associated with this SLO were taught so a complete data set is represented. | The mean value of 94.69 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00. Faculty felt good about the mean value especially since it represented data from all collecting points. | No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy. | n/a | n/a |

| **2.3 Graduates formulate a clear systemic orientation in case conceptualization and treatment.** | Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 2 core/“professional identity” standards and 8 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 2.3. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 6 courses as well as practicum and internship experiences. | 92.60 mean score for 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from 4 of the courses with 2 courses yet to be taught. Data was also collected from practicum and internship experiences. | The mean value of 92.60 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00. Faculty felt good about the mean value especially since a majority of the data sources have been taught. | No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as the remaining 2 courses are taught along with additional internship experiences. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy. | n/a | n/a |
### 3.2 Graduates are deeply aware of personal characteristics of self and the role of self as counselor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple measures and data collection points: There is 1 core/“professional identity” standard and 1 “professional practice” standard that informs SLO 3.2. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 1 course as well as internship experiences.</th>
<th>93.88 mean score over 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from the 1 identified course as well as from internship experiences.</th>
<th>The mean value of 93.88 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00. The faculty was pleased with the results to date. Faculty discussed how to better assess program effectiveness in helping students gain awareness of their personal theology and spiritual beliefs and how those affect and are affected by counseling.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assess student knowledge and awareness of personal theological and spiritual beliefs that affect and are affected by counseling via the existing course, COUN 5200.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Add COUN 5200 to the Program Objective Alignment Matrix as well as the SLO Curriculum Map to target for assessment purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This course and assessment measure will be tied in with core/“professional identity” standard II.G.5.b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as courses are taught and as COUN 5200 is added in. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy.</td>
<td>1/2016</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2015</td>
<td>5/2015</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2015</td>
<td>5/2015</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3 Graduates are knowledgeable of community resources and appropriately refer others to relevant professionals and agencies.

| Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 4 core/“professional identity” standards and 2 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 3.3. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 3 courses as well as practicum and internship experiences. | 93.40 mean score over 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from 1 of 3 courses as well as practicum and internship settings during this first year. | The mean value of 93.40 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00 and the faculty is eager to continue the process as additional courses are taught. Faculty discussed appropriateness of assessing standard II.G.1.b. “Professional roles, function, and relationships with other human service providers, including strategies for interagency/interorganization collaboration and communications.” Faculty decided to consider the possibility of moving this to internship. Faculty also discussed the possibility of creating a “rolling” internship that combined all the internship “courses” in to one for SCR assessment purposes. | No immediate action required. Two items will be placed on the Fall 2015 program faculty meeting agenda. 1. Faculty will consider moving II.G.1.b. out of practicum and in to internship for demonstration of competency purposes. 2. Faculty will further discuss the concept of a “rolling” internship experience that would likely combine internship “courses” into one experience for assessment purposes. |}
School Counseling program. This new assessment process began Fall 2014 and will require 2 full academic years to complete the first cycle of courses and SCRs.

The SSBS faculty decided at the previous annual assessment meeting (2013-2014) that we would begin a “3-year assessment rotation” for each goal and associated SLO. The focus for this year was Goal #1 “Graduates provide counseling that is informed by ethical and professional best practices.” Results and discussion are summarized below. However, since this was the first full year of assessment using the new process, all the Goals and associated SLOs are identified in the tables below. This comprehensive attention to all goals and associated SLOs will continue for at least the next two years until an adequate baseline can be established.

**Goal 1 “Graduates provide counseling that is informed by ethical and professional best practices.”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Objective</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Results of the Measurement</th>
<th>Faculty Discussion of the Results</th>
<th>Actions Taken by the School Faculty</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Graduates competently employ a variety of counseling skills and modalities as they engage students in a school counseling setting.</td>
<td>Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 5 core/“professional identity” standards and 5 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 1.1. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 4 courses as well as practicum and internship experiences.</td>
<td>94.26 mean score for 2014-2015 school year. 50% of the identified courses provided data along with the school practicum.</td>
<td>The mean value of 94.26 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00. The faculty was pleased with the initial mean value but awaits additional data from 2 more courses yet to be taught as well as internship experiences.</td>
<td>No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as courses are taught. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Graduates develop lesson plans and counseling strategies that are comprehensive including thorough assessment, accurate evaluation, and appropriate implementation.</td>
<td>Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 6 core/“professional identity” standards and 19 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 1.2. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 4 courses as well as practicum and internship experiences.</td>
<td>94.26 mean score for 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from 1 course and from practicum.</td>
<td>The mean value of 94.26 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00. The faculty is awaiting further data from additional courses and internship but initial data seems positive.</td>
<td>No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as courses are taught. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Graduates have a clear sense of school counselor identity and adhere to high ethical standards in all relationships, including students and their families, peers, and staff.

Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 10 core/“professional identity” standards and 7 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 1.3. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 4 courses as well as practicum and internship experiences.

94.40 mean score for 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from 3 of 4 courses along with practicum.

The mean value of 94.40 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00.

Faculty had little to discuss and were pleased with the initial mean but hesitant to draw conclusions until additional data is available.

No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as courses are taught. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy.

---

Goal 2 “Graduates synthesize theory, research, and systemic understanding into professional practice.”

2.1 Graduates accurately describe counseling theories and select relevant theoretical approaches when working with clients.

Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 12 core/“professional identity” standards and 6 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 2.1. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 8 courses.

94.03 mean score for 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from 50% of the identified courses.

The mean value of 94.03 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00.

Faculty had little to discuss and were pleased with the initial mean but hesitant to draw conclusions until additional data is available.

No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as courses are taught. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy.

---

2.2 Graduates understand and apply research, evaluation, and professional inquiry to the practice of counseling.

Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 8 core/“professional identity” standards and 9 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 2.2. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 2 courses.

91.54 mean score for 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from 50% of the identified courses.

The mean value of 91.54 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00.

Faculty had little to discuss and were pleased with the initial mean but hesitant to draw conclusions until additional data is available.

No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as courses are taught. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy.

---
### 2.3 Graduates formulate a clear systemic orientation in case conceptualization and treatment.

| Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 2 core/“professional identity” standards and 10 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 2.3. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 5 courses as well as practicum and internship experiences. | 93.64 mean score for 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from 2 of 5 courses along with practicum. | The mean value of 93.64 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00. Faculty had little to discuss and were pleased with the initial mean but hesitant to draw conclusions until additional data is available. | No immediate action required. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as courses are taught. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy. | n/a | n/a |

#### Goal 3 “Graduates demonstrate self and other awareness as they provide culturally relevant counseling.”

| Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 8 core/“professional identity” standards and 5 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 3.1. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 4 courses as well as practicum and internship experiences. | 93.67 mean score over 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from 3 of 4 courses along with practicum. | The mean value of 93.67 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00. The faculty favorably noted the mean value. Faculty realized that no formal program assessment was being used to determine how well students are trained to appreciate and respect theological and spiritual beliefs of clients. | 1. Assess student ability to appreciate and respect theological and spiritual beliefs of clients via the existing course, COUN 5200 2. Add COUN 5200 to the Program Objective Alignment Matrix as well as the SLO Curriculum Map to target for assessment purposes 3. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as the final course is taught and as COUN 5200 is added in. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy. | 1/2016 | 1/2016 | 5/2015 | 5/2015 | n/a | n/a |
### 3.2 Graduates are deeply aware of personal characteristics of self and the role of self as counselor.

| Multiple measures and data collection points: There is 1 core/“professional identity” standards that informs SLO 3.2. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 2 courses. | 94.55 mean score over 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from both collection points (100%). | The mean value of 94.55 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00. The faculty was pleased with the results to date. Faculty discussed how to better assess program effectiveness in helping students gain awareness of their personal theology and spiritual beliefs and how those affect and are affected by counseling. | 1. Assess student knowledge and awareness of personal theological and spiritual beliefs that affect and are affected by counseling via the existing course, COUN 5200.  
2. Add COUN 5200 to the Program Objective Alignment Matrix as well as the SLO Curriculum Map to target for assessment purposes.  
3. This course and assessment measure will be tied in with core/“professional identity” standard II.G.5.b.  
4. Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results. Additional data will be collected as courses are taught and as COUN 5200 is added in. Some standards may be combined for assessment purposes where there appears to be redundancy. | 1/2016 | 5/2015 |

### 3.3 Graduates are knowledgeable of community resources and appropriately refer others to relevant professionals and agencies.

