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SECTION I:  
KEY PROFESSIONAL INDICATORS (KPI’S)

Key Professional Indicator (KPI): Counseling

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

Results/Findings
The KPI for Counseling is that “Students will show knowledge of case conceptualization process from multiple theoretical perspectives.” On the first assessment of this KPI, M = 93.56 and SD = 1.72. On the second assessment, M = 97.44, SD = 4.24. 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 95.38 (SD = 3.68).

Interpretation and Use of Results
100% of students received a score of 80 or higher on this KPI. The fact that students scored high on both assessments of this KPI demonstrates strong student knowledge and skill in this KPI. 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.

Key Professional Indicator (KPI): Supervision

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

Results/Findings
The KPI for Supervision is that “Students will demonstrate skills of clinical supervision.” On the first assessment of this KPI, M = 96.35 and SD = 3.45. On the second assessment, M = 99.44, SD = 1.67. 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 97.75 (SD = 3.15).

Interpretation and Use of Results
100% of students received a score of 80 or higher on this KPI. The fact that students scored high on both assessments of this KPI demonstrates strong student knowledge and skill in this KPI. 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.
**Key Professional Indicator (KPI): Teaching**

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

**Results/Findings**
The KPI for Teaching is that “Students will learn effective methods of teaching that includes active learning.” No scores were collected on the first KPI assessment due to the COUN 820 course not being offered during this reporting period. On the second assessment, $M = 94.90$, $SD = 4.21$. 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 94.90 ($SD = 4.21$).

**Interpretation and Use of Results**
100% of students received a score of 80 or higher on this KPI. The fact that students scored high on both assessments of this KPI demonstrates strong student knowledge and skill in this KPI. 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.

**Key Professional Indicator (KPI): Research and Scholarship**

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

**Results/Findings**
The KPI for Research and Scholarship is that “Students will develop appropriate research questions for professional research and publication.” On the first assessment of this KPI, $M = 90.82$ and $SD = 4.02$. 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 95.19 ($SD = 5.56$).

**Interpretation and Use of Results**
100% of students received a score of 80 or higher on this KPI. The fact that students scored high on both assessments of this KPI demonstrates strong student knowledge and skill in this KPI. 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.
**Key Professional Indicator (KPI): Leadership and Advocacy**

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

**Results/Findings**
The KPI for Research and Scholarship is that “Students will develop appropriate research questions for professional research and publication.” On the first assessment of this KPI, \( M = 95.67 \) and \( SD = 5.43 \). On the second assessment, \( M = 93.22, SD = 7.10 \). 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 94.62 (SD = 6.16).

**Interpretation and Use of Results**
100% of students received a score of 80 or higher on this KPI. The fact that students scored high on both assessments of this KPI demonstrates strong student knowledge and skill in this KPI. 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 II: KEY PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS**

**Target/Benchmark**
Students will score a 3 or higher on all KPD areas each year.

**Results/Findings**
During Fall 2018 through Summer 2019 reporting period, 17 students were scored on KPD’s. All 17 of these students were assessed only one time on the KPD’s in either COUN 846 or in COUN 869. All scored above a 3 on each KPD area. The first KPD, “Professionalism,” had a mean score of 4.20 (SD = .64). The second KPD, “Accountability/Conscientiousness,” had a mean score of 4.07 (SD = .43). The third KPD, “Self-Regulation,” had a mean score of 3.98 (SD = .63). The fourth and final KPD, “Interpersonal Skills,” had a mean score of 4.02 (SD = .67).

**Interpretation and Use of Results**
All students scored above a three on all KPD’s. This is the first reporting period our program has utilized KPD’s to assess students, 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 ensure that students are demonstrating appropriate dispositional attributes and to enhance gatekeeping. 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: 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 were taken and averages of each content area were above 80, with all being significantly above 80: Counseling, $M = 95.38$ (SD = 3.68); Supervision, $M = 97.75$ (SD = 3.15); Teaching, $M = 95.19$ (SD = 4.43); Research and Scholarship, $M = 95.19$ (SD = 5.56); and Leadership and Advocacy, $M = 94.62$ (SD = 6.16). Across all KPI content areas, the mean of means and mean of standard deviations was $M = 95.68$, SD = 4.48.

