Please find our response, to your requests for more information, highlighted in yellow underneath the section and corresponding request. For the sake of visual aesthetic and organization, returning faculty data is at the end of the document.

We would like to replace our original Section V, with the Section V in this document pertaining to assessment.

- **Section II**
  - For core vs noncore credit delivery, it looks like these figures were provided as student credit hours. Could you provide the figures for course credit hours?
    - The data were replaced with the requested definition of delivery
  
  - Also, we need those figures for a full 12-month period – could you include figures for the most recent summer session?
    - The summer semester data were added in both Table 1 and Table 2

  - On the FTE ratios, it looks like student FTEs were calculated on the basis of a full-time master’s level load being 12 credits while a full-time doctoral level load is 9 credits. Is that correct? My understanding from the TTU website is that 9 credits would be full-time for any grad student – is that number different for the counseling program?
    - The Full Time Graduate Student hours was changed to 9 hours Table 1.

  - Also, FTE ratios should be calculated for core and noncore faculty together, rather than separated out (i.e. for the purposes of FTEs, we don’t distinguish between core and noncore).
    - The data were combined and displayed in Table 2.

  - Because we look at FTE over a full 12-month period, we’ll need FTE data for the most recent summer session too.
    - The FTE for summer is included in Table 1.
Table 1. Academic Year 18-19 Aggregate Faculty to Student Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Point Definitions</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Course Hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Credit Hours</td>
<td>1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTU Definition of Full Time Graduate student hours</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Grad Student Equivalent</td>
<td>207.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty to student ratio</td>
<td>1:9.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation:
We took the summer enrollment and added it into the equation/calculation. The total Course Credit Hours (Course CH) equaled 1869 hours for the last 12-month period. This number was divided by the full-time graduate student hours of 9 hours, which was erroneously calculated by using 12 hours in the initial submission. This resulted in 207.67 Full Time Graduate Student Equivalent (FTGSE). We added in the 6.5 Full Time Faculty Equivalent (FTFE) for Summer 2019 to bring the total for FTFE to 22.5 for the last 12-month period. Therefore, by dividing the total FTGSE by total FTFE the resulting faculty to student ratio is 1:9.23.

Table 2. Academic Year 18-19 Core vs. Non-Core Teaching

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total FTFE</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTFE Core</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTFE Non-Core</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Teaching</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Core Teaching</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation:
We took the total FTFE from each semester which equaled 22.5. Total core teaching equaled 15.5, non-core equaled 7. The resulting teaching percentages were calculated by dividing Core of 15.5 by total FTFE of 22.5 with the resulting percentage at 69% core teaching. Non-core faculty totaled 7 for AY-18-19. This total was divided by total FTFE of 22.5 resulting in a 31% non-core teaching.
- **Section V**
  - The Mid-Cycle narrative indicates that the program’s evaluation report is available on the website – can you let me know where?
    - Below is the link to our evaluation reports
      https://www.depts.ttu.edu/education/graduate/psychology-and-leadership/counselor_education/cacrep.php
  - And do you have documentation of any of the other methods listed for distribution of the report to stakeholders (e.g. copies of the email sent to students, alumni, faculty, etc)?
    - The documentation for the report is listed below.
      - **Newsletter distribution – Fall 2018** – We stated in our newsletter that accountability information can be found on our website. The newsletter and other newsletters are available upon request. Rather than adding additional appendices here is what was written:
      - **Fall 2018 as an example**
        - **Accountability** – CACREP accreditation provides a system for accountability. CACREP programs must undergo peer evaluation that ensures that the program meets and maintains the CACREP Standards (in 2015, the three programs at TTU met 300+ standards). Once accreditation has been achieved, annual reports, data collection, and program analysis/evaluation are required annually to ensure that standards are continuing to be met. Results and more information are available on our website.
      - **Data Day** – This is a presentation to the community, students, college, and university focusing on our program assessment. The slides for 2018 were included in our original mid-cycle report. This is was a presentation discussing our data. This took place on May 9, 2018. Other reports are available upon request.
      - **As part of the internship course, faculty present outcome data from our ongoing data collection taken from Bradley EPCE 5094 syllabus: The coverage of the Program Evaluation is available in other syllabi and can be provided upon request.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 28</th>
<th>Results of Ongoing Program Evaluation and Assessment (CACREP II. K. 8. d, e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Site Supervisor’s Evaluation of Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. <strong>Due April 28</strong>: Time Log signed by Student &amp; Site Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Student’s Evaluation of Site Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Student’s Evaluation of Internship Site (CACREP III. H. I; CACREP III. L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• As a result of the Mid-Cycle report material gathering process, the counseling faculty decided to adjust our assessment plan for forthcoming evaluations, the revised assessment plan is below.