| Multiple measures and data collection points: There are 4 core/“professional identity” standards and 8 “professional practice” standards that inform SLO 3.3. These standards are tabulated using SCRs that assess various assignments and exams across 3 courses as well as practicum and internship experiences. | 94.42 mean score over 2014-2015 school year. Data was collected from 2 of 3 courses along with practicum. | The mean value of 94.42 is above the benchmark set by faculty of 86.00. | No immediate action required. Two items will be placed on the Fall 2015 program faculty meeting agenda.  
1. Faculty will consider moving II.G.1.b. out of practicum and in to internship for demonstration of competency purposes.  
2. Faculty will further discuss | 5/2015 | 5/2015 | n/a | n/a |
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Assessment Timeline for Graduate Counseling Program
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As seen in the illustration of the Program Assessment Cycle, a significant component of the CAP is to gather data, evidence of the strengths and weaknesses of the Counseling Program’s performance in helping students achieve identified Student Learning Outcomes. Multiple measures are utilized to assess student performance. These measures are woven into formative evaluation and assessment throughout the year during Counseling Program weekly meetings, as well as summative evaluation and assessment during the Counseling Program.

Program faculty met 3-4 times per month from August 2014-April 2015 for a total of 28 documented planning and assessment meetings. A majority of these meetings was focused on preparing the CACREP self-study documentation. Highlights include: slight revision of the SACSCOC SLO’s to more easily line up with CACREP standards, establishing SCR protocol and recording procedures, development of the CAP, incorporation of the CPCE exam as a standardized measure of student competency for the MFT/CMHC program, updated practicum evaluation form, adjusting format and structure of 1hr courses, introduced new format for connecting SLO’s and CACREP standards using the SCR student data, reviewed and adjusted requirements for direct and indirect clock hours for both practicum and internship, shift course rotations somewhat to better accommodate developmental needs of students, and added additional academic coursework in both school counseling and MFT/CMHC programs.

In addition, on May 5, 2015 the faculty participated in the Counseling Program Review annual meeting. The primary purpose of this meeting was to consider program purpose and effectiveness using both anecdotal evidence as well as formal assessment data collected from 2014-2015 school year.

Direct Evidence: Feedback from student performance throughout the curriculum serves as the primary means of direct evidence. Students are assessed continuously throughout their time in the program. There are multiple benchmarks throughout this process, including experiential and discussion-based instructional methods as well as formalized assessment procedures. Student performance and demonstrated competency provides primary measures of program quality and effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Results of the Measurement</th>
<th>Faculty Discussion of the Results</th>
<th>Actions Taken by the School Faculty</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Competency Records (SCRs)</td>
<td>SCRs are used to demonstrate knowledge and skill attainment based on relevant CACREP standards. Any area on the SCR labeled as “Below Standard” requires</td>
<td>● There were 5 students who were identified as being below standard in 1 or more areas. ● A remediation plan was</td>
<td>● Learning SCR protocol as we go ● Remediation Plans appear to be accomplishing task ● Likely need to revise meeting schedule to better</td>
<td>● No immediate action required ● Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data as related to SLOs is provided in Appendix B and Appendix C.</td>
<td>A remediation plan which must be completed within 60 days. The SCRs are distributed by the course professor; students are required to provide copies to their academic advisors and to the Graduate Program Office for maintenance in the student’s file. SCRs closely tie the coursework to CACREP standards, and also provide a method of remediation/support for those students whose struggles may not be captured well through traditional grading methods.</td>
<td>Provided for each student identified as below standard. ● All plans to date have been successfully completed within the 60-day period and competency has been demonstrated by each student.</td>
<td>Accommodate collection of data from spring course work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rounds</td>
<td>Grand Rounds typically occurs in the fall semester of a student’s final year. Students present an actual case study before faculty and peers. Students are assessed in their use of theory, ethics, therapeutic interventions, treatment goals, client systems, multicultural components of therapy and issues related to the self of the therapist.</td>
<td>● Eleven students participated in Grand Rounds Fall 2014 ● All 11 students passed ● Group mean score was 94.83 ● Group range was 92.13-96.95</td>
<td>● Grand Rounds appears to be effective at demonstrating competencies within the students evaluated ● Grand Rounds was well attended by underclassmen and seemed to provide an excellent teaching tool for them as well as assessment for the presenter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● No immediate action required ● Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Rounds

Grand Rounds typically occurs in the fall semester of a student’s final year. Students present an actual case study before faculty and peers. Students are assessed in their use of theory, ethics, therapeutic interventions, treatment goals, client systems, multicultural components of therapy and issues related to the self of the therapist.

