



**Spring 2016, Summer 2016, and Fall 2016**

**Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) Assessment Plan and Report**

(Document student learning outcomes assessment plans and assessment data for each undergraduate and graduate degree program and certificate program, stand-alone minor, and distance education program offered online only.)

College: College of Education

Department: Counseling

Name of Degree or Certificate Program/Stand Alone Minor/Online Distance Education Program: Ph.D. Program in Counselor Education and Supervision

**Reflection on the Continuous Improvement of Student Learning**

1. List the changes and improvements your program planned to implement as a result of last year's student learning outcomes assessment data.
2. Were all of the changes implemented? If not, please explain.
3. What impact did the changes have on student learning?

SLOs were revised to be aligned with the five identified dimensions of doctoral professional identity in the 2016 CACREP standards. The dimensions are counseling, supervision, teaching, and leadership/advocacy.

**Student Learning Outcome 1**

(CACREP Standard 6.B.4.g)

**SLO 1:** Doctoral Professional Identity: Research and Scholarship. Doctoral students demonstrate knowledge of research questions appropriate for professional research and publication (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.4.g)

**Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes.

Revisions were made to the data source used for SLO 1. The rubric for this project was completely revised based on the 2016 CACREP standards and faculty input. As this revised rubric was implemented in fall 2016, both the old and new data sources will be provided on this report.

In 2015 the **SLO 1** was "Candidates for other professional school roles demonstrate an understanding of the professional and contextual knowledge expected in their fields; and use data, current research and technology to inform their practices."

The SLO was modified to more specifically focus on the Doctoral Professional Identity: Research and Scholarship to assess one of the dimensions of doctoral professional identity required in the 2016 CACREP standards.

**Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability.

1. In the Doctoral Seminar (CSLG 8000) the second question of the Professional Development Action Plan Paper Grading Rubric assesses “A statement of your identity as a researcher includes ‘Your ideas about your research agenda’ and ‘questions you may want to answer.’
2. In Prospectus Design (CSLG 8998) the Final Paper: Prospectus Design (CSLG 8998) Rubric has five items that focus specifically on the development and statement of a working proposal. The first dimension on the rubric specifically addresses the students’ ability to identify a “research problem and research question that is clear, articulated, and significant.”

The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a passing score on the Comprehensive Exam Research question.

**Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data.

1. In Doctoral Seminar (CSLG 8000) students complete a narrative paper reflecting on the content of the course and how they envision the content applying to their professional career. The goal for the assignment is to provide students the opportunity to reflect on their professional goals (e.g. begin thinking about where you see yourself in 5 years) and develop a plan for working toward those goals. This assignment is meant to be a jumping off point and a working document that can be updated throughout their programs. One component of the assignment is to assess their ability to state their plan to be as a researcher in terms of questions they would like to answer, the beginnings of a research agenda, and how they plan to do research. This is assessed on the second question of the Professional Development Action Plan Paper Grading Rubric assesses “A statement of your identity as a researcher” on an 8 point scale.
2. The purpose of Prospectus Design (CSLG 8998) is to help students understand the components of a dissertation proposal through writing a three-chapter working proposal. The first chapter provides a brief overview of the need and background for the study and how it will contribute to the advancement of knowledge, describes the research problem and purpose of the study, identifies the variables under investigation, the research hypotheses, objectives, and/or questions, and describes limitations and delimitations of the research. The second chapter presents literature to justify the study. The third chapter presents a clear, detailed description of the method proposed to address the research problem. Human subjects’ assurances, data collection instruments, a timeline for your progression through completion of the project, and other materials are included in appendices. In class 13 of the class, the first draft of their working proposal is due. Students receive feedback from the instructor and their peers. Based on this feedback students submit a final draft of their proposal in week 16 of class. The paper is evaluated using the first question of the Prospectus Design SLO Rubric that states “A research problem and research question that is clear, articulated, and significant. The rubric uses a 3 point Likert scale with the anchors: (0) does not meet expectations, (1) meets expectations, and (2) exceeds expectations. The faculty member enters the collected scores using a data management system, TaskStream.
3. Students may take the doctoral Comprehensive Exams in January, May, and August. The main objective of the Comprehensive Exam is to ensure that students demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the counseling professions by exhibiting adequate preparation to write a dissertation and to be counselor educators. Examinees must be able to analyze and synthesize information obtained from coursework and research within a multicultural counseling context. With advice and consent of the students’ Doctoral Program Advisor, students choose when to take the Comprehensive Examination. Students will meet with their Doctoral Program Advisors near the end of the semester in which they will have accrued at least 35 hours of doctoral course credit to verify their eligibility to take the exam and discuss the questions they may have about the exam.