V. Program Assessment and Evaluation

Assessment Overview

The Counselor Education Program faculty at Texas Tech University developed an assessment model whereby the program assessment and data collection were designed to address the following major questions:

1. Is the Counselor Education Program successful in educating its students to be competent, successful counselors?
2. Based on assessment data, what are the ways to improve the program?

Analogous to individuals needing a map to travel from one city to another, the Counselor Education Program faculty used the concept of a map to guide the development of their Assessment Model. The model was designed on the premise that continuous assessment is an integral part of our program, faculty are integral to moving assessment forward, and assessment data are salient to the success of our program. Additionally, the faculty operated on the premise that our assessment should extend beyond simply collecting and defining generic skills, and instead, it should extend the assessment to focus on outcome-based assessments, assessments that include internal and external data. Specifically, the Counselor Education Assessment Model was developed to incorporate a broad range of data collection that would capture Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in a manner to allow faculty to use a holistic approach to collect data not only about “best practice” but also to collect data to inform faculty on ways to improve the program.

The Assessment Model was developed by initially arranging our courses into three phases: Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3. These phases are depicted in Figure 5.1 below:

Figure 5.1. Course Phases
Figure 5.1 illustrates that the three phases occur separately and follow the receding phase. A more complete description of each phase is provided in the following paragraphs.

**Phase 1**
A course identified as Phase 1 is a course(s) that is didactic and is provided in a classroom setting. Some Phase 1 courses are taught face-to-face, some courses are online, and other courses are hybrid. A salient purpose of a Phase 1 course is to provide basic counseling information about counseling knowledge. Specifically, the Phase 1 courses provide the basic knowledge and skills for Phase 1 classes as well as providing the foundation for future Phase 2 and Phase 3 classes.

**Phase 2**
A course identified as a Phase 2 course is designed to allow the student to implement counseling knowledge and skills into counseling practice. The counseling practice occurs in a classroom setting under the direct supervision of Counselor Education Faculty. Essentially, these courses provide simulated practice in a structured setting with direct supervision.

**Phase 3**
A course identified as a Phase 3 course allows the student to integrate information (e.g., content, theory, role-plays) from Phase 1 and Phase 2 classes and implement them into actual counseling practice. Phase 3 classes focus on actual counseling practice at practica and internship sites.

After the courses were organized into the phase sequence outlined above, the assessment model was revisited and refined. The Assessment Model is depicted in Figure 5.2.

---

**Figure 5.2. Assessment Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admissions</th>
<th>Core Course Areas</th>
<th>Data Collection (P1, P2, P3 classes)</th>
<th>Assessment Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Application</td>
<td>1. Professional Counseling Orientation &amp; Ethical Practice</td>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Experiences (work volunteer)</td>
<td>4. Career Development</td>
<td>3. Written Papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GRE</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. End of Class Rubric(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. A&amp;E Rubrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Writing Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Decision by faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Program Evaluation
2. Implementation of Rubrics
3. Student Progress
4. Evaluation of Site Supervisor
5. Evaluation of Student by Site Supervisor
6. Portfolio Evaluation
7. Advisory Board Evaluation
8. Faculty Meetings
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Group Counseling &amp; Group Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Assessment &amp; Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Research &amp; Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>Rubrics are used to collect data in core courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Practicum (at site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Internship (at site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>CPCE Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>NCE Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Site Supervisor Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Advisory Board Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Alumni Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Employer Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Student Dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>CPCE Results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Figure 5.2 indicates, the model has four major components: Admissions, Core Course Areas, Data Collection, and Assessment Tasks. Although administrative tasks are listed in Figure 5.2, they are outlined more thoroughly in Figure 5.3. Figure 5.2 illustrates the data that are collected for admission into the Counselor Education Program. A holistic approach guides admissions decisions. Specifically, letters of recommendation, interest statement written by the student, experience (work or volunteer), curriculum vita, GPA, GRE scores, interview with prospective student, and writing sample are assessed by the faculty. Following the admission decision by the faculty, the student enrolls in the program. The Counselor Education courses are arranged according to the 8 core areas of CACREP. After the student matriculates into the program and its course sequence, assessment data are collected in each class. Rubrics were developed as a means to collect data for each class. The data from the rubrics complement the data obtained from other internal and external sources. An example of a rubric is provided in Appendix A. The rubric uses a 5-point (1=low, 5=high) Likert scale. As indicated on the rubric, a score of 3.0 is an average score. Using the rubric, the faculty meets with the student and discusses his/her skills, skills exhibited for example on a tape or direct observation. If scores are below 3.0, a remediation plan is developed.