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 five core areas of doctoral training. These initial findings demonstrate that, overall, students perform well on the KPI’s and demonstrate understanding of the content in each of the five core areas. 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 IV: EVALUATION OF STUDENTS IN THE FIELD

Practicum/Internship Evaluation of Student

Target/Benchmark
Students obtain minimum ratings of 3.5 on each of the 15 items, and overall, obtain a score over a 3.5. In addition, any particular item that scores below a 3.0 will be reviewed and addressed by faculty.

Results/Findings
From Fall 2018-Summer 2019, 15 practicum students were rated by their supervisors. The overall mean rating of practicum students was 4.81 and all students averaged above a 4.0 across all items. Doctoral internship students are not evaluated using a survey due to the multiple roles they may vacillate between during their practical experience.

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. Faculty have discussed continued use of these sites as they are highly rated by students and meet the high standards expected in clinical placements.
SECTION V:
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
Thirteen (13) alumni responded to the Ph.D. Graduates Post-Evaluation survey. All 13 stated they were utilizing their degree in the counseling field in some capacity and completed the survey. The following represent the responses from all 13 alumni that are now working in the counseling and or counselor education field. The survey assessed 20 items on a 5-point Likert type scale, ranging from minimally adequate (1) to excellent (5), and a NA option was also provided. Three items fell below a 4.0: 17. I advocate for important counseling issues, M = 3.92, SD = 1.00; 15. I have become involved in leadership activities within the counseling field, M = 3.85, SD = 1.23; 5. I have demonstrated proficient skills in the use of assessment and testing within my setting, M = 3.62, SD = 1.55.

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 17 out of 20 items on this survey. The items that scored below a 4.0 related to leadership, advocacy, and testing and assessment. However, these items scored close to the cut-off of 4.0. Clearly, leadership, advocacy, and testing and assessment are not perceived as critical as other items or not as large of a part of their job functions. Alumni ratings of the doctoral program appear consistent with ratings from the 2016-2017 reporting period at which point 82% of the 17 responses received rated their level of ability in each area as a 4.0 or higher. Thus, it appears alumni seem to feel equipped with the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful in the counseling and counselor education field.

The areas of leadership and advocacy were found to be somewhat lower than the other areas assessed in both this alumni survey and in the exit survey. A stronger focus on these areas is planned by the program and will be discussed in more detail under “exit survey.”

SECTION VI:
SUPERVISOR OR EMPLOYER EVALUATION OF ALUMNI

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
Of the 13 alumni that responded to the “Ph.D. Graduates Post-Evaluation” survey, eight provided emails of their current supervisor/employer. After four attempts to contact employers/supervisors to complete this survey, data were collected on four alumni’s performance.
Supervisors/Employers rated Ph.D. graduates as “Good,” “Excellent,” or “Unable to Assess” on most survey items. One alumnus received a “Satisfactory” (a “3” on the scale) on item 6: Demonstrates advanced ability when supervising others. There were no items rated as minimally or somewhat adequate.

**Interpretation and Use of Results**
Among a small pool of recent alumni originally surveyed (N =16), contact information for only eight supervisors/employers was able to be obtained. In one case, a supervisor was unable to assess most of the areas due to the alumni being new to the position. These challenges make it difficult to get a well-rounded picture of how our alumni are performing in a professional setting, though these results indicate overall our alumni are viewed as having skills that qualify as “good” or “excellent.” These findings are consistent with the supervisors/employers polled during the 2016-2017 reporting period.

**SECTION VII:**
**STUDENT PROGRAM EVALUATION AND EXIT SURVEY**

**Target/Benchmark**
Above a 7.0 rating on the 10-point Likert type scale

**Results/Findings**
The overall mean and SD for each domain were: I. The Program, M = 7.81, SD = 1.36; II. Professional Identity Foundations – Counseling, M = 6.83, SD = 1.66; III. Supervision, M = 7.89, SD = 1.29; IV. Teaching, M = 7.28, SD = 2.17; V. Research and Scholarship, M = 6.90, SD = 1.94; VI. Leadership and Advocacy, M = 5.80, SD = 2.42; IX. Other Program Activities, M = 5.60, SD = 2.59.

