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SECTION I:
KEY PROFESSIONAL INDICATORS (KPI’S)
AND COMP RESULTS FOR EACH OF CACREP’S
EIGHT CORE CONTENT AREAS

CORE CONTENT AREA 1: PROFESSIONAL COUNSELING ORIENTATION AND ETHICS

Key Professional Indicators (KPI’s)
Target / Benchmark
Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

Results / Findings
The KPI for Professional Counseling Orientation and Ethical Practice is that “Students will understand and develop a professional identity as a counselor.” On assessment one of this KPI, $M = 84.75$ and $SD = 7.22$. On assessment two of this KPI, $M = 94.27$, $SD = 8.35$. Almost all students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on one or both assessments of this KPI, while six students scored below 80 on a single assessment of this KPI and no students scored below 80 on two assessments of this KPI. The mean score of both assessments on this KPI was $M = 88.92$ ($SD = 9.02$).

Interpretation and Use of Results
54 of the 57 students assessed met or surpassed an average score of 80 on this KPI. All scores that fell below 80 were in the Counseling 601 course, which is an entry level course in our curriculum and is typically taken at the beginning of a master’s student’s coursework or taken by non-degree seeking students interested in learning about the counseling profession. These factors may explain the lower scores on the first assessment of this KPI as no students scored below 80 on the second assessment given to internship students nearing the end of their coursework in the master’s program. This is the first reporting period our program has utilized KPI’s as a measure of students’ performance, thus there is no prior data to which we can compare current scores.

Student scores will continue to be tracked in order to determine how we can best use KPI’s to improve student learning and the program as a whole. The data from this reporting period has already been discussed among faculty and will be utilized as a baseline from which we can gauge student performance in future semesters.

Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE)
Target / Benchmark
Students will score at or above the national mean for those taking this test as an exit exam in the area related to this outcome: Professional Counseling Orientation and Ethical Practice

Results / Findings
In this content area, ODU students’ mean of means for the year was 11.95. The mean of the national means for the year was 11.47 (mean of $SD = 2.13$).
Interpretation and Use of Results
CPCE scores demonstrate that students score above the national mean on this area and demonstrate knowledge in this content area. Student scores will continue to be tracked to ensure our curriculum reflects knowledge in this area of the CPCE.

CORE CONTENT AREA II: SOCIAL AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY

Key Professional Indicators (KPI’s)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

Results / Findings
The KPI for Social and Cultural Diversity is that “Students will describe the impact of heritage, attitudes, beliefs, understandings, and acculturative experiences on their views of others.” On the first assessment of this KPI, M = 97.28 and SD = 3.76. On the second assessment, M = 100, SD = 0. All students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on one or both assessments of this KPI. The aggregated mean score of both assessments on this KPI was 98.59 (SD = 3.04).

Interpretation and Use of Results
Social and Cultural Diversity is a strong area in our program, as evidenced by 100% (N = 60) of our students scoring 80 or above on the assessments of these KPI’s, and most significantly higher. This is the first reporting period our program has utilized KPI’s as a measure of students’ performance, thus there is no prior data to which we can compare current scores.

Student scores will continue to be tracked in order to determine how we can best use KPI’s to improve student learning and the program as a whole. The data from this reporting period has already been discussed among faculty and will be utilized as a baseline from which we can gauge student performance in future semesters.

Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score at or above the national mean for those taking this test as an exit exam in the area related to this outcome: Social and Cultural Diversity

Results / Findings
In this content area, ODU students’ mean of means for the year was 10.29. The mean of the national means for the year was 9.92 (mean of SD = 2.21).

