Program Assessment Report

For both the master’s and doctoral programs, extensive assessment is completed and is overseen by one faculty member and a graduate assistant. This assessment is placed in the “WEAVE” system, which is an electronic online system that organizes the reports. The reports are reviewed by faculty yearly, as well as the advisory boards. Deficient areas are addressed by faculty, in consultation with the advisory boards, and changes are made when necessary. In addition, a copy of the WEAVE report is made available, online, for students to view.

The following presents an outline of the outcome/objectives and specific measures that are used to assess various aspects of the program for the master’s programs and then for the doctoral program (pp. 1-3). This is followed by select areas of program evaluation that focus solely on the program (as opposed to other evaluation areas, such as student learning) (pp. 4-7). Finally, this is followed by copies of the WEAVE report for the 2013-2014 academic year (pp. 8-19 for the master’s program and 20-27 for the doctoral program). Currently, the 2014-2015 academic year is still in process.

Assessment in the Master’s Programs: Program assessment is broad based and occurs in multiple ways. For the master’s programs, specific outcomes/objectives include the following:

1. Knowledge attainment in key content areas
2. Case conceptualization proficiency
3. Demonstrating proficiency with counseling skills
4. Program evaluation
5. Teaching excellence
6. Competence faculty and supervisors
7. Evaluation of students in the field
8. Portfolio review
9. Community partnerships

Each of the outcomes and objectives are measured in numerous ways. The following lists each of the above outcomes/objectives and identifies the measures used to assess them.

1. Knowledge attainment in key content areas
   a. National Counselor Exam scores
   b. Comprehensive Professional Exam Scores
   c. Successful CACREP Review

2. Case conceptualization proficiency
   a. Completion of capstone project

3. Demonstrating proficiency with counseling skills
   a. Passing counseling skills class
   b. Successful passing of practicum and internship

4. Program evaluation
a. Supervisors of alumni review of program  
b. Evaluation of program by alumni  
c. Completion of evaluation by graduate students  
d. Advisory board review of program  

5. Teaching excellence  
a. Student evaluation of faculty teaching  
b. Teaching portfolio review  

6. Competent faculty and supervisors  
a. Evaluation of [site] supervisor  
b. Review of faculty information summary [yearly comprehensive faculty evaluation]  

7. Evaluation of students in the field  
a. Completion of evaluation by on-site supervisors  

8. Portfolio review [school counseling students]  
a. Successful completion of portfolio  

9. Community partnerships  
a. Continuing education workshops  
b. ODUCSB Community Counseling Center  
c. Partnerships with schools  

**Assessment in the Doctoral Program:** Program assessment is broad based and occurs in multiple ways. For the doctoral program, specific outcomes/objectives include the following:  

1. Program evaluation  
2. Accreditation of program  
3. Knowledge attainment in key content areas  
4. Develop community partnerships  
5. Teaching excellence  
6. Competent faculty  
7. Completion of dissertation  
8. Demonstrating knowledge in a specialty area  

Each of the outcomes and objectives are measured in numerous ways. The following lists each of the outcomes/objectives and identifies the measures used to assess them.  

**Outcome/Objective**  

1. Program evaluation  
a. Evaluation of program by graduating students  
b. Evaluation of supervisors/employers of graduates
c. Evaluation of program by alumni
d. Review of program by advisory board

2. Accreditation of program
   a. CACREP accreditation visit

3. Knowledge attainment in key content areas
   a. CACREP accreditation visit
   b. Successful dissertation defense
   c. Successful completion of candidacy exam

4. Develop community partnership
   a. ODU/CSB Community Counseling Center
   b. Continuing education workshops
   c. Partnerships with schools

5. Teaching excellence
   a. Teaching portfolio review
   b. Student evaluation of faculty teaching

6. Competent faculty
   a. Review of faculty information summary [yearly comprehensive faculty evaluation]

7. Completion of dissertation
   a. Successful dissertation defense

8. Demonstrating knowledge in a specialty area
   a. Successful dissertation defense
   b. Successful completion of candidacy exam
Select Program Evaluation Areas

The following highlights those areas of program assessment that directly assess program issues (i.e., in contrast to assessing student learning, etc.). For a full report of the master’s programs and the Ph.D. program, see the attached “WEAVE” Assessment Reports. WEAVE is the electronic online assessment system in which program evaluation is placed.

Direct program assessment occurs in multiple ways, including:

I. Evaluation of the program by graduating students
II. Evaluation of supervisors/employers of graduates
III. Evaluation of the program by alumni
IV. Review of the program by our advisory boards
V. Assessment of the program through a review of how our students do on the CPCE exam and on the NCE exam