As depicted in Figure 5.3, other assessment tools and assessment tasks are agreed upon and implemented by the faculty. The Counselor Education Faculty review data from a minimum of nine assessment tasks listed in Figure 5.3. For example, the Program Evaluation Survey data are collected from students, alumni, Counselor Education Advisory Board members, and employers. The data are discussed in faculty meetings, and decisions are made based on data obtained. As Figure 5.3 illustrates, other sources of data include rubrics, student progress, evaluations by site supervisors, evaluations by students, portfolios, Counselor Education Advisory Board, faculty meetings, and CPCE examination results. The specific data collection for each of the nine administrative tasks are described in Figure 5.3. As Figure 5.3 indicates, the Counselor Education Program faculty use a variety of sources for their collection of data.
Prior to placement in practicum and internship, an assessment review of the student’s progress is conducted to be sure the student is ready for placement.

Faculty review the data from the EPCE test results.

Using rubrics, data are collected in A&E courses, end-of-phase courses, and some didactic courses.

A program evaluation is conducted every 5 years to obtain data from the students, alumni, and employers.

In faculty meetings (once or twice a month), faculty review student dispositions. If issues arise, plans are made to work with the student.

In meetings with the Advisory Board, the Board assists in program evaluation.

Each student prepares a portfolio that is reviewed and evaluated by faculty.

Using rubrics, the student evaluates the site and the site supervisor.

A formal evaluation of the student is conducted twice each semester by the site supervisor.

A program evaluation is conducted every 5 years to obtain data from the students, alumni, and employers.

Using rubrics, data are collected in A&E courses, end-of-phase courses, and some didactic courses.

In faculty meetings (once or twice a month), faculty review student dispositions. If issues arise, plans are made to work with the student.

In meetings with the Advisory Board, the Board assists in program evaluation.

Each student prepares a portfolio that is reviewed and evaluated by faculty.

Using rubrics, the student evaluates the site and the site supervisor.

A formal evaluation of the student is conducted twice each semester by the site supervisor.
Table 5.1 Admission data

The Counselor Education Program uses a comprehensive and holistic approach to student admissions. This approach does not favor a single indicator rather weighs more than any other. The following metrics are among several indicators of quality that the program considers: Graduate Record Examination (GRE). The GRE scores for both, the Master’s and PhD program and over the past three academic years, are relatively similar to the national average and to the GRE scores for both, Master’s and PhD within the College of Education at Texas Tech University (150 and 145 on Verbal and Quantitative knowledge, respectively). Admitting students with average scores similar to both, national and local standards may be an important indicator of the quality of students who are in our program. Below is a table that summarizes the GRE scores by program level and by year of admission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Average of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National average in Education: 151

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Average of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National average in Education: 153

Our admission process also includes an equity monitoring component. Gender and Ethnicity are reported in our vital statistic annual reports. These reports are available on our website. Age, however is often omitted in equity monitoring efforts. Our program seeks to recruit students that will have a blend of professional experiences in addition to the proper academic credentials. Below is a table that summarizes age by program level and by year of admission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2
Program Assessment Plans/Reports
Our program has developed Program Assessment Plans (PAP) based on CACREP standards and the ASCA National Model. The PAPs are used for the University’s Graduate Program Review and are requirements for accreditation efforts, yet more importantly, to glean evidence for programmatic improvement. The PAPs outline student learning outcomes and expectations, assessment methods, results, and actions for improvement. Appendix B is an example of the four-column report PAP that shows evidence of this work and is presented by program and reporting year. The table below summarizes the global outcomes (criterion met or not met) of our program assessment plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average of GRE Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CPCE is used as an exit examination for our Master’s Degree Students. They must pass this examination to graduate from our program. Table 5.3 displays the results for the past three years Fall 2016 to Summer 2019. Nine semesters of data and a total of 88 students are displayed in the table. The percentile ranks we are using come from the national test taker data. Please note that the pass/fail score is based on a Z-score.