Interpretation and Use of Results
CPCE scores demonstrate that students score above the national mean on this area and demonstrate knowledge in this content area. Student scores will continue to be tracked to ensure our curriculum reflects knowledge in this area of the CPCE.
CORE CONTENT AREA III: HUMAN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Key Professional Indicators (KPI’s)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

Results / Findings
The KPI for Human Growth and Development is that “Students will be able to identify systemic and environmental factors that affect human development, functioning, and behavior.” On assessment one of this KPI, M = 88.65 and SD = 6.51. On assessment two, M = 99.83, SD = .91. All but one student received a KPI score of 80 or higher on one or both assessments of this KPI. The aggregated mean score of both assessments on this KPI was 94.64 (SD = 7.16).

Interpretation and Use of Results
Human Growth and Development is a strong area in our program, as evidenced by 54 of 55 students scoring 80 or above on the assessments of these KPI’s, and most significantly higher. This is the first reporting period our program has utilized KPI’s as a measure of students’ performance, thus there is no prior data to which we can compare current scores.

Student scores will continue to be tracked in order to determine how we can best use KPI’s to improve student learning and the program as a whole. The data from this reporting period has already been discussed among faculty and will be utilized as a baseline from which we can gauge student performance in future semesters.

Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score at or above the national mean for those taking this test as an exit exam in the area related to this outcome Human Growth and Development

Results / Findings
In this content area, ODU students’ mean of means for the year was 12.14. The mean of the national means for the year was 10.55 (mean of SD = 2.52).

Interpretation and Use of Results
CPCE scores demonstrate that students score significantly above the national mean on this area and demonstrate knowledge in this content area. Student scores will continue to be tracked to ensure our curriculum reflects knowledge in this area of the CPCE.
CORE CONTENT AREA IV: COUNSELING AND HELPING RELATIONSHIPS

Key Professional Indicators (KPI’s)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

Results / Findings
The KPI for Counseling and Helping Relationships is that “Students will demonstrate essential interviewing and counseling skills.” On assessment one of this KPI, M = 96.35 and SD = 7.98. On assessment two, M = 88.44, SD = 14.75. Almost all students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on one or both assessments of the counseling and helping relationships KPI. The aggregated mean score of this KPI was 91.03 (SD = 13.38). Six students scored below 80 on a single assessment of the counseling and helping relationships KPI, while none scored below 80 on two assessments of the KPI.

Interpretation and Use of Results
99% (N=74/75) of our students scoring 80 or above on the assessments of the counseling and helping relationships KPI, and most significantly higher. This is the first reporting period our program has utilized KPI’s as a measure of students’ performance, thus there is no prior data to which we can compare current scores.

Student scores will continue to be tracked in order to determine how we can best use KPI’s to improve student learning and the program as a whole. The data from this reporting period has already been discussed among faculty and will be utilized as a baseline from which we can gauge student performance in future semesters.

Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score at or above the national mean for those taking this test as an exit exam in the area related to this outcome: Counseling and Helping Relationships

Results / Findings
In this content area, ODU students’ mean of means for the year was 11.64. The mean of the national means for the year 11.16 (mean of SD = 2.29).

Interpretation and Use of Results
CPCE scores demonstrate that students score above the national mean on this area and demonstrate knowledge in this content area. Student scores will continue to be tracked to ensure our curriculum reflects knowledge in this area of the CPCE.
CORE CONTENT AREA V: GROUP COUNSELING AND GROUP WORK

Key Professional Indicators (KPI’s)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

Results / Findings
The KPI for Group Counseling and Group Work is that “Students will be able to identify dynamics associated with group process and development.” On assessment one of this KPI, M = 93.16 and SD = 7.85. On assessment two, M = 95.57, SD = 11.62. Almost all students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on one or both assessments of the counseling and group work KPI. The aggregated mean score of this KPI was 94.63 (SD = 10.30). Two students scored below 80 on a single assessment of the counseling and group work KPI, while none scored below 80 on two assessments of the KPI.

Interpretation and Use of Results
96% (N=46/48) of our students scoring 80 or above on the assessments of the group counseling and group work KPI, and most significantly higher. This is the first reporting period our program has utilized KPI’s as a measure of students’ performance, thus there is no prior data to which we can compare current scores. The CPCE exam demonstrates that ODU students also demonstrate average scores above the national mean in this content area.