I. Evaluation of the Program by Graduating Students

Master’s Students: All graduating master’s students take, online, 116 to 131 item survey that assesses how adequately the program taught the 8 CACREP Common Core standards, specialty coursework, their practicum and internship experience, and a number of program activities, such as ease of access to program policies, awareness of grants and scholarships, availability of assistantships, workshops and seminar opportunities, personal growth experiences, and ease of access to program advisor (length of survey varies as a function of specialty area). Results are examined and items in which students scored 3.5 or below on the 5-point scale of the survey are examined in more detail. These items are discussed at a program meeting, with our advisory boards, and made public to students. Based on discussions with faculty, advisory board members, and on student feedback, adjustments are made to the program. The full evaluation during the past academic year, 36 students took the program evaluation survey. Common items, regardless of specialty area, that scored below a 3.5 on the 5-point Likert-type scale included the following: 46. Basic parametric and non-parametric statistics (Mean=3.39; SD=1.10); 48. Uses of computers for data management and analysis (Mean=3.14; SD=1.10); 65. Easy access to program information and program policies (Mean=3.17; SD=1.32); 66. Awareness of ODU grants and scholarships that can be applied to graduate school (Mean=2.64; SD=1.48); 67. Awareness of available assistantships at ODU or in the Hampton Roads area (Mean=3.36; SD=1.20); 69. Opportunities to engage in research activities either on your own or with faculty (Mean=3.25; SD=1.40). Overall mean and SD for all 71 common items was 3.95 and .68 respectively. Thirteen (13) students took the survey who specialized in school counseling. For this specialty area, none of the 22 items fell below the 3.5 cutoff score. Overall mean and SD for this group was 4.06 and 0.85, respectively. Twenty (20) students took the survey who specialized in mental health counseling. For this specialty area, two of the 20 items fell below the 3.5 cutoff score, which included item 79. Strategies for community needs assessment to design, implement, and evaluate mental health care programs, and systems (Mean=3.45; SD=1.36); and item 91. Effective strategies for influencing public policy and government relations on local, state, and
national levels to enhance funding and programs that affect mental health services in general, and the practice of mental health counseling in particular (Mean=3.35; SD=0.81). The overall mean and standard deviation for this group of students was 3.95 and 0.81 respectively. Furthermore, three (3) students took the survey who specialized in college counseling. For this specialty area, fourteen out of 23 items’ mean fell below the 3.5 cutoff score, which included the following: 72. History and philosophy of college counseling, student affair, and higher education (Mean=3.33; SD=.58); 73. Issues, problems, and trends in student development in higher education (Mean=3.33; SD=.58); 75. Legal and ethical issues and standards of practice specifically related to college counseling (Mean=3.33; SD=1.53); 79. Historical and contemporary theories of college counseling and student development (Mean=3.33; SD=0.58); 81. Impact of different kinds of college environments (Mean=3.33; SD=1.53); 86. Methods and procedures in group work applicable to college populations (Mean=2.33; SD=0.58); 87. Small-group counseling approaches appropriate for the developmental stage and needs of traditional and nontraditional college students (Mean=2.33; SD=0.58); 88. Knowledge of issues that might affect the development and functioning of college (Mean=2.67; SD=0.58); 89. Application of procedures to ensure academic success (Mean=3.33; SD=1.53); 90. Methods and procedures to promote positive interpersonal relationships (Mean=3.0; SD=1.0); 91. Theories, models, and practices of leadership, organizational management, program development, and conflict resolution (Mean=3.33; SD=0.58); 92. Consultation skills for working with faculty, professional staff, and students' families in areas related to student development and welfare (Mean=3.0; SD=1.0); 93. Principles and models of biopsychosocial assessment, case conceptualization, and concepts of psychopathology that lead to diagnoses and appropriate counseling (Mean=3.0; SD=1.0); and 94. Appropriate referral systems for diagnosing and treating of disorders (Mean=3.0; SD=1.0). The overall mean and SD for this group was 3.23 and 0.89 respectively.

Ph.D. Students: All graduating Ph.D. students are requested to take a 64 item survey that assesses a variety of program concerns (climate, scholarship, doctoral committees, leadership), knowledge gained and awareness of professional identity, knowledge gained in core content areas for the Ph.D., knowledge gained and experience with leaning and conducting supervision, knowledge gained and experience with teaching, knowledge gained and experience with research and scholarship, knowledge gained and experience with counseling; knowledge gained and demonstration of the ability to provide leadership and advocacy activities. For the upcoming year, the survey was slightly changed and will now include 66 items.

During the past academic year, 8 of the 12 doctoral students who completed their Ph.D. in Counselor Education responded to the survey. Ten (10) out of 64 items were given ratings below an 8.0 on a 10-point Likert-type scale. Those items included: item 19. Ethical and legal considerations in counselor education and supervision (Mean=7.88; SD=3.31); item 32. Understand univariate and multivariate research designs and data analysis methods (Mean=7.88; SD=1.64); item 35. Know models and methods of program evaluation (Mean=7.50; SD=2.07); item 39. Demonstrate the ability to write grant proposals appropriate for research, program enhancement, and program development (Mean=6.75; SD=1.91); item 40. Demonstrate the ability to implement a program design evaluation (Mean=7.62; SD=1.85); item 45. Understand the effectiveness of models and methods of disaster response training (Mean=6.50; SD=2.07);
item 53. Understand theories and skills of leadership (Mean=7.63; SD=1.85); item 55. Understand models, leadership roles and strategies for responding to community, national, and international crises (Mean=7.25; SD=2.12); item 59. An awareness of ODU grants and scholarships that can be applied to graduate school (Mean=7.25; SD=1.58); item 60. An awareness of available assistantships at ODU or in the Hampton Roads area (Mean=8.88; SD=0.99). Particular emphasis should be placed on those scoring below a 7.5. The overall mean and SD was 8.63 and 0.87 respectively for the doctoral students’ satisfaction toward the counseling program

II. Evaluation of Supervisors/Employers of Graduates
Due to limited responses in follow-up of students, it was decided to conduct this evaluation every two or three years. This evaluation is scheduled to take place, again, during the 2015-2016 academic year. A program Facebook page is currently being developed which should help the program track alumni and assess a higher number of supervisors and employers. During the 2012-2013 academic year, the following was reported:

“Ongoing review by employers of students who have graduated program occurs every two to three years. The first evaluation includes alumni from 2000-2005. During the past academic year, a survey was sent to employers and supervisors of students who graduated the program over the past two academic years. Despite efforts, many students could not be found, and many did not follow-up with their supervisors. Of the approximately 50 students who we could contact, 10 students were able to have their supervisors complete a 10-point Likert-Type scale, supervisors rated their skills as extremely high with a mean of 9.3. No items were rated low. Specific item questions can be found in the program evaluator's office.”

III. Evaluation of the Program by Alumni
Due to limited responses in follow-up of students, it was decided to conduct this evaluation every two or three years. This evaluation is scheduled to take place, again, during the 2015-2016 academic year. A program Facebook page is currently being developed which should help the program track alumni and assess a higher number of alumni. During the 2012-2013 academic year, the following was reported:

“Twenty students returned a survey that assessed 20 items on a 10-point Likert-type scale. Two items were below the 8.0 target, and included item 9. I understand career development and related life factors and can apply these skills with clients with a score of 7.1, and item 12. My knowledge of crisis counseling and disaster response is adequate for my job setting. From these results we are examining changes in the career course and we have infused crisis and disaster counseling into the program. Other responses to the survey can be found in the program evaluator's office.”