The comprehensive exam in research assesses the knowledge of research questions appropriate for professional research and publication (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.4.g). Each of the 7 dimensions on the rubric is assessed using a 3-point Likert scale with the anchors: (1) does not meet expectations, (2) meets expectations, and (3) exceeds expectations. A score of 14 is required to “pass” each question. The responses are blindly reviewed by three different faculty members and scored using the Comprehensive Examination Rubric for Research. The director of the doctoral program enters the collected scores using a data management system, TaskStream.

Scores are collected using a data management system, TaskStream, and are analyzed at the college and program level. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by semester at three levels (College, Program and Licensure Area). Once a year results from all assessments administered by the programs are disseminated to the faculty in the College of Education. The data is discussed during a final faculty meeting and next steps are determined to address any needs identified. All strategies determined during this closing the loop discussion are implemented during the next academic year. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to all faculty members within the College of Education.

**Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected.

1. The program expects at least 70% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a score of 6 or higher on the item that assesses “A statement of your identity as a researcher.” [Professional Development Action Plan Paper Grading Rubric]
2. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a score of 1 or higher on the item that assesses “A research problem and research question that is clear, articulated, and significant.” [Final Paper: Prospectus Design (CSLG 8998) Rubric]
3. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a score of “met” expectations for the item that reads “demonstrates understanding of appropriate research questions.” [Comprehensive Examination Rubric for Research]

**Assessment Data:  
Spring 2015-Fall 2015**

As mentioned above, the SLO changed in the last year. Data from the **2015 SLO 1** is presented below.

<b>Counseling Comprehensive Exams</b>					
<b>Semester/Year</b>				<b>Spring 2015</b>	<b>Fall 2015</b>
Comprehensive Examination Four Areas					
1. Counseling Theory Area	Count			6	1
	Number/Percent Passed			100%	1 = 100%
2. Counseling Supervision Area	Count			7	1
	Number/Percent Passed			100%	1 = 100%
3. Research Area	Count			7	2
	Number/Percent Passed			100%	1 = 50%
4. Multicultural Counseling Area	Count			7	1
	Number/Percent Passed			100%	1 = 100%
Total of Comprehensive Areas	Count			8	5
<b>Total</b>	Number/Percent Passed			6 = 86%	4 = 80%

Counseling Dissertation				
Semester/Year			Spring 2015	Fall 2015
	Count		2	2
Dissertation Proposal Defenses			100%	100%
	Count		2	3
Dissertation Defenses			100%	100%

**Assessment Data: 2016**

**SLO 1: Doctoral Professional Identity: Research and Scholarship. Doctoral students demonstrate knowledge of research questions appropriate for professional research and publication (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.4.g)**

Semester	Performance Outcome 1	Performance Outcome 2	Performance Outcome 3		
	Fall 2016	Spring 2016	January	May	August
Total number of students	7	5	1	3	4
Number who met Expectations	5	4	0	1	4
Percentage who met expectations	71%	80%	0	33%	100%
Group Mean (if applicable)	6	1.3	NA	NA	NA

**Changes to be implemented Fall 2017:** Based upon the 2016 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome?

For Performance Outcome 1, 71% scored 6 or higher on the assessment which indicates that the Counselor Education and Supervision program met the performance outcomes and showed a positive impact on candidate learning. No instructional or program changes were needed.