Student scores will continue to be tracked in order to determine how we can best use KPI’s to improve student learning and the program as a whole. The data from this reporting period has already been discussed among faculty and will be utilized as a baseline from which we can gauge student performance in future semesters.

Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score at or above the national mean for those taking this test as an exit exam in the area related to this outcome: Group Counseling and Group Work

Results / Findings
In this content area, ODU students’ mean of means for the year was 11.14. The mean of the national means for the year 10.53 (mean of SD = 2.65).

Interpretation and Use of Results
CPCE scores demonstrate that students score above the national mean on this area and demonstrate knowledge in this content area. Student scores will continue to be tracked to ensure our curriculum reflects knowledge in this area of the CPCE.
CORE CONTENT AREA VI: CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Key Professional Indicators (KPI’s)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

Results / Findings
The KPI for Career Development is that “Students will be able to assess abilities, interests, values, personality and other factors that contribute to career development.” On assessment one of this KPI, M = 89.42 and SD = 5.19. On assessment two, M = 92.58, SD = 6.82. All students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on one or both assessments of this KPI. The aggregated mean score of both measures on this KPI was 90.64 (SD = 5.95).

Interpretation and Use of Results
Helping relationships and group counseling are strong areas in our program, as evidenced by 100% (N=43) of our students scoring 80 or above on the assessments of these KPI’s, and most significantly higher. This is the first reporting period our program has utilized KPI’s as a measure of students’ performance, thus there is no prior data to which we can compare current scores.

Student scores will continue to be tracked in order to determine how we can best use KPI’s to improve student learning and the program as a whole. The data from this reporting period has already been discussed among faculty and will be utilized as a baseline from which we can gauge student performance in future semesters.

Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score at or above the national mean for those taking this test as an exit exam in the area related to this outcome: Career Development

Results / Findings
In this content area, ODU students’ mean of means for the year was 11.06. The mean of the national means for the year 10.13 (mean of SD = 2.24).

Interpretation and Use of Results
CPCE scores demonstrate that students score significantly above the national mean on this area and demonstrate knowledge in this content area. Student scores will continue to be tracked to ensure our curriculum reflects knowledge in this area of the CPCE.
CORE CONTENT AREA VII: ASSESSMENT AND TESTING

Key Professional Indicators (KPI’s)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

Results / Findings
The KPI for Assessment and Testing is that “Students will be able to administer, score, and interpret psychological and/or educational assessments.” On assessment one of this KPI, M = 87.60 and SD = 7.29. On assessment two, M = 96.88, SD = 5.44. Almost all students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on one or both assessments of this KPI, while four (N = 4) scored below 80 on a single assessment of the KPI and no students scored below 80 on both assessments of the KPI. The aggregated mean score of both measures on this KPI was 89.85 (SD = 7.91).

Interpretation and Use of Results
88% (N = 30/34) of our students scored 80 or above on the assessments of these KPI’s, and most significantly higher. All KPI scores that fell below 80 were within 5% of the target score and were received on the first assessment of this KPI in the Testing and Client Assessment course. This is the first reporting period our program has utilized KPI’s as a measure of students’ performance, thus there is no prior data to which we can compare current scores.

Student scores will continue to be tracked in order to determine how we can best use KPI’s to improve student learning and the program as a whole. The data from this reporting period has already been discussed among faculty and will be utilized as a baseline from which we can gauge student performance in future semesters.

Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score at or above the national mean for those taking this test as an exit exam in the area related to this outcome: Assessment and Testing

Results / Findings
In this content area, ODU students’ mean of means for the year was 11.54. The mean of the national means for the year 10.78 (mean of SD = 2.27).