Table 5.3
Master’s Comprehensive Exam - CPCE Pass Rating and Percentile Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPCE Pass Rating and Percentile Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the data in Table 5.3 is summative for students, our program uses the data to improve our master’s programs. Our programs run on a cohort model. Therefore, the table reveals a reduction of CPCE test-takers in the fall semesters.
Summary

In summary, the Counselor Education Program faculty endorse the accountability movement that has involved counselor education as well as other professions in the last 20 years. In an attempt to capture the “broader” picture of program evaluation, the Counselor Education Program Faculty at Texas Tech University employed a wide array of data collection methods. As depicted in Figures 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3, these included both internal and external data collection sources. Accordingly, we have used that data to inform our program decisions, which in some instances has included such changes as the addition of a new course, revision to an existing course, and change in the sequencing of courses. Further, the faculty viewed our program assessment more broadly than simply satisfying CACREP requirements. This “broader vision” has allowed us to review and assess our data to improve the quality of student learning, and in turn, improve the quality of our program.
• Section II
  o For returning core faculty (Drs. Bradley, Crews, Hendricks, and marbley (sic)) please provide information regarding engagement with the counseling profession in the last three years in the areas of development/renewal and research and scholarly activity.
  • Information for Drs. Bradley, Crews, Hendricks, and marbley were added by each faculty member and are included below

Loretta Bradley

I. From 2016-2019, Loretta Bradley received the following awards:

2019  ACES Legacy Award
2018  IAMFC R. Smith Leadership Achievement Award
2017  IAMFC Past Presidential Award
2017  ACES Leadership Award
2016  IAMFC Lifetime Achievement Award
2016  J. Lewis Social Justice Award

II. From 2016-2019, Loretta Bradley has served on the following counseling boards:

Texas LPC Board for Professional Counselors
Texas Counseling Association (TCA) Board of Directors
Texas Association for Adult Development and Aging Executive Board
International Association for Marriage and Family Counselors Executive Board
IAMFC Treasurer

III. From 2016-2019, Loretta Bradley had the following publications:


### IV.

From 2016-2019, Loretta Bradley had the following publications (national, international, and state):


- Ethical dilemmas encountered by school counselors and counselors in private practice. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Three Rivers Counseling Association Conference, San Angelo, TX, March 22, 2019.

- LPC licensure issues. Presentation at the Texas Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, Dallas, TX, March 1, 2019.

About sex therapy: Expanding the clinical boundaries of couples counseling. Presentation (co-presenter) at the International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors, New Orleans, LA, January 30, 2019.


Ethical dilemmas: An overview. Presentation (co-presenter) at the College of William and Mary Ethics Symposium, Williamsburg, VA, December 14, 2018.

Ethics across the lifespan. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Texas Counseling Association Growth Conference, Dallas, TX, November 17, 2018.

Using ethical principals in community engaged counseling: A voice for marginalized communities. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Texas Counseling Association Growth Conference, Dallas, TX, November 16, 2018.

Ethics for professional counselors and supervisors: How to navigate ethics in a complex world. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Texas Counseling Association Growth Conference, Dallas, TX, November 15, 2018.

Updates from the Texas State Board of Examiners of Professional Counselors. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Texas Counseling Association Growth Conference, Dallas, TX, November 15, 2018.


International programs in family counseling. Presentation (co-presenter) at the American Counseling Association Conference, Atlanta, GA, April 29, 2018.

Perspectives on the past and present: Projections for the future. Presentation (co-presenter) at the American Counseling Association Conference, Atlanta, GA, April 27, 2018.

Introducing the IAMFC new code of ethics. Presentation (co-presenter) at the American Counseling Association Conference, Atlanta, GA, April 27, 2018.
Issues for Licensed Professional Counselors (LPCs). Presentation (co-presenter) at the Texas Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, Austin, TX, March 2, 2018.

Ethical problems encountered by couple and family counselors. Presentation at the International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors World Conference, New Orleans, LA, February 1, 2018.


Ethical vs. unethical dilemmas: Discussion and decision. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Texas Counseling Association Growth Conference, Galveston, TX, November 17, 2017.

Advocacy leadership, cultural competency, and multicultural ethics. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Texas Counseling Association Growth Conference, Galveston, TX, November 17, 2017.

Ethical decision-making for professional counselors. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Texas Counseling Association Growth Conference, Galveston, TX, November 16, 2017.

Connecting to your LPC board. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Texas Counseling Association Growth Conference, Galveston, TX, November 16, 2017.

A structured counselor education mentor program: Development, recruitment, and implementation. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Conference, Chicago, IL, October 7, 2017.


Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC) Update and Issues. Presentation (co-presenter) at Texas Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, Austin, TX, March 3, 2017.
Ethical concerns for couple and family counselors. Presentation (co-presenter) at International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors World Conference, New Orleans, LA, February 2, 2017.

Counselor supervision: Professional issues. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Texas Counseling Association Growth Conference, Dallas, TX, November 4, 2016.