For Performance Outcome 2, 80% scored 1 or higher on the assessment which indicates that the Counselor Education and Supervision program met the performance outcomes and showed a positive impact on candidate learning. No instructional or program changes were needed.

For Performance Outcome 3, 8 students took this comps question, and 5 of them passed showing that 63% passed for the 3 administrations of the exam. The program edited the rubrics for comps and developed a “provisional pass” to the scoring protocol.

## Student Learning Outcome 2 (CACREP Standard 6.B.1.b)

SLO 2: Doctoral Professional Identity: Counseling. Doctoral students will be able to demonstrate integration of theories relevant to counseling (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.1.b )

**Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes.

Revisions were made to the data source used for SLO 2. The rubric for this project was revised based on the 2016 CACREP standards and faculty input. As this revised rubric was implemented in fall 2016, both the old and new data sources will be provided on this report.

In 2015 the **SLO 2** was “Candidates for other school professions demonstrate professional behaviors consistent with fairness and the belief that all students can learn, including creating caring, supportive learning environments, encouraging student-directed learning, and making adjustments to their own professional dispositions when necessary.”

The Student Learning Outcome was modified to more specifically focus on the Doctoral Professional Identity: Counseling. This SLO was modified to assess one of the five dimensions of doctoral professional identity required in the 2016 CACREP standards (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.1.a).

**Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability.

1. Doctoral Practicum in Counseling (CSLG 8431) – The outcome measure is Case Conceptualization Rubric.
2. Advanced Counseling Theory Seminar (CSLG 8100) – The outcome measure is the final grade on the Theory Paper assignment.
3. Doctoral Comprehensive exam – The outcome measure is the score on the item, integration of theories relevant to counseling, on the Comprehensive Examination Rubric for Theories.

**Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data.

1. In CSLG 8431, students will present a 10-minute segment of a counseling session during the case presentation. For this case presentation, students complete the Case Presentation for Group Supervision. Based on students’ written report, content of their taped segment, and discussion about their segment relative to their theory, the faculty member assesses students’ (1) ability to describe work with client using the language from the theory from which you are working, (b) ability to demonstrate work with client from a stated theoretical perspective, and (3) ability to generate future hypotheses concerning possible counseling approaches or interventions from a stated theoretical perspective. These three (3) dimensions are assessed on a 3-point Likert scale with the anchors: (1) does not meet expectations, (2) meets expectations, and (3) exceeds expectations. The faculty member enters the collected scores using a data management system, TaskStream.

2. In CSLG 8100, students write a Counseling Integration Theory Paper that articulates an integrative theoretical approach to counseling that is consistent with their beliefs about human nature and psychological change. Their papers should demonstrate an appropriate synthesis of research and theory, a consistent view of human nature and change, and an integration of theories relevant to counseling. The components of the paper are: key concepts of their theoretical approach, view of their role as therapist, therapeutic goals, relationship issues, and central techniques and methods. Students are instructed to include only those theories and concepts that truly fit for who they are as a person, how they see themselves as counselors, how they conceptualize mental health, and what they consider as the vehicle that instigates change and growth in counseling. The assignment is graded using the Rubric for Theoretical Integration Paper which is a 3-point Likert scale ranging from 1-3. The faculty member enters the collected scores using a data management system, TaskStream.
  
4. Students may take the doctoral Comprehensive Exams in January, May, and August. The main objective of the Comprehensive Exam is to ensure that students demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the counseling professions by exhibiting adequate preparation to write a dissertation and to be counselor educators. Examinees must be able to analyze and synthesize information obtained from coursework and research within a multicultural counseling context. The responses are blindly reviewed by three different faculty members and scored using the Comprehensive Examination Rubric for Theories.