Interpretation and Use of Results
CPCE scores demonstrate that students score well above the national mean on this area and demonstrate knowledge in this content area. Student scores will continue to be tracked to ensure our curriculum reflects knowledge in this area of the CPCE.
CORE CONTENT AREA VIII: RESEARCH AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

Key Professional Indicators (KPI’s)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

Results / Findings
The KPI for Research and Program Evaluation is that “Students will be able to critique research to inform counseling practice.” On assessment one of this KPI, M = 94.29 and SD = 5.07. On assessment two, M = 90.70, SD = 12.33. Almost all students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on one or both assessments of this KPI, while four (N = 4) scored below 80 on a single assessment of the KPI and no students scored below 80 on both assessments of the KPI. The aggregated mean score of this KPI was 91.95 (SD = 9.99).

Interpretation and Use of Results
93% (N = 57/61) of our students scored 80 or above on the assessments of these KPI’s, and most significantly higher. All KPI scores that fell below 80 were received on the second assessment of this KPI in the Introduction to Research course, which is the second measure of this KPI. Of note is that this course is offered through another department in the College of Education. This is the first reporting period our program has utilized KPI’s as a measure of students’ performance, thus there is no prior data to which we can compare current scores.

Student scores will continue to be tracked in order to determine how we can best use KPI’s to improve student learning and the program as a whole. The data from this reporting period has already been discussed among faculty and will be utilized as a baseline from which we can gauge student performance in future semesters.

Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score at or above the national mean for those taking this test as an exit exam in the area related to this outcome: Research and Program Evaluation

Results / Findings
In this content area, ODU students’ mean of means for the year was 12.17. The mean of the national means for the year 10.95 (mean of SD = 2.49).

Interpretation and Use of Results
CPCE scores demonstrate that students score above the national mean on this area and demonstrate knowledge in this content area. Student scores will continue to be tracked to ensure our curriculum reflects knowledge in this area of the CPCE.
SECTION II:
KEY PROFESSIONAL INDICATORS (KPI’S)
FOR CLINICAL MENTAL HEALTH
COUNSELING AND FOR SCHOOL COUNSELING

CORE CONTENT AREA: CLINICAL MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELING

Key Professional Indicators (KPI’s)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

Results / Findings
The KPI for Clinical Mental Health Counseling is that “Students will apply the diagnostic process using current diagnostic classifications systems.” On assessment one of this KPI, M = 88.69 and SD = 7.39. On assessment two, M = 94.63, SD = 6.30. Almost all students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on one or both assessments of this KPI, while seven (N = 7) scored below 80 on a single assessment of the KPI and no students scored below 80 on both assessments of the KPI. The aggregated mean score of this KPI was 91.12 (SD = 8.81).

Interpretation and Use of Results
92% (N = 48/52) of our students scored 80 or above on the assessments of these KPI’s, and most significantly higher. This is the first reporting period our program has utilized KPI’s as a measure of students’ performance, thus there is no prior data to which we can compare current scores.

Student scores will continue to be tracked in order to determine how we can best use KPI’s to improve student learning and the program as a whole. The data from this reporting period has already been discussed among faculty and will be utilized as a baseline from which we can gauge student performance in future semesters.

CORE CONTENT AREA: SCHOOL COUNSELING

Key Professional Indicators (KPI’s)

Target / Benchmark
Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

Results / Findings
The KPI for School Counseling is that “Students will create lesson plans for school counseling program core curriculum.” No scores were collected for assessment one of this KPI during this reporting period. On assessment two, M = 90, SD = 11.55. All students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on assessment two for this KPI. The aggregated mean score of this KPI was 90 (SD = 11.55).
**Interpretation and Use of Results**

100% (N=4) of our students scored 80 or above on the assessment of this KPI. Due to the small number of school counseling students that obtained a score during this reporting period, future reporting periods will tell us much more about students’ level of performance on this KPI. The small number of KPI scores in this specialty area is, in part, due to the low number of students enrolled in the School Counseling track and taking internship during this past year. In the future, faculty will be asked to distinguish school counseling students from clinical mental health students when reporting scores from practicum, which is not a school counseling specific course. This is the first reporting period our program has utilized KPI’s as a measure of students’ performance, thus there is no prior data to which we can compare current scores. Student scores will continue to be tracked in order to determine how we can best use KPI’s to improve student learning and the program as a whole. The data from this reporting period has already been discussed among faculty and will be utilized as a baseline from which we can gauge student performance in future semesters.

