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PROGRAM OUTCOME REPORT

Comprehensive Exam (CPCE)

Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE): 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 which parallel the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Program’s (CACREP’s) common-core content areas, are consistent, indicating no particular weak spot in the curriculum. All students passed the CPCE in this reporting period. Students likely do well on the exam due to excellence in teaching and students who are rigorous in their study habits.

Program Evaluation

During the 2017-2018 academic year, 41 students took the program evaluation survey (32 students indicated being Mental Health Counseling students and 9 students indicated being School Counseling students). The overall mean and SD of the core evaluation were 4.09 and 1.47 respectively. Survey items rated below an average of 3.5 included: Section IX. Practicum: 58. One and one-half hours of week of group supervision (or its equivalent), M = 3.29, SD = 3.15. Section X. Internship: 64. One hour a week of individual on-site supervision, M = 2.92, SD = 2.31; 65. One and one-half hours of week of group supervision (or its equivalent). M = 3.32, SD = 3.13; 68. A minimum of 240 hours of direct service with clients, M = 3.39, SD = 3.11; 69. An opportunity to become familiar with a variety of professional activities other than direct services, M = 3.37, SD = 3.12. Section XI. Other Program Activities: 74. Awareness of ODU grants and scholarships that can be applied to graduate school, M = 2.93, SD = 1.00; 75. Awareness of available assistantships at ODU or in the Hampton Roads area, M = 3.29, SD = .086; 77. Opportunities to engage in research activities either on your own or with faculty, M = 3.29, SD = .089; 79. Easy access to your program advisor, M = 3.27, SD = 1.06. The overall mean and SD for each domain were: I. Professional Orientation and Ethical Practice, M = 4.02, SD = .78; II. Human Growth and Development, M = 4.07, SD = .71; III. Social and Cultural Diversity, M = 4.37, SD = .69; IV. Helping Relationships, M = 4.27, SD = .69; V. Group Work, M = 4.14, SD = .88; VI. Career Development, M = 3.91, SD = .91; VII. Assessment, M = 4.36, SD = .69; VIII. Research and Program Evaluation, M = 3.89, SD = .76; IX. Practicum, M = 4.63, SD = 4.96; X. Internship, M = 3.64, SD = 3.60; XI. Other Program Activities, M = 3.91, SD = .91.

Addressing Weak Areas:
The program has taken the following steps to address areas of weakness:
1. **Field placements:** A new Clinical Coordinator of practicum and internship has been hired, and she is re-organizing the field placement experiences to ensure that students are obtaining the necessary direct service and supervision hours. She has also revised all the forms and the practicum and internship handbook to ensure compliance with this important area of the program.

2. **Assistantships:** A section of the program handbook is dedicated to how to find assistantships, and periodic announcements will be made in the department newsletter about potential assistantships.

3. **Access to faculty and opportunities to engage in research:** The program has developed activities to increase visibility of faculty and to depart knowledge about their research areas. This has been done in the following ways: (a) a new faculty information system displayed on the department page that highlights faculty scholarship activities, (b) increased departmental activities, with students, to enhance student/faculty interaction (e.g., holiday party), (c) continued efforts to have faculty highlight their research activities in the department newsletter, and (d) reaching out to students to engage in scholarly activities (e.g., ethics competition).

**Evaluation of Students in their Field Placements**
From Fall 2017-Summer 2018, 30 practicum students were rated by their supervisors on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The overall mean rating of practicum students was 4.31. All but one item was rated above 4.0. With a rating of 3.9, students rated this item just slightly low: “Was able to conceptualize client problems in terms of consistent, sound, personal theory.” Since this item was barely below the target of 4.0, it will be re-evaluated during the next assessment cycle. During this same reporting period, 113 internship students were rated by their supervisors. The overall mean was 4.52. All items were rated above a 4.0.

**Evaluation of Program by Alumni**
Completed every two years, this was last conducted during the 2016-2017 academic year. Fifty-eight students responded to the Alumni Evaluation Survey during that year. Fifteen additional students responded and indicated that they are not working in the counseling field and therefore did not complete the evaluation survey. Final data were collected from fifty students (50 completed surveys). 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. With a mean score of 3.98 and SD of 1.04, only one item (item 10) was scored below the 4.0 target: “I have the necessary skills in testing and assessment to work successfully with clients.” Since this item was barely below the target of 4.0, it will be re-evaluated during the next assessment cycle.

**Evaluation of Program by Employers and Supervisors**
Only a small number of alumni gave the email addresses of their employers and supervisors, despite four requests to alumni. And of these, only three responded to our survey. Data were collected on three alumni’s performances. Supervisors/employers rated the students as "good" or "excellent" (5.0 or higher) on all items. The program needs to come up with a more efficient way of contact employers and supervisors.
Access to Surveys: If you would like to see any of the actual surveys, please contact Dr. Ed Neukrug, Counseling Program Evaluator at eneukrug@odu.edu.