The comprehensive exam in the theories assesses ability to demonstrate integration of theories relevant to counseling (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.1.b). Each of the 7 dimensions on the rubric is assessed using a 3-point Likert scale with the anchors: (1) does not meet expectations, (2) meets expectations, and (3) exceeds expectations. A score of 14 is required to “pass” each question. The responses are blindly reviewed by three different faculty members and scored using the Comprehensive Examination Rubric for Research. The director of the doctoral program enters the collected scores using a data management system, TaskStream.

Scores are collected using a data management system, TaskStream, and are analyzed at the college and program level. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by semester at three levels (College, Program and Licensure Area). Once a year results from all assessments administered by the programs are disseminated to the faculty in the College of Education. The data is discussed during a final faculty meeting and next steps are determined to address any needs identified. All strategies determined during this closing the loop discussion are implemented during the next academic year. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to all faculty members within the College of Education.

**Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected.

1. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a score of 6 or higher on the Case Conceptualization Rubric.
2. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a score of 8 or higher on the Rubric for Theoretical Integration Paper.
3. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a passing score on the Comprehensive Exam Theories question.

**Assessment Data:  
Spring 2015-Summer 2015**

<b>Program</b>		
<b>Practicum (8431)only Offered in Spring Semester</b>	<b>Spring 2015</b>	<b>Fall 2015</b>
Count	6	
Practicum Evaluation: Dispositions	100%	
Count	6	

Practicum Evaluation: Working in Counseling Environment	100%	
Count	6	
Practicum Evaluation: Counseling Professional Behavior	100%	
Count	6	
Practicum Evaluation: Counseling Process Skills	100%	
Count	6	
Practicum Evaluation: Conceptualization Skills	100%	
Count	6	
Practicum Evaluation: Personalization Skills	100%	
Count	6	
Practicum Evaluation: Supervision Conduct	100%	
<b>Internship (CSLG 8440)</b>		
Count	2	3
Internship Evaluation: Dispositions	100%	100%
Count	2	3
Internship Evaluation: Working in Counseling Environment	100%	100%
Count	2	3
Internship Evaluation: Counseling Professional Behavior	100%	100%
Count	2	3
Internship Evaluation: Counseling Process Skills	100%	100%
Count	2	3
Internship Evaluation: Conceptualization Skills	100%	100%
Count	2	3
Internship Evaluation: Personalization Skills	100%	100%
Count	2	3
Internship Evaluation: Supervision Conduct	100%	100%

#### Assessment Data: 2016

**SLO 2: Doctoral Professional Identity: Counseling.** Doctoral students will be able to demonstrate integration of theories relevant to counseling (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.1.b )

	Performance Outcome 1	Performance Outcome 2*	Performance Outcome 3		
Semester	Fall 2016		January	May	August
Total number of students	7	NA	1	3	3
Number who met Expectations	6	NA	0	2	3
Percentage who met expectations	86%	NA	0	66%	100%
Group Mean (if applicable)	5.8	NA	NA	NA	NA

\*Course changed semesters from Fall semester to Spring semester so it was not taught in 2016.

**Changes to be implemented Fall 2017:** Based upon the 2016 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome?

For Performance Outcome 1, 86% scored 6 or higher on the assessment which indicates that the Counselor Education and Supervision program met the performance outcomes and showed a positive impact on candidate learning. No instructional or program changes were needed.

For Performance Outcome 3, 7 students took this comps question, and 5 of them passed showing that 71% passed for the 3 administrations of the exam. The program edited the rubrics for comps and developed a “provisional pass” to the scoring protocol.

**Student Learning Outcome 3**  
(CACREP Standard 6.B.3.a)

**SLO: 3** Doctoral Professional Identity: Teaching. Doctoral students demonstrate knowledge of roles and responsibilities related to educating counselors (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.3.a)

**Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes.

Revisions were made to the data source used for SLO 2. The rubric for this project was completely revised based on the 2016 CACREP standards and faculty input. As this revised rubric was implemented in fall 2016, both the old and new data sources will be provided on this report.