**SECTION III:**

**KEY PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS (KPD’S)**

**Target / Benchmark**

Students will score a 3 or higher on all KPD areas each year.

**Results / Findings**

During the Fall 2018 through Summer 2019 reporting period, 75 students were scored on KPD’s. Of the 75 students, only two of these students were assessed twice on the KPD’s, while the remaining 73 students were assessed only once. The first KPD, “Professionalism,” had a mean score of 4.24 (SD = .59) and two students scored below a three on this KPD. The second KPD, “Accountability/Conscientiousness,” had a mean score of 4.26 (SD = .62) and two students scored below a three on this KPD. The third KPD, “Self-Regulation,” had a mean score of 4.14 (SD = .633) and one student scored below a three on this KPD. The fourth and final KPD, “Interpersonal Skills,” had a mean score of 4.20 (SD = .63) and two students scored below a three on this KPD.

**Interpretation and Use of Results**

97% of students (N = 73) scored above a three on all KPD’s. One student scored below three on three KPD aggregate areas and one student scored below three on all four KPD aggregate areas. These students met with their advisor and the graduate program director and developed a professional development plan to address these low areas. Other than the two students, no other students scored below a “3” on any of the 18 dispositional items.

This is the first reporting period our program has utilized KPD’s as a measure of students’ performance, thus there is no prior data to which we can compare current scores. Student scores will continue to be tracked in order to determine how we can best use KPD’s to support our students’ learning and improve the program as a whole. The data from this reporting period has already been discussed among faculty and will be utilized as a baseline from which we can gauge student performance in future semesters.
SECTION IV: AGGREGATE KPI SCORES

Target/Benchmark
Aggregate KPI scores for all students scored on a KPI will be above 80.

Results / Findings
Averages of students’ scores on both assessments of each KPI for the eight content areas and the two specialty areas were all significantly above 80: Professional Counseling Orientation and Ethics, M = 88.92 (SD = 9.02); Social and Cultural Diversity, M = 98.59 (SD = 3.04); Human Growth and Development, M = 94.64 (SD = 7.16); Counseling and Helping Relationships, M = 91.03 (SD = 13.38); Group Counseling and Group Work, M = 94.63 (SD = 10.30); Career Development, M = 90.64 (SD = 5.95); Assessment and Testing, M = 89.85 (SD = 7.91); Research and Program Evaluation, M = 91.95 (SD = 9.99); Clinical Mental Health Counseling, M = 92.23, SD = 10.85; and School Counseling, M = 100, SD = 0. The total aggregated score for all KPI domains was, M = 92.55, SD = 9.51.

Interpretation and Use of Results
This is the Counseling program’s first reporting period utilizing KPI’s as a measure of students’ knowledge in CACREP’s eight core areas and two specialty areas. These initial findings demonstrate that, overall, students perform well on the KPI’s and demonstrate understanding of the content in each of these eight core areas and the two specialty areas. These findings correspond with findings from the CPCE for this reporting period as well, confirming that our students are high performing overall.

SECTION V: AGGREGATE CPCE SCORES

Target/Benchmark
Overall, students will score above the national mean on the CPCE exam.

Results / Findings
During the Fall 2018-Summer 2019 reporting period, 51 students took the CPCE exam. The weighted mean of ODU counseling students was 91.93 (SD = 10.38). The National mean of means for the 2018-2019 reporting period was 85.73 (mean of SD = 13.14). All but two of the 51 students that took the CPCE exam passed.