IV. Review of the Program by Our Advisory Boards
The master's and doctoral programs and respective specialty areas all have advisory boards. These boards have met with program directors, the Chair of the department, and with faculty over the past few years to consult concerning direction of the programs.
V. Assessment of the Master’s Degree Programs Through a Review of How Our Students Do on the CPCE Exam and on the NCE Exam

NCE Exam: During the 2014-2015 academic year, two test dates for the National Counselor Examination (NCE) were available. About 25 students took the NCE and our pass rate approximates 90 percent. Our students have consistently scored higher than the national average on the exam. Additionally, our students tend to score higher than other CACREP institutions and considerably higher than non-CACREP institutions. Also, our students tended to score higher than the mean on the eight CACREP content areas. Specific tests results are maintained by the program evaluator and can be accessed via request from the department chair.

During the 2014--2015 year, fifty-nine (59) of our master’s level counseling students took the national comprehensive exam (CPCE). Two students failed the exam which necessitated them re-taking it. A faculty member met with the students to review the scores and to discuss ways of improving specific areas of deficit. One student passed on the second attempt and the second student passed on the third attempt. Our students, on average, scored close to one-half standard deviation above the national mean of all schools who take the exam as an exit exam. In addition, our students tend to do better than other CACREP accredited institutions. Overall, our students consistently scored well above the mean on each of the eight content areas which match the CACREP core content areas. Specific scores are maintained by the program evaluator and can be accessed via a request from the department chair.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of our master's degree (M.S.Ed.) Counseling Graduate Program is to equip students with the skills, knowledge, and attitudes which will enable them to function well in the demanding and ever-changing world of the professional counselor. This mission is closely aligned with that of Old Dominion University: advancement of knowledge, pursuit of truth, and responsible citizenship. The program and faculty's values have also been shaped through program accreditation by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). We accept responsibility to provide high quality training programs grounded in self-evaluation and improvement; in doing this we intend to remain responsive to the changing requirements of a dynamic, pluralistic society, to new and emerging client needs, and to the counseling profession, both regionally and nationally. The Counseling Graduate Program serves diverse, qualified students from the Hampton Roads region, from across the United States, and from countries worldwide. A key aim of the program faculty is not only to prepare these diverse students with research-based knowledge and generic competencies, but also to help them develop those attitudes of tolerance, curiosity, reflectiveness, commitment, perseverance, and compassion, which will serve them well in professional practice. Unfolding from this mission statement are the program's objectives and the curriculum, which can be found in the master's program handbook.

Goals

G 1: To have a nationally recognized Counseling Program
To have a nationally recognized Counseling Program

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Targets and Findings

SLO 1: Knowledge Attainment in Key Content Areas
Students will show that they have attained knowledge the eight key content areas identified by our accrediting body, CACREP. By examining syllabi and reviewing the program, CACREP accreditation assures that the program is addressing these content areas and students are learning them. Secondly, successful scores on the CPCE exam assures student learning of content areas. The CPCE exam is a national comprehensive exam aligned with CACREP content standards. Finally, for those students who take the National Certification Exam, passing rates is another way we can assure student learning in the content areas is taking place. Like the CPCE exam, the NCC exam is aligned with CACREP content areas.

Related Measures:

M 1: National Counselor Exam (NCE)
Students will successfully pass the NCE by either meeting or surpassing the national mean.

**Target:** Mean or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
During the 2013-2014 academic year, two test dates for the National Counselor Examination (NCE) were available. Fifteen (15) of our counseling masters students took the non-mandatory NCE exam and 15 passed. Our students have consistently scored higher than the national average on the exam. Additionally, for both testing periods, our students scored higher than other CACREP institutions and considerably higher than non-CACREP institutions. Also, our students tended to score higher than the mean on the eight CACREP content areas. Specific tests results are maintained by the program evaluator and can be accessed via request from the department chair.

**M 2: Comprehensive Professional Exam scores**
Scores by ODU students comparable to the national average on the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE).

**Target:** Scores to be near the national mean or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
During the 2013-2014 year, 55 of our master's level counseling students took the national comprehensive exam (CPCE). Our students, on average, scored close to three-quarters standard deviation above the national mean. One student failed the exam. All others passed. Overall, our students consistently scored well above the mean on each of the eight content areas which match the CACREP core content areas. Specific scores are maintained by the program evaluator and can be accessed via a request from the department chair.

**M 3: Successful CACREP review**
Successful review of new Mental Health Counseling Program, new College Counseling Program, and new Ph.D. in Counselor Education Program.

**Target:** Full accreditation of all programs.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
During the 2013-2014 academic year, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) reviewed and accredited the on-campus and distance learning master's counseling programs as a single site operating from the Norfolk campus. The accreditation will expire October 31, 2020.
SLO 2: Case Conceptualization Proficiency
Students will show that they have mastered the ability to conceptualize client cases by demonstrating proficiency in a capstone project that takes place during the internship. This project includes the presentation of a case study to the class concerning a client they work with during the internship.

**Related Measures:**

**M 4: Completion of Capstone Project**
Instructor who serves as the student’s internship supervisor reviews capstone project that includes presentation of a case study to the class concerning a client the student is working with during the internship.

**Target:** 95% pass rate.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
The capstone project is approached from a mastery learning perspective. Students deliver written and oral case studies and case conceptualizations. This past year the pass rate for the case study and presentation in internship was 100%.

SLO 3: Demonstrating Proficiency with Counseling Skills
Students will demonstrate mastery of basic counseling skills by passing COUN 633: Counseling Skills with a B- or better. COUN 633 focuses solely on the learning of basic counseling skills and mastery of these skills through attainment of a B- or better is mandatory for students to continue in the Counseling Program.

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: Passing Counseling Skills Class**
Students need to pass the basic Counseling Skills class with a grade of B or better. Passing this class involves the use of an outside criteria, such as showing mastery of basic counseling skills on the Carkhuff scale (mean of 3.0 or higher), or basic skills passed on Ivey’s or Egan’s criteria.

**Target:** 95% pass rate

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Review of student transcripts and a survey of faculty who teach the counseling skills courses indicates that students have passed the counseling skills classes at a rate of 97% or higher during the 2013/2014 academic year (72 of 74 students passed).

M 6: Successful Passing of Practicum and Internship
Successful evaluation of students by faculty and site supervisors in students' field placement courses. Faculty will assess students by viewing videotapes and rating the
ability of students. Field supervisors will use a rating scale provided by the program (results of rating scale is reported separately).

**Target:** 95% Pass Rate

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Feedback from faculty and from the Counseling Program clinical coordinator show a very high pass rate for students completing practicum and internship (approximately 99%). Student performance seems particularly good in internship, as evidenced by high evaluation marks from internship students' site supervisors (see Objective 7).