Couples’ therapy: Challenges and solutions. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Texas Counseling Association Growth Conference, Dallas, TX, November 3, 2016.

Ethical decision making for LPCs, school counselors, and LPC supervisors. Presentation (co-presenter) at the Texas Counseling Association Growth Conference, Dallas, TX, November 3, 2016.


Opportunities and a Vision for Social Justice Counseling. Presentation (co-presenter) at the American Counseling Association Conference, Montreal, Canada, April 2, 2016.

Professional and Client Wills. Presentation (co-presenter) at the American Counseling Association Conference, Montreal, Canada, April 2, 2016.

Legendary Persons in Marriage and Family Counseling. Presentation (co-presenter) at the International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors Conference, New Orleans, LA, March 12, 2016.

Treatment and Ethical Challenges in Couples Counseling. Presentation (co-presenter) at the International Association for Marriage and Family Counselors Conference, New Orleans, LA, March 12, 2016.
Charles Crews

Presentations


Crews, C., Texas Association for Mediation and Dispute Management - Conference, "Our Communications Toys," Texas Association for Mediation and Dispute Management, Lubbock, Texas. (October 18, 2018).


Grant

Lertora, I. (Co-Principal), Cravens, J. (Co-Principal), Phelan-Glasscock, K. (Co-Principal), Moffitt, B. (Principal), Crews, C. (Co-Principal), "Counselor Practicum and Internship Scholarship," Sponsored by Hellen Jones Foundation, Private, $75,000.00. (December 2018 - December 2019).

Crews, C. (Co-Principal), Carter, S. (Co-Principal), "Stakeholder Acceptance of School Gun Violence Interventions," Sponsored by COE Competitive Edge Grant, Texas Tech University, $6,000.00. (September 1, 2018 - August 30, 2019).
Service/Performance Partnerships

Art, Affirmation, and Identity: Supporting LGBTQIA Youth and Family Through Creative Exploration of Personal Development, Clinical Service, Engaged Research and Creative Activity, Other (Specify Below), Research and Creative Activity, Support for community adolescent identity development through art., Texas. (September 1, 2018 - Present).

Be Mindful When Your Mind’s Full, Noncredit Classes and Programs, This program introduces participants to mindfulness techniques for counseling, personal wellness and supervision. In this experiential program, the presenters will lead mindfulness activities that will prepare you to examine yourself, clients and supervisees/interns. A mindfulness based program will be presented to educate your clients and supervisees to increase their attention to internal and external thoughts and experiences, leading to successful self-regulating behaviors., Texas. (November 4, 2016 - November 2016).

Building Counselor Education Alumni Group, Other (Specify Below), Meeting to discuss the development of a TTU Alumni group supporting professional counselors., Texas. (September 19, 2016 - September 2016).

Counselor Education Program Spring 2016 Conference, Experiential or Service Learning, This is a continuing education growth conference for Professional Counselors in the region - school, clinical, private practitioners, New Mexico. (May 6, 2016 - May 2016).

Counselors Exploring Causes, Treatment, and Prevention of Dating Violence, Sexting, and Porn Addiction, Noncredit Classes and Programs, this program transports participants into a discussion about dating violence, inappropriate sexualized texting, pornography addiction, and related concerns. Developmental stages will be explored in the lens of the aforementioned constructs. Counseling techniques will be discussed to address these issues with clients in schools, clinical settings, and in private practice. Discussion on aggression, current research in sexuality, reasons for dating violence, pornography addiction, and how to intervene at the individual, couple, group, and societal level will bring participants into a better understanding of these topics. (November 10, 2016 - November 2016).

CREST bootcamp, Public Programs, Events and Resources, This program introduced Texas school counselors to the counselors reinforcing excellence for students in Texas award program. Which is in evidence â€” based decision-making document highlighting the major achievements of counseling programs in the state of Texas., All. (February 1, 2016 - February 2016).

Ethical and Legal Issues for School Counselors, Noncredit Classes and Programs, A 6 hour inservice training for professional school counselors serviced by the Region 16 educational service center., Texas. (August 11, 2016 - August 2016).
Hacking the Hackers, Noncredit Classes and Programs, This was a lecture given to the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute, Texas. (March 1, 2016 - March 2016).

Misconduct Prevention for TTU Rec Center Staff 2016, Noncredit Classes and Programs, Specific instruction in appropriate interactions with minors during summer TTU Rec Center camps., Texas. (June 1, 2016 - June 2016).

Sexual Misconduct Prevention for TTU Camps, Noncredit Classes and Programs, State training for summer camp staff affiliated with Texas Tech, New Mexico. (March 16, 2016 - March 2016).