In 2015 the **SLO 3** was “Candidates for other professional school roles critique and reflect on their work within the context of student learning. They establish educational environments that support and engage student learning within the context which they work. Candidates demonstrate appropriate effective communication skills, instructional methods and are organized, knowledgeable, and responsive to students.”

The Student Learning Outcome was modified to more specifically focus on the Doctoral Professional Identity: Teaching. This SLO was modified to assess one of the five dimensions of doctoral professional identity required in the 2016 CACREP standards. (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.3.a).

**Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability.

1. In the Doctoral Seminar (CSLG 8000), the outcome measure is a passing score on the Doctoral Teaching SLO Rubric #1.
2. In Instructional Theory in Counselor Education (CSLG 8203) the outcome measure is a passing score on the Doctoral Teaching SLO Rubric #1.



**Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data.

1. In Doctoral Seminar (CSLG 8000) students complete a narrative paper reflecting on the content of the course and how they envision the content applying to their professional career. The goal for the assignment is to provide students the opportunity to reflect on their professional goals (e.g. begin thinking about where you see yourself in 5 years) and develop a plan for working toward those goals. This assignment is meant to be a jumping off point and a working document that can be updated throughout their programs. One component of the assignment is to assess their ability to state their understanding of the roles and responsibilities of being a counselor educator and how those roles and responsibilities apply to them as an individual. This is assessed on the first question of the Professional Development Action Plan Paper Grading Rubric assesses “A statement of your identity as an educator” on a 4-point scale.
2. In CSLG 8203, students were evaluated on Rubric #1 at the end of the semester based on their journals covering the readings. In these journals, students were asked to assess the readings in terms of roles and responsibilities related to educating counselors. The journal entries were evaluated on a rubric that addressed these issues.

**Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected.

1. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a score of 3 or higher on the Doctoral Teaching SLO Rubric #1 used in 8000.
2. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a score of 4 or higher on the Doctoral Teaching SLO Rubric #1 used in 8203.

**Assessment Data:**

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015**

<b>DSTOR Evaluation (Fall Only)</b>		
<b>Semester</b>		Fall 2015
DSTOR: Organization	Count	5
Meets or Exceeds Expectations		100%
DSTOR: Communication	Count	5
Meets or Exceeds Expectations		100%
DSTOR: Knowledge of Subject	Count	5
Meets or Exceeds Expectations		100%
DSTOR: Appropriate Instructional Method	Count	5
Meets or Exceeds Expectations		100%
PCPE: Student Engagement	Count	5
Meets or Exceeds Expectations		100%

**Assessment Data: 2016**

**SLO: 3 Doctoral Professional Identify: Teaching. Doctoral students demonstrate knowledge of roles and responsibilities related to**

educating counselors (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.3.a)

	<b>Performance Outcome 1</b>	<b>Performance Outcome 2</b>
<b>Semester</b>	Fall 2016	Fall 2016

Total number of students	7	7
Number who met Expectations	7	7
Percentage who met expectations	100%	100%
Group Mean (if applicable)	3.29	4.9

**Changes to be implemented Fall 2017:** Based upon the 2016 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome?

Based upon the Assessment Report, The Counselor Education and Supervision Program met all performance outcomes and showed a positive impact on candidate learning. No instructional or program changes were needed.

**Student Learning Outcome 4**  
**(CACREP Standard 6.B.3.d)**

**SLO: 4** Doctoral Professional Identity: Teaching. Doctoral students effectively demonstrate instructional and curriculum design, delivery, and evaluation methods relevant to counselor education (CACREP Section 6.B.3.d).

**Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes.

Revisions were made to the data source used for SLO 2. The rubric for this project was completely revised based on the 2016 CACREP standards and faculty input. As this revised rubric was implemented in fall 2016, both the old and new data sources will be provided on this report.

In 2015 the **SLO 3** was “Candidates for other professional school roles critique and reflect on their work within the context of student learning. They establish educational environments that support and engage student learning within the context which they work. Candidates demonstrate appropriate effective communication skills, instructional methods and are organized, knowledgeable, and responsive to students.”