**SLO 4: Program Evaluation**
The program is evaluated in the following ways: 1. Students complete an evaluation of the program during their last semester; areas evaluated include: (a) whether the 8 curriculum content areas identified by CACREP have been fully covered, (b) whether the specialty area curriculum as identified by CACREP has been fully covered, (c) effectiveness of field placements (practicum and internship), and (d) "other" program areas such as knowledge of program policies, availability of assistantships, knowledge of conferences and workshops, and access to personal growth experiences. 2. Every two years an evaluation is sent to the employers of recent alumni. Evaluation of students by employers is a reflection of program efficacy. Evaluation includes an overview of alumni’s professional work habits and counseling skills. 3. An advisory board evaluates program informally through feedback to Graduate Program Director.

**Related Measures:**

**M 7: Supervisors of Alumni Review of Program**
Ongoing review by employers of students who have graduated program. The first evaluation includes alumni from 2000-2005. Subsequently, every two to three years a mailing will be sent to students who graduated from the program. Students are asked for names and addresses of their immediate supervisors. Supervisors will be sent a Likert-Type scale (range 1 - 10) to rank order items concerning the alumni’s performance on the job.

**Target:** Average scores of 8.0 or higher on the Likert-Type scale.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met**
Ongoing review by employers of students who have graduated program occurs every two to three years. The first evaluation includes alumni from 2000-2005. In 2011-2012 a survey was sent to employers and supervisors of students who graduated the program over the past two academic years. Despite efforts, many students could not be found, and many did not follow-up with their supervisors. Of the approximately 50 students who we could contact, 10 students were able to have their supervisors complete a 10-point Likert-Type scale, supervisors rated their skills as extremely high with a mean of 9.3. No items were rated
low. Specific item questions can be found in the program evaluator's office. The next review will occur in 2014-2015, and the faculty are discussing new methods of staying in touch with graduates in order to better procure their employment information.

M 8: Evaluation of Program by Alumni
Ongoing review by alumni who have graduated program. The first evaluation includes alumni from 2000-2005. Subsequently, every two years a mailing will be sent to students who graduated from the program. Students will be sent a Likert-Type scale (range 1 - 10) to rank order items concerning their perceptions of the program.

**Target:** Average scores of 8.0 or higher on the Likert-Type scale.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met**
Alumni surveys are conducted every two - three years and were not done this year. Alumni will be surveyed again in 2014-2015.

M 9: Completion of Evaluation by Graduating Students
Students will complete an extensive review of the program during their internship by completing an extensive Likert-Type scale.

**Target:** On a Likert-Type Scale (1 = unsatisfactory, 2= minimally adequate, 3 = satisfactory, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent), any item below a 3.5 will be examined with particular emphasis on items below a 3.0.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
During the 2013-2014 academic year, 36 students took the program evaluation survey. Common items, regardless of specialty area, that scored below a 3.5 on the 5-point Likert-type scale included the following: 46. Basic parametric and non-parametric statistics (Mean=3.39; SD=1.10); 48. Uses of computers for data management and analysis (Mean=3.14; SD=1.10); 65. Easy access to program information and program policies (Mean=3.17; SD=1.32); 66. Awareness of ODU grants and scholarships that can be applied to graduate school (Mean=2.64; SD=1.48); 67. Awareness of available of assistantships at ODU or in the Hampton Roads area (Mean=3.36; SD=1.20); 69. Opportunities to engage in research activities either on your own or with faculty (Mean=3.25; SD=1.40). Overall mean and SD for all 71 common items was 3.95 and .68 respectively. Thirteen (13) students took the survey who specialized in school counseling. For this specialty area, none of the 22 items fell below the 3.5 cutoff score. Overall mean and SD for this group was 4.06 and 0.85 respectively. Twenty (20) students took the survey who specialized in mental health counseling. For this specialty area, two of the 20 items fell below the 3.5 cutoff score, which included item 79. Strategies for community needs assessment to design, implement, and evaluate mental health care programs, and systems (Mean=3.45; SD=1.36); and item 91. Effective strategies for influencing public policy and government relations on local, state, and national
levels to enhance funding and programs that affect mental health services in general, and the practice of mental health counseling in particular (Mean=3.35; SD=0.81). The overall mean and standard deviation for this group of students was 3.95 and 0.81 respectively. Furthermore, three (3) students took the survey who specialized in college counseling. For this specialty area, fourteen out of 23 items’ mean fell below the 3.5 cutoff score, which included the following: 72. History and philosophy of college counseling, student affair, and higher education (Mean=3.33; SD=.58); 73. Issues, problems, and trends in student development in higher education (Mean=3.33; SD=.58); 75. Legal and ethical issues and standards of practice specifically related to college counseling (Mean=3.33; SD=1.53); 79. Historical and contemporary theories of college counseling and student development (Mean=3.33; SD=0.58); 81. Impact of different kinds of college environments (Mean=3.33; SD=1.53); 86. Methods and procedures in group work applicable to college populations (Mean=2.33; SD=0.58); 87. Small-group counseling approaches appropriate for the developmental stage and needs of traditional and nontraditional college students (Mean=2.33; SD=0.58); 88. Knowledge of issues that might affect the development and functioning of college (Mean=2.67; SD=0.58); 89. Application of procedures to ensure academic success (Mean=3.33; SD=1.53); 90. Methods and procedures to promote positive interpersonal relationships (Mean=3.0; SD=1.0); 91. Theories, models, and practices of leadership, organizational management, program development, and conflict resolution (Mean=3.33; SD=0.58); 92. Consultation skills for working with faculty, professional staff, and students' families in areas related to student development and welfare (Mean=3.0; SD=1.0); 93. Principles and models of biopsychosocial assessment, case conceptualization, and concepts of psychopathology that lead to diagnoses and appropriate counseling (Mean=3.0; SD=1.0); and 94. Appropriate referral systems for diagnosing and treating of disorders (Mean=3.0; SD=1.0). The overall mean and SD for this group was 3.23 and 0.89 respectively.

M 10: Advisory Board Review of Program
Yearly review by outside advisory board members in each specialty area. Board will meet and review goals, basic course work, handbooks, and other program material.