OTHER SUBSTANTIAL PROGRAM CHANGES
The program is currently undergoing the Council on Counseling and Related Program’s (CACREP) re-accreditation process. This entails a total review of the program so that it is in alignment with the most current (2016) CACREP Standards. Because standards change, a subsequent re-alignment of the coursework must change to be in sync with the new standards and are reflected in our current syllabi. If you would like to see a copy of our current syllabi, please feel free to contact Darrella Wilson at dlwilson@odu.edu.

In addition to re-alignment of our syllabi, there are other changes the program has made. For instance, we have re-constituted our advisory boards, so that we could have feedback on our programs. In addition, we have developed new program objectives that are more in line with the mission of our program. A couple of major changes include the assessment of Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) and Key Professional Dispositions (KPD’s). KPI’s are the assessment of knowledge or skills of the students. They are measured twice and are based on an aspect of each of the eight common-core content areas of master’s programs as defined CACPREP (Professional Counseling Orientation and Ethical Practice, Social and Cultural Diversity, Human Growth and Development, Career Development, Counseling and Helping Relationships, Group Counseling and Group Work, Assessment and Testing, and Research and Program Evaluation). Additional KPIs for Clinical Mental Health Counseling and for School Counseling have also been devised. In addition, KPD’s have been developed for the master’s program and are assessed at the end of Coun 633: Counseling Skills, at the end of Coun 634: Advanced Counseling and Psychotherapy Techniques, and at the end of Coun 669: Practicum. If you would like to view the new objectives, and obtain a full understanding of the KPIs, and the KPDs, please access the M.S. Ed. Program Handbook which can be accessed at www.odu.edu/chs/academics/counseling/msed-in-counseling.
Program Evaluation
A 77-item survey that accesses learning and other areas of the program was assessed by ten (10) students directly after they obtained their Ph.D. Items that received particularly low scores (below 7 on a 10 point scale) are being examined. They included the following:

Section I. The Program: None below 7.00

Section II. Professional Identity
9. Doctoral students have experiences designed to develop an area of professional counseling expertise as demonstrated through scholarly publications and/or presentations (M = 6.30, SD = 2.33). 10. Doctoral students have opportunities to develop collaborative relationships with program faculty in teaching, supervision, research, professional writing, and service to the profession and the public (M=6.60, SD=2.91). 11. Doctoral students' participation in appropriate professional organizations is fostered (M=6.40, SD=2.69). 12. Doctoral students have experiences that contribute to and promote scholarly counseling research (M=5.70, SD=2.69).

How addressed: The program faculty reviewed this area and due to the number of presentations by students, awards received by students, and publications of students (often with faculty) felt that students were, indeed thriving in this area. The program would like to review how students respond to these items during the next cycle and revisit if more can be done in this area, if need be.

Section III. Knowledge:
13. Theories pertaining to the principles and practice of counseling, career development, group work, systems, consultation, and disaster responses training (M = 6.60, SD = 2.42). 18. Models and methods of assessment and use of data (M = 6.50, SD = 2.46).

How addressed: It was believed that consultation and disaster response training were particularly neglected in the program and new modules on disaster response and consultation has been developed in Coun 801: Current Issues in Counseling.

Section IV. Supervision: None

Section V. Teaching: None

Section VI. Research and Scholarship: 32. Understand univariate and multivariate research designs and data analysis methods (M=6.70, SD=2.53). 34. Know models and methods of assessment (M=6.40, SD=2.42) 36. Demonstrate the ability to formulate and appropriately document a research hypothesis appropriate for research in professional journals (M=6.70,
SD=2.24) 37. 38. Demonstrate professional writing skills necessary for journal and newsletter publications (M=6.70, SD=2.72). 39. Demonstrate the ability to write grant proposals appropriate for research, program enhancement, and program development (M=4.80, SD=2.75).

How Addressed: The faculty will address items 32, 34, and 39 with the Educational Foundations and Leadership faculty who teach the advanced research courses so that they can hone in on these items with students.

Section VII. Counseling
43. Understand different methods for evaluating counseling effectiveness (M=6.80, SD=2.40)
44. Understand the research base for existing counseling theories (M=6.80, SD=2.79)
45. Know theories and treatment methods of addiction, their strengths and weaknesses, theoretical bases for efficacy and change, applicability to multicultural populations, and ethical/legal considerations (M=5.40, SD=3.17)
46. Understand the effectiveness of models and methods of disaster response training (M=4.70, SD=2.87)
47. Demonstrate skills involved with the effective practice of the major counseling theories, to include individual, group, systems, developmental and consultation forms of counseling (M=6.30, SD=2.65)
48. Understand the effectiveness of models and methods of disaster response training (M=4.70, SD=2.87)
49. Demonstrate skills involved in adapting counseling theories, techniques, and methods to client needs (M=6.80, SD=2.96).