The Student Learning Outcome was modified to more specifically focus on the Doctoral Professional Identity: Teaching. This SLO was modified to assess one of the five dimensions of doctoral professional identity required in the 2016 CACREP standards. (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.3.a).

**Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability.

1. In Instructional Theory in Counselor Education (CSLG 8203) the outcome measure is a passing score on the Doctoral Teaching SLO Rubric #2
2. In Doctoral Internship: Teaching (CSLG 8445), the outcome measure is a passing score on the Doctoral Teaching SLO Rubric #2.

**Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data.

1. In CSLG 8203, students were evaluated on Rubric #2 upon completing of their teaching demonstration in class during the last 5 weeks of the semester.
2. For the CSLG 8445 Doctoral Internship: Teaching course, the Doctoral Teaching SLO #2 rubric is used to assess students in 3 areas to determine sufficient knowledge in the content area described in the CACREP standard (6.B.3.b). The first area is “Provides content that is well structured and sequenced; visuals or handouts help make content clear.” The second area is “Emphasizes key concepts using multiple strategies (verbal examples, overheads, slides).” The third area is “Monitors student understanding and responses throughout the lesson.” Each item is scored on a 3 point scale. Minimum passing score is a 6

with no scores of 1 or 0. This assessment is conducted at the end of the spring and fall semesters after the course is completed.

**Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected.

1. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a score of 6 or higher on the Doctoral Teaching SLO Rubric #2 used in 8203.
2. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a score of 6 or higher on the Doctoral Teaching SLO Rubric #2 used in 8445.

**Assessment Data:**

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015**

<b>DSTOR Evaluation (Fall Only)</b>		
<b>Semester</b>		Fall 2015
DSTOR: Organization	Count	5
Meets or Exceeds Expectations		100%
DSTOR: Communication	Count	5
Meets or Exceeds Expectations		100%
DSTOR: Knowledge of Subject	Count	5
Meets or Exceeds Expectations		100%
DSTOR: Appropriate Instructional Method	Count	5
Meets or Exceeds Expectations		100%
PCPE: Student Engagement	Count	5
Meets or Exceeds Expectations		100%

**Assessment Data: 2016**

**SLO: 3 Doctoral Professional Identify: Teaching. Doctoral students demonstrate knowledge of roles and responsibilities related to**

educating counselors (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.3.a)

	<b>Performance Outcome 1</b>	<b>Performance Outcome 1</b>
<b>Semester</b>	Fall 2016	Fall 2016
Total number of students	7	2
Number who met Expectations	7	2
Percentage who met expectations	100%	100%
Group Mean (if applicable)	6.7	6

**Changes to be implemented Fall 2017:** Based upon the 2016 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome?

Based upon the Assessment Report, The Counselor Education and Supervision Program met all performance outcomes and showed a positive impact on candidate learning. No instructional or program changes were needed.

## Student Learning Outcome 5

(CACREP Standard 6.B.2.b)

**SLO 5:** Doctoral Professional Identify: Supervision. Doctoral students demonstrate knowledge of theoretical frameworks and models of clinical supervision (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.2.b).

**Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes.

This additional Student Learning Outcome was created to focus on the Doctoral Professional Identity: Supervision to assess one of the five dimensions of doctoral professional identity required in the 2016 CACREP standards.

**Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability.

This Student Learning Outcome was assessed through three data collection instruments:

1. In Clinical Supervision in Counseling (CSLG 8110), the outcome measure is a passing score on the Doctoral Supervision SLO Rubric.
2. In Doctoral Internship: Supervision (CSLG 8442), the outcome measure is a passing score on the Doctoral Supervision SLO Rubric.
3. The Comprehensive Exam specifically covers the standard, “demonstrate knowledge of theoretical frameworks and models of clinical supervision” [Comprehensive Exam Rubric for Supervision].

**Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data.

1. For the CSLG 8110 Clinical Supervision in Counseling course, the Doctoral Supervision SLO Rubric is used to assess students in 2 areas to determine sufficient knowledge in the content area described in the CACREP standard (6.B.2.b). The first is student “ability to identify theoretical frameworks and models of clinical supervision.” The second assessment area is “articulate theoretical frameworks and models of clinical supervision.” Each item is scored on a 4 point scale (0-3), with a highest possible total score of 6 (sum of two items). Minimum passing total score is a 4 with no scores of 1 or 0. This assessment is conducted at the end of the fall semester after the course is completed.
2. For the CSLG 8442 Doctoral Internship: Supervision course, the Doctoral Supervision SLO Rubric is used to assess students in 2 areas to determine sufficient knowledge in the content area described in the CACREP standard (6.B.2.b). The first is student “ability to identify theoretical frameworks and models of clinical supervision.” The second assessment area is “articulate theoretical frameworks and models of clinical supervision.” Each item is scored on a 4 point scale (0-3), with a highest possible total score of 6 (sum of the two items). Minimum passing score is a 4 with no scores of 1 or 0. This assessment is conducted at the end of the spring semester after the course is completed.
3. Students may take the doctoral Comprehensive Exams in January, May, and August. The main objective of the Comprehensive Exam is to ensure that students demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the counseling professions by exhibiting adequate preparation to write a dissertation and to be counselor educators. Examinees must be able to analyze and synthesize information obtained from coursework and research within a multicultural counseling context. The responses are blindly reviewed by three different faculty members and scored using the Comprehensive Examination Rubric for Supervision.

The comprehensive exam in the supervision area assesses knowledge of theoretical frameworks and models of clinical supervision (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.2.b). Each of the 7 dimensions on the rubric is assessed using a 3-point Likert scale with the anchors: (1) does not meet expectations, (2) meets expectations, and (3) exceeds expectations. A score of 14 is required to “pass” each question. The responses are blindly reviewed by three different faculty members and scored using the Comprehensive Examination Rubric for Research. The director of the doctoral program enters the collected scores using a data management system, TaskStream.

Scores are collected using a data management system, TaskStream, and are analyzed at the college and program level. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by semester at three levels (College, Program and Licensure Area). Once a year results from all assessments administered by the programs are disseminated to the faculty in the College of Education. The data is discussed during a final faculty meeting and next steps are determined to address any needs identified. All strategies determined during this closing the loop discussion are implemented during the next academic year. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to all faculty members within the College of Education.

**Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected.

1. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a passing score, as defined above, on the Doctoral Supervision SLO Rubric in the CSLG 8110 Clinical Supervision in Counseling course.

2. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a passing score, as defined above, on the Doctoral Supervision SLO Rubric in the CSLG 8442 Doctoral Internship: Supervision course.
3. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a passing score on the Comprehensive Exam Supervision question.

**Assessment Data:**

**SLO 4: Doctoral Professional Identify: Supervision. Doctoral students demonstrate knowledge of theoretical frameworks and models of clinical supervision (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.2.b).**

	Performance Outcome 1	Performance Outcome 2	Performance Outcome 3		
Semester	Spring 2016	Spring 2016	January	May	August
Total number of students	7	8	1	3	3
Number who met Expectations	7	8	0	2	3
Percentage who met expectations	100%	100%	0	66%	100%
Group Mean (if applicable)	4.71	4.5	NA	NA	NA

**Changes to be implemented Fall 2017:** Based upon the 2016 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome?

For Performance Outcome 1, 100% scored a “pass” on the assessment which indicates that the Counselor Education and Supervision program met the performance outcomes and showed a positive impact on candidate learning. No instructional or program changes were needed.

For Performance Outcome 2, 100% scored a “pass” on the assessment which indicates that the Counselor Education and Supervision program met the performance outcomes and showed a positive impact on candidate learning. No instructional or program changes were needed.