**Target:** Collecting of feedback and making changes as needed

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met**
The master's and doctoral programs and respective specialty areas all have advisory boards. These boards have met with program directors, the Chair of the department, and with faculty over the past few years to consult concerning direction of the programs. As the program was recently re-accredited and advisory board members were consulted in that process by the CACREP team, no advisory team meetings were held this year. Meetings should resume during the 2014-2015 academic year.
SLO 5: Teaching Excellence
For full-time faculty, teaching is evaluated through: 1. University generated evaluation instrument students take at the completion of each course, and 2. Teaching portfolio review by team of two or three program faculty completed yearly for non-tenured faculty and every five years for tenured faculty. New adjunct faculty are observed and evaluations monitored by Program Director and Chair.

Related Measures:

M 11: Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching
Students will evaluate faculty at the completion of each course through the University evaluation system.

Target: Faculty evaluation by students on the University 5-point Likert-type student evaluation scale to be above a 4.0 on average.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
For overall teaching effectiveness, on average, departmental faculty were ranked highly for their teaching, and slightly higher than the other faculty in the College of Education (which maintains a mean close to 4.2 on a 5 point scale). For the fall 2013 semester, departmental faculty were rated at 4.45 on a 5 point Likert scale, compared to 4.42 for the college average. For the spring 2014 semester, departmental faculty were rated at 4.46, compared to 4.41 for the college average. For the summer session of the 2013-2014 academic year, departmental faculty were rated at 4.53 on overall teaching effectiveness, compared to 4.44 for the college.

M 12: Teaching Portfolio Review
Yearly teaching portfolio review of non-tenured faculty members and five year teaching portfolio of tenured faculty. A review of quantitative and qualitative evaluations of tenure-track and adjunct faculty which occurs through review of teaching portfolios for tenure track faculty by committee, the Department Chair and the Dean and through reviews of adjunct faculty by the Department Chair.

Target: Acceptable Evaluation of Teaching Portfolio.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
Faculty were successfully reviewed by committees, Chair, and Dean and received feedback. All faculty met minimum standards in the review and most faculty were well above what was expected. Numerous faculty awards for teaching were received.

SLO 6: Competent Faculty and Supervisors
To assure competent faculty and supervisors, faculty are routinely evaluated by their peers and by students. Supervisors are vetted by the field-placement coordinator and are routinely evaluated by students.

**Related Measures:**

**M 13: Evaluation of Supervisor**
Internship field supervisors are routinely rated by students on a 5-point Likert-type scale that assesses (a) the supervisor's regularity in meeting, (b) ability to guide, (c) ability to help students with personal issues interfering in counseling, (d) effectiveness at discussing professional issues, (e) level of support, (f) ability to communicate effectively, (g) level of learning, and (h) overall effectiveness.

**Target:** 4.0 or above on a 5-point Likert-type scale

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
This year we utilized an online survey to collect data and students submitted their final evaluation through email. A total of 52 students responded to the survey evaluating their sites and supervisors' effectiveness. The overall evaluation for the sites and experiences was 4.48 on a 5.0 point Likert scale with a standard deviation of 0.83. All items showed means above 4.0, with a range of standard deviation between 0.70 to 1.2. However, the item related to opportunities to record counseling sessions reached the minimum score of 1, indicating that approximately seven students reported that they had difficulty getting their sessions recorded. For the overall evaluation of the site supervisor's effectiveness, the mean was 4.4 with a standard deviation of 0.83. All students rated their supervisor from the range acceptable to excellent, except two students ranked their supervisor's effectiveness as poor. Faculty addressed these individual supervisors directly and intervened when necessary.

**M 14: Review of Faculty Information Summary**
Yearly evaluation of faculty through the Faculty Information Summary. Occurs through separate evaluations by a departmental faculty committee, the Chair, and the Dean.

**Target:** Acceptable evaluations by committee, Chair, and Dean.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Faculty were successfully reviewed by committees, Chair, and Dean and received feedback. All faculty met minimum standards in the review and most faculty were well above what was expected. Numerous faculty won awards or were highlighted for their teaching, research, and scholarship.

**SLO 7: Evaluation of Students in the Field**
Students will be evaluated by their internship supervisor using a Likert-type rating scale. Evaluation examines the following areas: (a) on-site behavior, (b) human relation skills, (c) the counseling relationship, (d) basic counseling skills, (e) management/program skills and competencies, (d) conceptualization skills, (e) use of supervision, and (f) specific skills in the students’ specialty areas.

**Related Measures:**

**M 15: Completion of Evaluation by On-Site Supervisors**

On-site internship supervisors will complete a Likert-Type Scale at the completion of the student’s internship.

**Target:** Site supervisor evaluations of ODU Counseling internship students for all internship students will be completed yearly with a target of 4.0 for every item on the 5-point Likert-type scale. Site supervisor evaluations are scanned and are kept by the field placement coordinator. Contact the field placement coordinator for a closer look of these evaluations.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

This year we collected 51 surveys from the site supervisors regarding the intern students’ performance at the site based on three elements: site professionalism, supervision, and the ability to work with clients. The overall mean for the students’ performance was 4.6 and the standard deviation was 0.6. The scores given by the site supervisors ranged from 3.0 to 5.0 overall. The site professional mean was 4.5 with a standard deviation 0.59. The supervision mean was 4.52, with a standard deviation 0.55; and the ability to work with clients mean was 4.50, with a standard deviation 0.52. The data indicated that a few site supervisors received lower score across standards. The field placement coordinator has access to the evaluations, and keeps an eye out for any evaluations which are lower so that she can closely monitor the students’ improvements.

**SLO 8: Portfolio Review**

Students in the school counseling program will show mastery of a wide range of school counseling concepts and skills by developing a portfolio which will be handed in during the internship. The portfolio should contain approximately 20 items, which are identified in the school counseling internship handbook (see http://education.odu.edu/elc/docs/Internship%20School_Handbook_Updated_August_2008_081908.pdf). Specifics of how to develop the portfolio are also listed there. Student portfolios will be evaluated by the university internship supervisor. A passing score is required for successful completion of the internship.

**Related Measures:**

**M 16: Successful Completion of Portfolio**
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For school counseling students only: Faculty internship supervisor will review items in portfolio which should include: case conceptualization of client, major papers, vitae/resume, audio and/or videotapes of work with clients.