Interpretation and Use of Results
Overall, our students consistently score well above the mean, often as much as one-half to one standard deviation above. Scores along all eight content areas are consistent, indicating no particular weak spot in the curriculum. The pass rate for our students during this reporting period was 96% (i.e., 49 of 51 students passing). Our students continue to surpass the national average and perform exceedingly well on the CPCE. Student very high pass rate (49 of 51) and students' high scores indicate their in-depth knowledge, understanding, application, and synthesis of the
eight CACREP content areas. Students likely do well on the exam due to excellence in teaching and rigorous study habits.

SECTION VI:
EVALUATION OF STUDENTS IN THE FIELD

Practicum/Internship Evaluation of Student

Target / Benchmark
Students should obtain aggregate minimum mean ratings of 3.5 or above on each of the 15 items, as well as a total mean score for all 15 items that is at or above 3.5.

Results / Findings
From Fall 2018-Summer 2019, 46 practicum students were rated by their supervisors. The overall mean rating of practicum students was 4.50 and across all 15 items their average scores were above 3.5. During this same reporting period, 115 internship students were rated by their supervisors. The overall mean was 4.46 and across all 15 items their average scores were above 3.5.

Interpretation and Use of Results
These results indicate that our students are rated highly in their clinical placements and site supervisors view students as at developmentally appropriate levels in their clinical work.

SECTION VII:
EVALUATION OF FIELD PLACEMENT EXPERIENCE

Practicum/Internship Evaluation of Site

Target / Benchmark
Sites will be rated 3.5 or above. Sites that are rated particularly low (below 3.5) will be reviewed regarding whether or not they will be used in the future.

Results / Findings
For the 2018-2019 academic year, 157 field placement (44 practicum students and 113 internship) students rated their sites on a 5-point Likert-Type scale. Results for practicum students indicated an overall mean of 4.18 and a standard deviation of 1.19 for practicum sites. Practicum students rated all items above 4.0 with the exception of Item 2. Opportunities to record (audio or video) counseling session (M = 3.75, SD = 1.32). Internship students indicate a mean of 4.44 and standard deviation of .81. No items were rated below a 4.0 among internship students.
Interpretation and Use of Results
On average, Practicum and Internship students rate their practicum and internship sites favorably. All items were rated above 3.5 by both practicum and internship students completing the site surveys. This indicates a high level of overall satisfaction with the sites available for practicum and internship experience.

Practicum/Internship Evaluation Site Supervisor

Target / Benchmark
Students will rate their supervisors 3.5 or above. Supervisors who are rated particularly low (below 3.5) will be reviewed regarding whether or not they should be used in the future.

Results / Findings
For the 2018-2019 academic year, 157 students (44 practicum students and 113 internship) rated their field placement supervisors. Practicum students’ mean rating for site supervisors was 4.30 with a standard deviation of 1.25. Internship students’ mean rating for site supervisors was 4.54 with a standard deviation of .78.

Interpretation and Use of Results
Students rated their supervisors above 3.5 in all 8 identified items on this survey. Practicum and Internship students rated their supervisors particularly high and see them as providing excellent supervision. These students report positive supervision experiences with current supervisors. The program should continue with current supervisors and seek other supervisors of similar quality. Current training of supervisors for supervision activities seems to be working well.

SECTION VIII:
ALUMNI SURVEY

Target / Benchmark
100% of the alumni survey items will have an aggregate score of 4.0 or higher on a 5-point Likert type scale

Results / Findings
Twenty-nine students responded to the master’s Graduates Post-Evaluation survey. Six of these students responded and indicated that they are not working in the counseling field and therefore did not complete the remainder of the evaluation survey. Only one item (item 9) was scored below the 4.0 target: “9. I understand career development and related life factors and can apply these skills with clients,” with a mean score of 3.74 and SD of .90.