- Eleven students participated in Grand Rounds Fall 2014
  - All 11 students passed
  - Group mean score was 94.83
  - Group range was 92.13-96.95

Grand Rounds appears to be effective at demonstrating competencies within the students evaluated.

Grand Rounds was well attended by underclassmen and seemed to provide an excellent teaching tool for them as well as assessment for the presenter.

No immediate action required.

Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results.
| Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE) | This standardized exam is typically given during the spring final semester of MFT/CMHC students. The CPCE is used to assess counseling students’ ability to recall and access knowledge relevant to the practice of counseling. Results are used to assess functioning in various curricular areas, as well as allow the faculty to compare students to national norms. | Seven students took the CPCE Spring 2015 | Faculty were pleased with results considering the program has never used the CPCE and students did very well as a whole | No immediate action required  
Next year (2016), the group mean will be reported that includes any student who failed as well as a group mean that is recalculated to account for those who failed and then passed | n/a 4/2016 | n/a |
| Professional School Counselor (PSC) Praxis | SC students complete the School Guidance and Counseling (SGC) Praxis during their final spring semester. The SGC Praxis measures knowledge and skills required in both primary and secondary school levels. Domains assessed by the SGC Praxis include: counseling and guidance; consulting; coordinating; and, professional issues. The SGC Praxis is required for licensure in Tennessee as a Professional School Counselor. Student scores are examined by the Program Director and by the program faculty to identify strengths and weaknesses in the achievement of necessary knowledge. | Seven students took the PSC Praxis in 2015 (one SC 2014 graduate, four SC 2015 graduates, two Non-degree alumni seeking licensure as SC) | Faculty were very pleased with results considering this was the first group of individuals, trained in the school counseling program, had taken the PSC Praxis | No immediate action required  
Next year (2016), both the aggregate mean as well as the cohort mean for the graduate year cohort will be reported | n/a 4/2016 | n/a |
| Oral Exam | During their final spring semester, all counseling students are required to complete and pass an oral exam. Students are provided a case study approximately one hour prior to the exam and asked questions about conceptualization, treatment direction, and ethics related to the case. Each student’s responses are evaluated for clinical competency. A summary of student performance is developed by each Internship Coordinator (MFT/CMHC and SC) and presented to the Program Faculty at the Counseling Program Review meeting each spring. | • Eleven students participated in Oral Exams Spring 2015  
• All 11 students passed  
• Group mean score was 93.81  
• Group range was 90.27-95.34 | • Oral Exams appear to be effective at demonstrating competencies within the students evaluated  
• Breaking up in to two separate evaluation teams allowed more efficient use of student and faculty time  
• Having at least 2 and sometimes 3 faculty per evaluation team allowed for a thorough assessment and discussion with each student  
• Oral Exams were well attended by underclassmen and seemed to provide an excellent teaching tool for them as well as assessment for the presenter | • No immediate action required  
• Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results | n/a | n/a |
| Skills Data-Practicum Course Evaluations | Students are evaluated by their site supervisor during practicum. These evaluations comprise an important assessment of student skills. Domains assessed include: counseling skills; treatment; client systems; faith integration; self of the therapist; ethics; professionalism; and, diversity. The student’s evaluation is incorporated into the course grade, which is utilized as a comprehensive evaluation of developmentally appropriate skills. Students are required | • Twelve students were enrolled in practicum  
• One student failed to pass and was required to repeat practicum  
• One student was below standard in 1 area, a remediation plan was provided, competency was achieved, and the student was able to continue on to internship  
• Students provided 524.3 hours of direct | • Faculty were pleased with overall performance of practicum students  
• Using practicum as a “gatekeeping” entry to clinical appeared to be very effective  
• The process of developing a remediation plan for students who failed to meet a particular competency worked well  
• Faculty were impressed with the amount of direct service hours provided to clients | • No immediate action required  
• Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results | n/a | n/a |
to earn a B or better in practicum before proceeding to internship. The abundance of data collected through practicum is tabulated by the Internship Coordinators and presented to the Program faculty during the Counseling Program Review meeting each spring.