Technological evolution and pedagogics in counselor preparation and supervision, Noncredit Classes and Programs, Educational program for the Texas Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, All. (January 29, 2016 - January 2016).

The Prevention of Sexual Misconduct between student teachers and the student whom they serve, Noncredit Classes and Programs, A specific training for student teachers at TTU who will be student teaching in area schools., Texas. (August 15, 2016 - August 2016).

What Do You Mean I’m Stressed? The Inside Scoop of Counselor Educators and Burnout, Noncredit Classes and Programs, This program will discuss the prevalence of burnout among counselor educators. A comparison of pre-existing literature and the results of a survey sent out to counselor educators in 2016 will be discussed. The presenters will identify the latest areas that cause stress, which can negatively impact job satisfaction. The presenters will offer wellness interventions that can be utilized to cope with and combat these feelings of stress and burnout., Texas. (November 3, 2016 - November 2016).

Youth Summer Activity Camp Priorities: Preventing Sexual Misconduct and Promoting positive interactions, Noncredit Classes and Programs, Specific training for activity camps that serve youth and their families, Texas. (June 2, 2016 - June 2016).

**Book, Scholarly-New**


**Journal**

aretha marbley

CACREP Team Member-2010-present

Professional Committees
Association for Black Sexologists and Clinicians (ABSC) Board Member (2014-)
American Counseling Association (ACA) Women’s Interest Network Coordinator /Chair (2006-)
Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD)
    Vice President of African American Concerns (2011-2017)
    Writers Consortium (2013-2018)

Memberships

National
American Counseling Association
    Divisions:
        Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD)
        Counselors for Social Justice Division of ACA
American Educational Research Association (AERA)
    Division: Counseling and Human Development

State
Texas Counseling Association
    Divisions
        Texas Counselors for Social Justice
        Texas Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development

Local
West Texas Chapter of the National Association for Multicultural Education

Presentations:
National:


    Principals in Community Engaged Counseling: A Voice for Marginalized Communities. Presented at Texas Counseling Association in Dallas, TX.


Bret Hendricks

**Book Chapters**


**Journal Articles**


**National Presentations**


Hendricks, C.B. and co-presenters. Ethical issues in family counseling. American Counseling


**Invited Presentations**


Hendricks, C.B. Strategic planning for ACA branches. ACA Leadership Training Institute, Alexandria, VA., July 2016.


Hendricks, C.B. Strategic planning for ACA branches. ACA Leadership Training Institute, Alexandria, VA., July 2016


**Journal Editorial Boards**
Editorial Board, The Family Journal, 2006-present


**Counsel of Accreditation for Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP)**

Trained as Team Leader

Trained as Team Member

**International and National Service**

Executive Committee, American Counseling Association, 2017-2018

Member, Ethics Committee
American Counseling Association
2018-2021

Chair, By-Laws and Ethics Committee
International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors, 2015-2017

Member, Ethics Committee

Task Force Member
American Counseling Association Presidential Task Force for LGBT Developmental Issues, 2016-2017

Chair, American Counseling Association, Branch Development Committee
2016-2017

Member, American Counseling Association Governing Council Nominations and Election Committee
2015-2016

Member
American Counseling Association Governing Council
2015-2018

Committee Member
American Counseling Association Branch Development Committee
Member, 2015-2016
2014-2017
State Service

Chair, Strategic Planning
Texas Counseling Association
2015-2018

Board Member, Texas Association of Mental Health Counselors
2018-2019

Member, Senate
Texas Counseling Association
2019-2021

Professional Service Program Reviewer

National:
Reviewer of Programs, 2018, American Counseling Association Conference
Reviewer of Programs, 2017, American Counseling Association Conference
Reviewer of Programs, 2016, American Counseling Association Conference

Professional Service Program Reviewer

Reviewer of Programs, 2018, Texas Counseling Association Conference
Reviewer of Programs, 2017, Texas Counseling Association Conference
Reviewer of Programs, 2016, Texas Counseling Association Conference
Reviewer of Programs, 2006, Texas Counseling Association Conference

Awards

Outstanding Service Award, Texas Counseling Association, 2017
President’s Award, Texas Counseling Association, 2016

Memberships

American Counseling Association Professional Member
Association of Counselor Education and Supervision Professional Member
Association of Adult Development and Aging Professional Member
Association of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Interests in Counseling Professional Member
Texas Counseling Association
Emeritus Member
Texas Association of Mental Health Counseling Professional Member
Texas Association of Adult Development and Aging Professional Member
### Appendix A

#### Texas Tech University
College of Education/Counselor Education
Counselor-in-Training Counseling Competencies
Phase 3

(CACREP II.G.1.b; II.G.2.d; III, II.G.56; CMHS B.12; D. 124568; E.123; H.123; J.12; J.12; SC A.5; B.12; D.12345; F.1234; H.12345; J.123; J.3; L.123; L.123; N.1245; P.12)

Directions: Lines 1 and 2 of this Feedback are completed by the Counselor-in-Training (student). The remainder of the form will be completed by your University Professor. This form is to be turned in with the audio/video tape and given to your University Professor.