Interpretation and Use of Results
Alumni responded with 4.0 or higher when rating their perceived level of ability at their current place of employment on all item but one: career counseling. However, this item scored at 3.74, close to the cut-off of 4.0. Thus, at this time, all items seem to be scoring high. On the other hand, it is problematic that we have an even lower response rate (N = 29) than in our prior
reporting period of 2016-2017 when we received fifty-eight responses (N = 58). Great effort needs to be made to obtain student responses.

SECTION IX:
SUPERVISOR/EMPLOYER EVALUATION
OF ALUMNI SURVEY

Target / Benchmark
100% of the employer survey items will have an aggregate score of 4.0 or higher on a 5-point Likert type scale

Results / Findings
Program alumni were contacted four times via email to solicit responses to the evaluation survey. From program alumni, contact information for eleven current employers/supervisors was collected. A survey assessing the performance of our alumni was sent out four times to these employers/supervisors, yielding two responses. Data were collected on three alumni's performances. Supervisors/employers rated these two students as "good" or "excellent" (4.0 or higher), unless they indicated “unable to evaluate” on an item.

Interpretation and Use of Results
Based on the limited responses collected, students have demonstrated strength in a wide variety of counseling skills on the job. The program has just implemented gathering personal emails from students when they complete their program evaluation survey. This should allow for easier follow-up of students as well as easier access to their supervisors and employers. The results obtained during this reporting period mirror the results from the 2016-2017 reporting period.

SECTION X:
STUDENT PROGRAM EVALUATION AND EXIT SURVEY

Target / Benchmark
100% of the exit survey items will have an aggregate score 3.0 or higher on a 5-point Likert type scale.

Results / Findings
During the 2018-2019 academic year, 29 students took the program evaluation survey (21 students indicated being Mental Health Counseling students and 8 students indicated being School Counseling students). Of the students that completed an additional survey of demographics, 89.36% were female and the remaining respondents were male. The mean age of students was 31.16 (SD = 8.37) with a range of 22-49 years old. 70% of students indicated they identify as Caucasian, 20% identify as Black/African American, 4% identify as Hispanic/Latinx, 2% identify as Asian, 2% identify as Native American/American Indian, and 2% identified “Other” as their ethnicity, but did not specify their ethnicity in the space allotted. The overall mean and SD of the core evaluation, which assessed the eight CACREP content areas, were 4.17 and .83 respectively. No items on the survey were rated below a 3.0, though we have chosen here
to highlight areas that fell below a 3.5 as these are areas that we would like to consider for improvement over the next year. Survey items rated below an average of 3.5 included: Section I. Professional Orientation and Ethical Practice: 9. Current labor market information relevant to opportunities for practice within the counseling profession, M = 3.24, SD = 0.97. Section IV. Helping Relationships: 44. Crisis intervention, trauma-informed, and community-based strategies, such as Psychological First Aid, M = 3.48, SD = 1.22. Section IX. Two specialty areas were assessed depending on the students’ track of study: Clinical Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling. The responses were specific to each of these tracks. Clinical Mental Health Counseling, Section II. Counseling, Prevention, and Intervention: 13. Classifications, indications, and contraindications of commonly prescribed psychopharmacological medications for appropriate medical referral and consultation, M = 3.33, SD = 1.04. Clinical Mental Health Counseling, Section III. Diversity and Advocacy: 21. Strategies for interfacing with the legal system regarding court-referred clients, M = 3.33, SD = 1.17. School Counseling, Section II. Contextual Dimensions: 13. Common medications that affect learning, behavior, and mood in children and adolescents, M = 3.38, SD = 1.49.

The overall mean and SD for each domain were: I. Professional Orientation and Ethical Practice, M = 4.02, SD = .86; II. Human Growth and Development, M = 4.02, SD = .89; III. Social and Cultural Diversity, M = 4.47, SD = .67; IV. Helping Relationships, M = 4.20, SD = .84; V. Group Work, M = 4.33, SD = .79; VI. Career Development, M = 3.97, SD = .88; VII. Assessment, M = 4.47, SD = .66; VIII. Research and Program Evaluation, M = 3.93, SD = 1.05; XI. Other Program Activities, M = 3.97, SD = .88; Mental Health Counseling, M = 3.97, SD = .85; School Counseling, M = 4.10, SD = .98.