| Skills Data-Internship Evaluations | Students are evaluated by their site supervisor during each semester of internship. These evaluations comprise an important assessment of student skills. Domains assessed include: counseling skills; treatment; client systems; faith integration; self of the therapist; ethics; professionalism; and, diversity. The student’s evaluation is incorporated into the course grade, which is utilized as a comprehensive evaluation of developmentally appropriate skills. Students are required to earn a B or better during their internship experience. The abundance of data collected through internship coursework is tabulated by the Internship Coordinators and presented to the Program faculty during the Counseling Program Review meeting each spring. | ● Eleven students were enrolled in internship ● All students passed with a “B” or better ● Students provided 916.8 hours of direct services to clients with a mean of 86.8/student ● Students provided 1654.6 hours of indirect clock hours with a mean of 154.4/student | ● Faculty were pleased with overall performance of internship students ● Faculty were impressed with the amount of direct service hours provided to clients ● Faculty discussed the possibilities of developing a “rolling” internship that would better account for competencies that may need to be demonstrated for assessment purposes every semester versus competencies that need be demonstrated only once during the entire internship | ● No immediate action required ● Faculty will continue reviewing both the process and the results and will give further consideration to the concept of a “rolling” internship | n/a | Fall 2015 | n/a |
Indirect Evidence: Indirect evidence is collected from students and graduates of the program as well as institutional data, providing additional support and evidence that learning has occurred. This evidence is also collected from stakeholders, providing their perspectives of student learning, growth, and development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alumni Survey</th>
<th>A survey of alumni from the previous 5 years is conducted annually beginning Fall 2014. The survey seeks data on numbers of alumni who obtain employment in the field of study, professional licenses, supervisory certifications and professional development activities. The survey also seeks input from graduates on how well prepared they are as professionals, suggestions for program improvement as well as identifying elements of the program that were particularly beneficial.</th>
<th>Ninety percent of respondents were employed in counseling field.</th>
<th>Faculty were pleased with the 90% employment rate, though there was some discussion about tweaking the question so that it would get at those who sought employment.</th>
<th>Develop a more effective Supervisor Training Procedure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forty-seven percent have taken licensure exam and passed all but 1 passing on first attempt.</td>
<td>The passing rate for those who attempted licensure exam appears quite high for those who responded (100%) with only one of those requiring second attempt.</td>
<td>Improve communications with and support of off-campus supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two respondents obtained LPC license. Five obtained LMFT license.</td>
<td>One respondent obtained clinical supervision certification and one is a supervisor in training.</td>
<td>Expand site visits and contact with field supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One respondent obtained clinical supervision certification and one is a supervisor in training.</td>
<td>Five percent of the respondents have continued on to doctoral studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents indicated a much higher level of supervision satisfaction with the University Counseling Center site as opposed to other sites off-campus.</td>
<td>Respondents indicated a much higher level of supervision satisfaction with the University Counseling Center site as opposed to other sites off-campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty were pleased with the awareness that recent graduates are already obtaining or seeking supervisory certifications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty were concerned about the seeming contrast between supervision experience at the University Counseling Center versus off-campus settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty were concerned about the seeming contrast between supervision experience at the University Counseling Center versus off-campus settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty were concerned about the seeming contrast between supervision experience at the University Counseling Center versus off-campus settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty were concerned about the seeming contrast between supervision experience at the University Counseling Center versus off-campus settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Focus Groups</strong></td>
<td>Student focus groups are conducted annually in the spring semester. These focus groups seeking program information from current students and those about to graduate. In particular, input is sought to help maintain or improve the quality of the program and the student’s clinical and academic experiences.</td>
<td>• School Counseling students indicated a feeling at times that instructors in academic courses saw school counseling as an “after-thought.”</td>
<td>• Faculty discussed findings from the focus groups. Particular concern was expressed in trying to improve the perception that some school counseling students had in feeling perhaps marginalized.</td>
<td>• Program Director will take lead in meeting and discussing with School Program faculty the intention of embedding SC students into culture, or adjusting culture to be more welcoming to SC students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Site Supervisor and Employer Survey** | Annual surveys are used to gather important data from stakeholders, including site supervisors and employers. For the 2014-15 Academic Year, the surveys took the form of informal interviews with the Internship Coordinator. In total, seven individuals representing their respective agencies were interviewed. | • Summary statements from each interview were formulated and used to create a one-page summary document. | • Graduate Counseling Faculty are to discuss the summary document Fall 2015. | • No immediate action in direct relation to these summaries will be taken until Beyond the immediate summaries, the Program Director will oversee an online survey to supplement individual interviews for both Site Supervisors as well as Potential Employers for the 2015-16 academic year. | Fall 2015 | n/a |