Student’s Name: N/A
Client Name: N/A
Semester: Fall 2018
Tape #: 2

Faculty Evaluation:

Meets Minimum Competency Skill Levels
Does not meet Minimum Competency Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-skill</th>
<th>Beginning 1</th>
<th>Basic 2</th>
<th>Proficient 3</th>
<th>Advanced 4</th>
<th>Exceptional 5</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening of session is conducted appropriately in a friendly manner</td>
<td>The student never exhibits a friendly manner during the opening of the session.</td>
<td>The student almost never exhibits a friendly manner during the opening of the session.</td>
<td>The student sometimes exhibits a friendly manner during the opening of the session.</td>
<td>The student almost always exhibits a friendly manner during the opening of the session.</td>
<td>The student always exhibits a friendly manner during the opening of the session.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening of session is conducted appropriately providing structure for the session</td>
<td>The student never provides structure during the opening of the session.</td>
<td>The student almost never provides structure during the opening of the session.</td>
<td>The student sometimes provides structure during the opening of the session.</td>
<td>The student almost always provides structure during the opening of the session.</td>
<td>The student always provides structure during the opening of the session.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits encouraging behavior to the client</td>
<td>The student never encourages the client to tell his/her own story and direct the session.</td>
<td>The student almost never encourages the client to tell his/her own story and direct the session.</td>
<td>The student sometimes encourages the client to tell his/her own story and direct the session.</td>
<td>The student almost always encourages the client to tell his/her own story and direct the session.</td>
<td>The student always encourages the client to tell his/her own story and direct the session.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-skill</td>
<td>Beginning 1</td>
<td>Basic 2</td>
<td>Proficient 3</td>
<td>Advanced 4</td>
<td>Exceptional 5</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label appropriate timing to respond to the client</td>
<td>The student never uses appropriate timing; always rushes the client; never uses silence</td>
<td>The student almost never uses appropriate timing; almost always rushes the client; almost never uses silence</td>
<td>The student sometimes uses appropriate timing; sometimes rushes the client; sometimes utilizes silence</td>
<td>The student almost always uses appropriate timing; almost never rushes the client; almost always utilizes silence</td>
<td>The student always uses appropriate timing; never rushes the client; always uses silence appropriately</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks open-ended questions</td>
<td>The student never employs open-ended responses to encourage client participation.</td>
<td>The student almost never employs open-ended responses; however almost always uses close-ended responses.</td>
<td>The student sometimes employs open-ended responses to encourage client participation.</td>
<td>The student almost always employs open-ended responses to encourage client participation.</td>
<td>The student always employs open-ended responses to encourage client participation.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately tracks client’s statements</td>
<td>The student never tracks client’s statements accurately.</td>
<td>The student almost never tracks client’s statements accurately.</td>
<td>The student sometimes tracks client’s statements accurately.</td>
<td>The student almost always tracks the client’s statements accurately.</td>
<td>The student always tracks the client’s statements accurately.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately reflects client’s content and affect</td>
<td>The student never responds accurately to client by reflecting the content or affect of the client’s message.</td>
<td>The student almost never responds accurately to client by reflecting the content or affect of the client’s message.</td>
<td>The student sometimes responds accurately to client by reflecting the content or affect of the client’s message.</td>
<td>The student almost always responds accurately to client by reflecting the content or affect of the client’s message.</td>
<td>The student always responds accurately to client by reflecting the content or affect of the client’s message in a way that enhances the counseling relationship and the client’s insight into self.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifies client’s message</td>
<td>The student never allows the client to lead through feedback and clarification of client’s message; always sends his/her own messages.</td>
<td>The student almost never allows the client to lead through feedback and clarification of client’s message; almost always sends his/her own messages.</td>
<td>The student sometimes allows the client to lead through feedback and clarification of client’s message; sometimes sends his/her own messages.</td>
<td>The student almost always allows the client to lead through feedback and clarification of client’s message; almost never sends his/her own messages.</td>
<td>The student always allows the client to lead through feedback and clarification of client’s message; never sends his/her own messages.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses responses to control the direction of the session</td>
<td>The student never uses responses effectively in controlling the direction of the counseling session.</td>
<td>The student almost never uses responses effectively in controlling the direction of the counseling session.</td>
<td>The student sometimes uses responses effectively in controlling the direction of the counseling session; sometimes uses higher level counseling responses.</td>
<td>The student almost always uses responses effectively in controlling the direction of the counseling session; almost always uses higher level counseling responses.</td>
<td>The student always uses responses effectively in controlling the direction of the counseling session; always uses higher level counseling responses.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sub-skill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-skill</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Basic 2</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display empathy, connectiveness, and unbiased treatment</td>
<td>The student never communicates warmly, caring, and positive regard through voice tone and body language.</td>
<td>The student almost never communicates warmly, caring, and positive regard through voice tone and body language.</td>
<td>The student sometimes communicates warmly, caring, and positive regard through voice tone and body language.</td>
<td>The student almost always communicates warmly, caring, and positive regard through voice tone and body language.</td>
<td>The student always communicates warmly, caring, and positive regard to client through voice tone and body language.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing of session is conducted appropriately in a friendly manner</td>
<td>The student never exhibits a friendly manner during the closing of the session.</td>
<td>The student almost never exhibits a friendly manner during the closing of the session.</td>
<td>The student sometimes exhibits a friendly manner during the closing of the session.</td>
<td>The student almost always exhibits a friendly manner during the closing of the session.</td>
<td>The student always exhibits a friendly manner during the closing of the session.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing of session is conducted appropriately providing structure for the session</td>
<td>The student never provides structure during the closing of the session.</td>
<td>The student almost never provides structure during the closing of the session.</td>
<td>The student sometimes provides structure during the closing of the session.</td>
<td>The student almost always provides structure during the closing of the session.</td>
<td>The student always provides structure during the closing of the session.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** A rating below 3 does not meet minimum program standards.