**Target:** 95% rate or higher.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
All school counseling students who were in internship for the 2013/2014 academic year compiled and submitted school counseling portfolios. All students passed their portfolio review after receiving formative feedback from their individual university supervisor and addressing areas of weakness.

**SLO/O 9: Community Partnerships**
The program seeks to broaden its partnership with local school systems, the Norfolk Community Service Board, and with local mental health professionals.

**Related Measures:**

**M 17: Continuing education workshops**
To offer workshops throughout the year on counseling topics that foster increased knowledge for students and professionals and to foster cooperation and networking among the program, professionals in the field, with agencies, and with schools.

**Target:** Two workshops a year.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met**
During the 2013-2014 academic year, the Counseling and Human Services Department co-sponsored one workshop with the Office of Counseling Services. The workshop, "To Write Love on Her Arms," was presented by Jamie Tworkowski. The "Big Splash" workshops that were previously offered have been discontinued, and the faculty is planning to replace them with webinars for the 2014-2015 academic year.

**M 18: ODU/CSB Community Counseling Center**
To jointly develop and run a Community Counseling Center with the Norfolk Community Service Board that offers counseling to individuals in the community, provide practicum and internship placements for our master`s students, and provide opportunities for our doctoral students to supervise master`s students.

**Target:** To be up and running by Fall of 2009.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Training clinic activities with local community partners continued during the academic period September 30, 2013 - September 30, 2014. For context, in the previous several years, the CHS Department maintained a training clinic in
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partnership with the Norfolk Community Services Board (NCSB). The clinic in the previous academic year provided counseling services for the uninsured and underinsured residents of Norfolk. As an example, in the previous academic year, 19 masters and doctoral level counselors in training completed their practicum or internship at the clinic; ODU student clinicians spent approximately 400 hours serving clients; and the clinic provided psychoeducational services to community entities such as the Salvation Army HOPE Village and TCC. The clinic partnership concluded at the end of the previous academic year and the CHS/NCSB contract ended during that time period. In turn, based on a track record of prior success, during September 30, 2013 - 2014, CHS Department activities related to training clinic endeavors focused on developing and pursuing a new community training partnership. CHS dedicated some Department Chair time and some time from one specifically designated faculty member to: designing a new clinic format; developing budgets; soliciting university support (from the DCOE Dean, potential partner ODU departments such as Psychology, upper ODU administration, etc.); and searching for community locations and partners. This work was successful: a budget was developed; ODU members have provided tentative support; and strategic conversations are underway with key Norfolk community entities who have high potential as partners. A goal at the end of this time-period is to pursue and implement the plans developed during 2013-2014; however, as will be indicated in future reports in this format or elsewhere, immediate budgetary concerns are likely to have an impact on the next stages for a CHS training clinic.

M 19: Partnerships with Schools
To develop a number of projects that foster ongoing relationships between the School Counseling Program at ODU and school systems in Virginia.

Target: To begin research and partnerships in Fall of 2008 and be up and running by Fall of 2009.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
In addition to the partnerships forged as a result of student practicum and internship placements (including visiting school practicum and internship sites and offering semi-annual professional development to the site supervisors), ODU has engaged in a number of efforts to build partnerships with school districts in Virginia. All school counseling faculty are active participants on the Hampton Roads School Counseling Leadership Team, which convenes quarterly and brings together a group of school counseling leaders from region 2 public schools and universities in the Hampton Roads area that train future school counselors in efforts to promote k-12 student achievement and school counseling student success. Key school partnerships for the 2013/2014 academic year included: School counseling faculty members provided training for school counselors in several school districts and school counseling students from area universities. School counseling faculty members provided training
and ongoing consultation, to a number of districts this year, which is an expansion from previous years. To date training and or consultation was provided to school counselors in Newport News, Norfolk, and Virginia Beach City Public Schools. School counseling faculty served on the school counseling program advisory boards for several school districts. School Counseling and Human Services faculty partnered with Newport News Public Schools and were awarded a $2.5 million grant to facilitate smooth transitions, promote family engagement, and address the personal/social concerns of the district's high percentage of military-connected youth. Faculty meet monthly with the district counselors and provide ongoing consultation to address military students' needs. Along similar lines, faculty have partnered with Booker T. Washington high school to develop a new practicum and internship site for our school counselor trainees and to also provide consultation to their school counselors and staff.
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Ph.D. program in Counseling is to equip students with the skills, knowledge, and attitudes which will enable them to function well in the demanding and ever-changing world of the doctoral level professional counselor. This mission is closely aligned with that of Old Dominion University: advancement of knowledge, pursuit of truth, and responsible citizenship. The program faculty’s values have been shaped also through program accreditation by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP); we accept responsibility to provide high quality training programs grounded in self-evaluation and improvement, and in doing this we intend to remain responsive to the changing requirements of a dynamic, pluralistic society, to new and emerging client needs, and to the counseling profession both regionally and nationally. The Counseling Program serves diverse, qualified students from the Hampton Roads region, from across the United States, and from countries world-wide. A key aim of the program and the faculty is not only to prepare these diverse students with research-based knowledge and generic competencies, but also to help them develop those attitudes of tolerance, curiosity, reflectiveness, commitment, perseverance, and compassion, which will serve them well in professional practice. Unfolding from this mission statement are the Program’s Objectives which can be found in the Ph.D. program handbook.

Goals

G 1: To have a nationally recognized Counseling Program
To have a nationally recognized Counseling Program

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives with Targets and Findings
SLO 1: Program Evaluation
Evaluation of program by students who graduate, by employers and supervisors of students who have graduated, and by advisory board of Ph.D. program.

Related Measures:

M 1: Evaluation of Program by Graduating Students
A 65-item student questionnaire given directly after they graduate that assesses multiple aspects of their doctoral program experiences. Based on CACREP standards.