For Performance Outcome 3, 7 students took this comps question, and 5 of them passed showing that 71% passed for the 3 administrations of the exam. The program edited the rubrics for comps and developed a “provisional pass” to the scoring protocol.

**Student Learning Outcome 6**  
(CACREP Standard 6.B.5.i)

**SLO 6:** Doctoral Professional Identify: Leadership and Advocacy. Doctoral students demonstrate knowledge of role of counselors and counselor educators advocating on behalf of the profession and professional identity (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.5.i).

**Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes.

This additional Student Learning Outcome was created to focus on the Doctoral Professional Identity: Leadership and Advocacy to assess one of the five dimensions of doctoral professional identity required in the 2016 CACREP standards.

**Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability.

1. In the Doctoral Seminar (CSLG 8000) the outcome measure is the final grade on the Professional Development Plan assignment.
2. In Applied Multicultural Counseling (CSLG 8346) the outcome measure is the final grade on the MSJCC Integration Project.
3. In the Internship: Teaching (CSLG 8445) the outcome measure is a passing score on item #4 on the Doctoral Teaching SLO Rubric #2.

**Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data.

1. In Doctoral Seminar (CSLG 8000) students complete a narrative paper reflecting on the content of the course and how they envision the content applying to their professional career. The goal for the assignment is to provide students the opportunity to reflect on their professional goals (e.g. begin thinking about where you see yourself in 5 years) and develop a plan for working toward those goals. This assignment is meant to be a jumping off point and a working document that can be updated throughout their programs. One component of the assignment is to assess their ability to reflect on their role in advocating for the profession and to process their views of leadership in the profession. This is assessed on the third question of the Professional Development Action Plan Paper Grading Rubric assesses "A statement of your identity as a researcher" on a 2-point scale.
2. In Applied Multicultural (CSLG 8346) students complete an advocacy project where they are expected to demonstrate their role as a counselor in advocating on behalf of the profession and professional identity. The course is taught during the spring term and the project is evaluated by a rubric. The data are collected in Taskstream.
3. For the CSLG 8445 Doctoral Internship: Teaching course, the Doctoral Teaching SLO #2 rubric is used to assess students in the area of leadership and advocacy within the role of a counselor educator to determine sufficient knowledge in the content area described in the CACREP standard (6.B.5.i). This item is scored on a 3 point scale. Minimum passing score is a 2. This assessment is conducted at the end of the spring and fall semesters after the course is completed.



**Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected.

1. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a score of 1 or higher final grade on the Professional Development Plan assignment.
2. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a score of 2 or higher on the rubric on the MSJCC Integration Project.
3. The program expects at least 80% of doctoral students assessed will achieve a score of 2 or higher on item #4 of the Doctoral Teaching SLO #2 rubric.

**Assessment Data: 2016**

**SLO 5: Doctoral Professional Identify: Leadership and Advocacy. Doctoral students demonstrate knowledge of role of counselors and counselor educators advocating on behalf of the profession and professional identity (CACREP 2016; Section 6.B.5.i).**

	<b>Performance Outcome 1</b>	<b>Performance Outcome 2</b>	<b>Performance Outcome 3</b>
Semester	Fall 2016	Spring	Fall 2016
Total number of students	7	7	5
Number who met Expectations	7	7	5
Percentage who met expectations	100%	100%	100%
Group Mean (if applicable)	1.57	3	2

**Changes to be implemented Fall 2017:** Based upon the 2016 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome?

For Performance Outcome 1, 100% scored 1 or higher on the assessment which indicates that the Counselor Education and Supervision program met the performance outcomes and showed a positive impact on candidate learning. No instructional or program changes were needed.

For Performance Outcome 2, 100% scored 2 or higher on the assessment which indicates that the Counselor Education and Supervision program met the performance outcomes and showed a positive impact on candidate learning. No instructional or program changes were needed.

For Performance Outcome 3, 100% scored 2 or higher on the assessment which indicates that the Counselor Education and Supervision program met the performance outcomes and showed a positive impact on candidate learning. No instructional or program changes were needed.