**Interpretation and Use of Results**
Data was collected from graduated students following the 2018-2019 academic year. All six (6) graduates from the Ph.D. in Counselor Education responded to the survey. Of the students that completed an additional survey of demographics, 83.33% were female (N = 5) and the remaining respondents were male. The mean age of students was 28.29 (SD = 5.62) with a range of 27-40 years old. 66.67% of students indicated they identify as Caucasian, 16.67% identify as Black/African American, and 2% identify as Asian. The overall average mean and average SD of the program evaluation were 7.13 and 2.30, respectively, for the doctoral students' evaluation of the counseling program during the Fall 2018-Summer 2019 reporting period.

Some items fell below the 7.0 benchmark. Due to the small number of graduates during his reporting period (N = 6), low scores by one student can dramatically impact the average scores. Nonetheless, these low scores were reviewed by faculty to understand areas for growth and improvement within the program. The following addresses each area which has scores below a 7.0 and how those areas will be improved. Specific item scores can be accessed from the program evaluator of the doctoral program.
Professional Identity – Counseling: Dr. Neukrug has recently revised the course COUN 842: Advanced Counseling Theories and it now has a much larger focus on case conceptualization and contemporary theories, which are areas that ranked lower in the exit survey. We expect to see these ratings increase over the next few years.

Professional Identity – Teaching: Dr. McAuliffe, who teaches COUN 820: Counselor Education Teaching and Practice, has begun addressing the areas of online instruction and will focus more on remediation and gatekeeping in the future. These are areas that ranked lower in the exit survey. We expect to see these ratings increase over the next few years.

Professional Identity – Research and Scholarship: Areas that were rated lower included grant proposal writing, finding other funding sources, ethics in research, and knowledge of qualitative research. The program has recently added a greater focus on how to write grant proposals and obtain other sources of funding in the class COUN 835: Advanced Counseling Research Design and Assessment. In addition, a qualitative design course and a program evaluation course are already required, and students are required to obtain a CITI certificate (ethics). Thus, we will monitor the impact of these changes and assess again when the next cohort of students evaluates these areas. If these scores continue to be lower, we will explore what we need to do.

Professional Identity – Leadership and Advocacy: To increase the focus on Leadership and Advocacy in our counseling doctoral program, faculty have recently added a book to COUN 801: Current Issues in Counseling and Counselor Education which has a focus on leadership in the field (see Chang, C. Y., Barrio Minton, C. A., Dixon, A., Myers, J. E., & Sweeney, T. J.; 2012; Professional counseling excellence through leadership and advocacy). In addition, a new assignment (i.e., Leadership Self-Assessment and Goals paper), as well as increased lecture and discussion pertaining to leadership was added.

Other Program Activities: To ensure these concerns are addressed while students are actively enrolled in the doctoral program, the Graduate Program Director of the doctoral program has instituted an end of the semester “Question and Answer” with all doctoral students to assess these areas more fully and answer any questions that they may have regarding these areas.

SECTION VIII:
EVALUATION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES
FROM SITE SUPERVISORS

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

Results/Findings
Of the eleven sites where students were placed, four supervisors of the Ph.D. practicum and internship students responded to this survey. The average mean of the 7-items on this survey was 4.93 and the average standard deviation was .61.
Interpretation and Use of Results
The responses received from site supervisors suggests that current supervisors view students as meeting expectations for the five 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 five content areas, indicating how well-prepared our students are for clinical practice.

SECTION IX:
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, 26 field placements within 11 sites (18 practicum students and 8 internship) students rated their sites. Results for practicum students indicated an overall mean of 4.51 and a standard deviation of .81 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 = 3.78, SD = 1.51). Internship students indicate a mean of 4.25 and standard deviation of .87. Practicum students rated all items above 4.0 with the exception of Item 2. Opportunities to record (audio or video) counseling session (M = 3.00, SD = 1.58).

Interpretation and Use of Results
On average, practicum and internship students rated their practicum and internship sites favorably. Item 2 regarding ability to record at sites was rated low for both practicum and internship students. This indicates a high level of overall satisfaction with the sites available for practicum and internship experience, though also acknowledges the challenges to obtain recordings as part of these practical placements. The Clinical Coordinator of the doctoral program will continue to assess sites for the viability of recording clients.

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, 26 students (18 practicum students and 8 internship) rated their field placement supervisors. Practicum students’ mean rating for site supervisors was 4.70
with a standard deviation of .65. Internship students’ mean rating for site supervisors was 4.67 with a standard deviation of .65.

**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.