Target: Items above a score of 8.0 on a 10-point Likert-Type scale will not be examined. All other items will be examined with particular emphasis of those below a 7.5.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
During the 2013-2014 academic year, eight (8) of the 12 doctoral students who completed their Ph.D. in Counselor Education responded to the survey. Ten
Out of 64 items were given ratings below an 8.0 on a 10-point Likert-type scale. Those items included: item 19. Ethical and legal considerations in counselor education and supervision (Mean=7.88; SD=3.31); item 32. Understand univariate and multivariate research designs and data analysis methods (Mean=7.88; SD=1.64); item 35. Know models and methods of program evaluation (Mean=7.50; SD=2.07); item 39. Demonstrate the ability to write grant proposals appropriate for research, program enhancement, and program development (Mean=6.75; SD=1.91); item 40. Demonstrate the ability to implement a program design evaluation (Mean=7.62; SD=1.85); item 45. Understand the effectiveness of models and methods of disaster response training (Mean=6.50; SD=2.07); item 53. Understand theories and skills of leadership (Mean=7.63; SD=1.85); item 55. Understand models, leadership roles and strategies for responding to community, national, and international crises (Mean=7.25; SD=2.12); item 59. An awareness of ODU grants and scholarships that can be applied to graduate school (Mean=7.25; SD=1.58); item 60. An awareness of available assistantships at ODU or in the Hampton Roads area (Mean=8.88; SD=0.99). Particular emphasis should be placed on those scoring below a 7.5. The overall mean and SD was 8.63 and 0.87 respectively for the doctoral students’ satisfaction toward the counseling program.

M 2: Evaluation by Supervisors/Employers of Graduates
Ongoing review by employers and supervisors of students who have graduated the program. The first evaluation will take place three years after the first student has graduated from the program (Spring of 2012). Students who have graduated will be asked for names and addresses of their immediate supervisors or employers. Supervisors or employers will be sent a Likert-type scale (range 1 - 10) to rank order items concerning the alumni’s performance on the job. Ongoing evaluations will take place every two to three years following the Spring of 2012 evaluation.

**Target:** 8.0 or higher on Likert-type scale.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met**
Ongoing review by employers of students who have graduated program occurs every two to three years. The first evaluation includes alumni from 2000-2005. In 2011-2012 a survey was sent to employers and supervisors of students who graduated the program over the past two academic years. Despite efforts, many students could not be found, and many did not follow-up with their supervisors. Of the approximately 50 students who we could contact, 10 students were able to have their supervisors complete a 10-point Likert-Type scale, supervisors rated their skills as extremely high with a mean of 9.3. No items were rated low. Specific item questions can be found in the program evaluator's office. The next review will occur in 2014-2015, and the faculty are discussing new methods of staying in touch with graduates in order to better procure their employment information.

M 3: Evaluation of Program by Alumni
Ongoing review by alumni who have graduated program. The first evaluation includes alumni from 2000-2005. Subsequently, every two years a mailing will be sent to students who graduated from the program. Students will be sent a Likert-Type scale (range 1 - 10) to rank order items concerning their perceptions of the program.
Target: Average scores of 8.0 or higher on the Likert-Type scale.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
Alumni surveys are conducted every two - three years and were not done this year. Alumni will be surveyed again in 2014-2015.

M 4: Review of Program by Advisory Board
The three specialty areas of the master's program as well as the doctoral program will have advisory boards which will meet periodically during the year to gain feedback from practitioners in the field and to generate ideas about program development.

Target: To review program once a year and give feedback as necessary. To start in 2008-2009 academic year.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Not Met
The master's and doctoral programs and respective specialty areas all have advisory boards. These boards have met with program directors, the Chair of the department, and with faculty over the past few years to consult concerning direction of the programs. As the program was recently re-accredited and advisory board members were consulted in that process by the CACREP team, no advisory team meetings were held this year. The meetings should resume during the 2014-2015 academic year.

SLO 2: Accreditation of Program
This is the second full year of the Ph.D. Program in Counselor Education. We hope to have a CACREP accreditation visit to assure all program competencies are met.

Related Measures:

M 5: CACREP Accreditation Visit
Successful CACREP review

Target: Visit by CACREP team and successful.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) reviewed the Clinical Mental Health Counseling, School Counseling, and Student Affairs and College Counseling master's programs and the Counselor Education and Supervision doctoral program during the 2011/2012 academic year. All programs were deemed to be of the highest standards for CACREP programming. All programs were re-accredited without exception. All programs are fully accredited until October 31, 2020.

SLO 3: Knowledge Attainment in Key Content Areas
Students will be expected to acquire knowledge in the key content areas identified by CACREP. Knowledge will be exhibited through successful passage of course with a grade of B or higher as well as successfully passing the candidacy exam. For the candidacy exam, the student will be given 3 questions from a list of 10 questions developed by faculty. The student will have 4 hours to complete the exam. The exam will be graded by
the student’s advising committee which is composed of three faculty. Students must pass their candidacy exam to move forward in the program.

**Related Measures:**

**M 5: CACREP Accreditation Visit**
Successful CACREP review

**Target:** Visit by CACREP team.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Program was successfully reviewed by CACREP and now has full accreditation.

**SLO 4: Develop Community Partnership**
The program seeks to broaden its partnership with local school systems, the Norfolk Community Service Board, and with local mental health professionals.

**Related Measures:**

**M 6: ODU/CSB Community Counseling Center**
To jointly develop and run a Community Counseling Center with the Norfolk Community Service Board that offers counseling to individuals in the community, provide practicum and internship placements for our master’s students, and provide opportunities for our doctoral students to supervise master’s students

**Target:** To be up and running by Fall of 2008.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Training clinic activities with local community partners continued during the academic period September 30, 2013 - September 30, 2014. For context, in the previous several years, the CHS Department maintained a training clinic in partnership with the Norfolk Community Services Board (NCSB). The clinic in the previous academic year provided counseling services for the uninsured and underinsured residents of Norfolk. As an example, in the previous academic year, 19 masters and doctoral level counselors in training completed their practicum or internship at the clinic; ODU student clinicians spent approximately 400 hours serving clients; and the clinic provided psychoeducational services to community entities such as the Salvation Army HOPE Village and TCC. The clinic partnership concluded at the end of the previous academic year and the CHS/NCSB contract ended during that time period. In turn, based on a track record of prior success, during September 30, 2013 - 2014, CHS Department activities related to training clinic endeavors focused on developing and pursuing a new community training partnership. CHS dedicated some Department Chair time and some time from one specifically designated faculty member to: designing a new clinic format; developing budgets; soliciting university support (from the DCOE Dean, potential partner ODU departments such as Psychology, upper ODU administration, etc.); and searching for community locations and partners. This work was successful: a budget was developed; ODU members have provided tentative support; and strategic conversations are underway with key Norfolk
community entities who have high potential as partners. A goal at the end of this time-period is to pursue and implement the plans developed during 2013-2014; however, as will be indicated in future reports in this format or elsewhere, immediate budgetary concerns are likely to have an impact on the next stages for a CHS training clinic.