How Addressed: Faculty teaching theory courses have been made aware of these weak areas and will attempt to infuse them into their teaching.

Section VIII. Leadership and Advocacy:
53. Understand theories and skills of leadership (M=5.20, SD=2.56)
56. Understand models, leadership roles and strategies for responding to community, national, and international crises (M=5.30; SD=2.83)
57. Understand current topical and political issues in counseling and how those issues affect the daily work of counselors and the counseling profession (M=6.00; SD=2.83)
58. Demonstrate the ability to provide leadership or contribute to leadership efforts of professional organizations and/or counseling programs (M=6.20; SD=2.75)
59. Demonstrate the ability to advocate for the profession and its clientele (M=6.70, SD=2.57).

How Addressed: Faculty teaching leadership courses (e.g., Current Issues, Practicum, and Internship) have been made aware of these weak areas and will attempt to infuse them into their teaching.

Section IX. Other Program Activities:
60. Easy access to program information and program policies (M=6.80, SD=2.44)
61. An awareness of ODU grants and scholarships that can be applied to graduate school (M=6.20, SD=2.96).
64. Opportunities to engage in research activities on one's own or with faculty (M=5.80, SD=2.89).

How Addressed: The program will increasingly advertise such opportunities in the department newsletter.
Evaluation of Students in their Field Placements
From Fall 2017-Summer 2018, 30 practicum students were rated by their supervisors on a 5-point Likert-type scale. The overall mean rating of practicum students was 4.31. All but one item was rated above 4.0. With a rating of 3.9, students rated this item just slightly low: “Was able to conceptualize client problems in terms of consistent, sound, personal theory.” Since this item was barely below the target of 4.0, it will be re-evaluated during the next assessment cycle. During this same reporting period, 113 internship students were rated by their supervisors. The overall mean was 4.52. All items were rated above a 4.0.

Evaluation of Program by Alumni (Conducted Every Two Years: Last Survey 2016-2017)
This ongoing review of Ph.D. alumni occurs every two years. An email is sent to students who graduated from the program that includes a 28-item online survey, using a 5 point Likert-Type scale ranging from minimally adequate (1) to excellent (5). Students are asked to rank order items concerning their perceptions of the program. A response option of NA was provided as well.

Seventeen (17) PhD alumni responded to the Program Evaluation Survey. The average of all items was 4.36 with an average SD of .77. Four items received an average score below 4.0, and included 11. I have immersed myself in scholarly activities (M = 3.71, SD = .89), 12. I have submitted publications and/or grant proposals to appropriate agencies/publications (M = 3.29, SD = 1.40), 13. I see myself as a scholar or researcher (M = 3.71, SD = 1.23), and 14. I believe others see me as a scholar or researcher (M = 3.76, SD = 1.35).

Evaluation of Program by Employers and Supervisors
Approximately 25 program alumni were contacted four times via email to solicit responses to the evaluation survey. Data were collected on four alumni’s performance. Supervisors/Employers rated Ph.D graduates mostly as "Good" or "Excellent" on all survey items. There were no items rated as minimally or somewhat adequate. The program needs to come up with a more efficient way of contact employers and supervisors.

Access to Surveys: If you would like to see any of the actual surveys, please contact Dr. Ed Neukrug, Counseling Program Evaluator at eneukrug@odu.edu.

OTHER SUBSTANTIAL PROGRAM CHANGES
The program is currently undergoing the Council on Counseling and Related Program’s (CACREP) re-accreditation process. This entails a total review of the program so that it is in alignment with the most current (2016) CACREP Standards. Because standards change, a subsequent re-alignment of the coursework must change to be in sync with the new standards and are reflected in our current syllabi. If you would like to see a copy of our current syllabi, please feel free to contact Darrella Wilson at dlwilson@odu.edu.
In addition to re-alignment of our syllabi, there are other changes the program has made. For instance, we have re-constituted our advisory boards, so that we could have feedback on our programs. In addition, we have developed new program objectives that are more in line with the mission of our program. A couple of major changes include the assessment of Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) and Key Professional Dispositions (KPD’s). KPI’s are the assessment of knowledge or skills of the students. They are measured twice and are based on an aspect of each of the five common-core content areas of doctoral programs as defined by CACPREP (Counseling, Supervision, Teaching, Research and Scholarship, Leadership and Advocacy). In addition, KPD’s have been developed for the doctoral program and are assessed at the end of Coun 846 (Advanced Supervision) and at the end of Coun 869 (Practicum). If you would like to view the new objectives, and obtain a full understanding of the KPIs, and the KPDs, please access the Ph.D. Program Handbook which can be accessed at www.odu.edu/chs/academics/counseling/phd-in-education-counseling-concentration