**Interpretation and Use of Results**

No items fell below a 3.0 on this assessment. Due to this, the program would like to focus on improving areas that fell below 3.5 during this reporting period. Two out of 86 items assessing the eight content areas fell below this 3.5 mark. Last year, track specializations were not evaluated due to an error with the survey. During this reporting period, two of the twenty-three items assessing quality of Clinical Mental Health specialization coursework fell below 3.5 and one of the 34 items assessing quality of the School Counseling specialization coursework fell below 3.5. This information demonstrates that students are evaluating the program positively overall. Some of the items in which students scored lower (between 3.0 and 3.5) are being addressed the following manner:

**Section I. Professional Orientation and Ethical Practice:** 9. Current labor market information relevant to opportunities for practice within the counseling profession, M = 3.24, SD = 0.97. In COUN 648: Career Development, students will focus on current labor market information. They will learn about O’NET and complete a scavenger hunt assignment in which they review current labor market information at a national and state level for clinical mental health and school counselors, including wages, job titles, work activities, and job outlook.

**Section IV. Helping Relationships:** 44. Crisis intervention, trauma-informed, and community-based strategies, such as Psychological First Aid, M = 3.48, SD = 1.22. In COUN 645 a trauma-informed assessment was added to students’ clinical assessment report. In addition, in COUN 634: Advanced Counseling Techniques, there has been a major shift in attention to crisis.
intervention, trauma-informed care, community-based strategies, and psychological first aid. A large portion of the semester is now spent on these issues.

Section IX. Clinical Mental Health Counseling, Section II. Counseling, Prevention, and Intervention: 13. Classifications, indications, and contraindications of commonly prescribed psychopharmacological medications for appropriate medical referral and consultation, M = 3.33, SD = 1.04. Clinical Mental Health Counseling, Section III. Diversity and Advocacy: 21. Strategies for interfacing with the legal system regarding court-referred clients, M = 3.33, SD = 1.17. For psychopharmacological medications, COUN 680: Mental Health Counseling covers this with a class module on this topic. However, we plan to enhance student knowledge of this area through a component of the take-home written essay exam. The exam has four parts and our proposed modification will include one part where students will be asked to explore the literature on psychopharmacological medications used in counseling and answer specific questions about the most commonly prescribed classes of medications. In addition, in this class, to expand the coverage of the legal system regarding court-referred clients we plan on a modification which will include a partial module going over this information with PowerPoint slides and asking students to respond to a case study describing this scenario.

Section IX. School Counseling, Section II. Contextual Dimensions: 13. Common medications that affect learning, behavior, and mood in children and adolescents, M = 3.38, SD = 1.49; 18. Dr. Edirmanasinghe will add a larger component on this topic in the class COUN 678: Counseling Children and Adolescents in School Settings.

SECTION XI: EVALUATION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES BY SITE SUPERVISORS

Target/Benchmark
All supervisors will rate students as a 4.0 or above on a 5-point Likert scale in their ability to meet the eight core CACREP competency areas.

Results / Findings
Eleven current supervisors of ODU’s Counseling practicum and internship students responded to this survey. The average mean of the 9-items on this survey was 4.49 and the average standard deviation was .80.

Interpretation and Use of Results
The responses received from site supervisors suggests that current supervisors view students as meeting expectations for the eight core CACREP competency areas as evidenced by their practice at their site placements. However, it would be beneficial to elicit a greater number of responses from current site supervisors as the number of sites our students are placed at far exceeds the eleven sites represented during this reporting period. Collecting additional responses would give us a more accurate understanding of how site supervisors feel our students meet criteria in these eight content areas, indicating how well-prepared our students are for clinical practice.