M 7: Continuing Education Workshops
To offer workshops throughout the year on counseling topics that foster increased knowledge for students and professionals and to foster cooperation and networking among the program, professionals in the field, with agencies, and with schools

Target: Start seminars by Fall of 2008.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Partially Met
During the 2013-2014 academic year, the Counseling and Human Services Department co-sponsored one workshop with the Office of Counseling Services. The workshop, "To Write Love on Her Arms," was presented by Jamie Tworkowski. The "Big Splash" workshops that were previously offered have been discontinued, and the faculty is planning to replace them with webinars for the 2014-2015 academic year.

M 8: Partnerships with Schools
To develop a number of projects that foster ongoing relationships between the School Counseling Program at ODU and school systems in Virginia.

Target: Development of partnership with Newport News School System.

Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met
In addition to the partnerships forged as a result of student practicum and internship placements (including visiting school practicum and internship sites and offering semi-annual professional development to the site supervisors), ODU has engaged in a number of efforts to build partnerships with school districts in Virginia. All school counseling faculty are active participants on the Hampton Roads School Counseling Leadership Team, which convenes quarterly and brings together a group of school counseling leaders from region 2 public schools and universities in the Hampton Roads area that train future school counselors in efforts to promote k-12 student achievement and school counseling student success. Key school partnerships for the 2013/2014 academic year included: School counseling faculty members provided training for school counselors in several school districts and school counseling students from area universities. School counseling faculty members provided training and ongoing consultation, to a number of districts this year, which is an expansion from previous years. To date training and or consultation was provided to school counselors in Newport News, Norfolk, and Virginia Beach City Public Schools. School counseling faculty served on the school counseling program advisory boards for several school districts. School Counseling and Human Services faculty partnered with Newport News Public Schools and were awarded a $2.5 million grant to facilitate smooth transitions, promote family engagement, and address the personal/social concerns of the district's high percentage of military-connected youth. Faculty meet monthly with the district counselors and provide ongoing consultation to address
military students’ needs. Along similar lines, faculty have partnered with Booker T. Washington high school to develop a new practicum and internship site for our school counselor trainees and to also provide consultation to their school counselors and staff.

**SLO 5: Teaching Excellence**

For full-time faculty, teaching is evaluated through (1) University generated evaluation instrument students take at the completion of each course, and (2) Teaching portfolio review by team of two or three program faculty completed yearly for non-tenured faculty and every five years for tenured faculty. New adjunct faculty are observed and evaluations monitored by Program Director and Chair.

**Related Measures:**

**M 9: Teaching Portfolio Review**

Yearly teaching portfolio review of non-tenured faculty members and five year teaching portfolio of tenured faculty. A review of quantitative and qualitative evaluations of tenure-track and adjunct faculty which occurs through review of teaching portfolios for tenure track faculty by committee, the Department Chair and the Dean and through reviews of adjunct faculty by the department chair.

**Target:** Acceptable evaluation of teaching portfolio.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

Faculty were successfully reviewed by committees, Chair, and Dean and received feedback. All faculty met minimum standards in the review and most faculty were well above what was expected. Numerous faculty awards for teaching were received.

**M 10: Student Evaluation of Faculty**

Students will evaluate faculty at the completion of each course through the University evaluation system.

**Target:** Faculty evaluation by students on the University 5-point Likert-type student evaluation scale to be above a 4.0 on average.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**

For overall teaching effectiveness, on average, departmental faculty were ranked highly for their teaching, and slightly higher than the other faculty in the College of Education (which maintains a mean close to 4.2 on a 5 point scale). For the fall 2013 semester, departmental faculty were rated at 4.45 on a 5 point Likert scale, compared to 4.42 for the college average. For the spring 2014 semester, departmental faculty were rated at 4.46, compared to 4.41 for the college average. For the summer session of the 2013-2014 academic year, departmental faculty were rated at 4.53 on overall teaching effectiveness, compared to 4.44 for the college.

**SLO 6: Competent Faculty**

Every tenure-track and tenured faculty complete a yearly Faculty Information Summary (FIS) which summarizes their accomplishments in the areas of scholarship, research, and
teaching. The FIS is reviewed by two or three faculty for non-tenured faculty and by the Chair for tenured faculty. The Dean reviews all faculty FIS.

**Related Measures:**

**M 11: Review of Faculty Information Sheet**
Yearly evaluation of faculty through the Faculty Information Summary. Occurs through separate evaluations by a departmental faculty committee, the Chair, and the Dean.

**Target:** Acceptable evaluations by the committee, Chair, and Dean

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
Faculty were successfully reviewed by committees, Chair, and Dean and received feedback. All faculty met minimum standards in the review and most faculty were well above what was expected. Numerous faculty won awards or were highlighted for their teaching, research, and scholarship.

**SLO 7: Completion of Dissertation**
Students will undertake their dissertation following successful completion of their candidacy exam. The dissertation will be approved by the student's dissertation committee and must focus on an important issue in counselor education and supervision. It is hoped that 100% of students who start their dissertation will successfully complete the dissertation.

**Related Measures:**

**M 12: Successful Dissertation Defense**
All students who defend their dissertations will be successful.

**Target:** Students with targeted dissertation defenses during the 2009-2010 academic year successfully defended their dissertations.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
All students successfully defended their dissertations.

**SLO 8: Demonstrating Knowledge in a Specialty Area**
Students are asked to develop a specialty area of which they can demonstrate excellence. Knowledge base attainment in that specialty area is shown through the successful candidacy exam. In addition, expertise in a specialty area is shown through successfully defending their dissertation and preparing an article for submission to a counseling journal as part of their dissertation.

**M 12: Successful Dissertation Defense**
All students who defend their dissertations will be successful.

**Target:** Students with targeted dissertation defenses during the 2009-2010 academic year successfully defended their dissertations.

**Findings (2013-2014) - Target: Met**
All students successfully defended their dissertations.
M (In process): Successful Candidacy Exam