**Comments:** Your tape and corresponding materials were well-organized. Although you did well on several aspects of your tape, there were some aspects that need improvement. As you will hear in class, we discussed each of the sub-items, and you did well. You should be at a 3 or higher in all areas. Send your rating for each area (e.g., rating 2 or 3) to your mentor. Therefore, I would like for you to reevaluate a one-hour appointment with me within 7 days. We can discuss and clarify any areas you need help with. We will discuss and develop a remediation plan.
Appendix B

Assessment: Account Information Four Column

Degree Program - COE - Counselor Education (PHD)

CIP Code: 13.1101.00
Disciplinary Accrediting Body: CACREP & SACSOC
Next Program Review: 19-20
Degree Program Coordinator: Bret Hendricks
Degree Program Coordinator Email: brad.hendricks@ttu.edu
Degree Program Coordinator Phone: 814-1744
Degree Program Coordinator Mall Stop: 1071

Program Purpose Statement: The Ph.D. program in Counselor Education prepares students to develop and implement advocacy and social justice leadership activities that impact the needs of institutions of higher education, communities, schools (P-12), and the counseling profession.

Assessment Coordinator: Larry Rowey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Advocacy leadership skills (Phase 1) | Course Level Assessment: Each of the P1 courses (EPCE 6335 and 6336) are assessed via an A&E rubric. EPCE 6337 is assessed via an End-of-Phase rubric. | Assessment Cycle: 2018 - 2019
Result Types: Criterion Met
A&E: n = 31, mean = 4.75 (SD = 0)
End: n = 27, mean = 4.85 (SD = 0) (09/30/2019) | Actions for Improvement: Research courses are being reviewed to determine if students are acquiring the research skills required to conduct PHD-level research projects. Specific research courses have been added to the course requirements. CACREP Standards and course syllabi continue to be reviewed as required. A survey is in the process of being prepared for each course asking students to rate their understanding of the CACREP Standards presented in each specific course. Faculty will be asked to rate their performance.

Related Documents:
- COE Assessment Overview.docx
- P1 Rubric Ethics 6350.docx
- Phd Scope & Sequence.docx
- Phd Assessment Plan 2.docx
Degree Program - COE - Counselor Education (PHD)

CIP Code: 13.1101.00
Disciplinary Accrediting Body: CACREP & SACSCOC
Next Program Review: 19-20
Degree Program Coordinator: Bret Hendricks
Degree Program Coordinator Email: bret.hendricks@ttu.edu
Degree Program Coordinator Phone: 834-1744
Degree Program Coordinator Mail Stop: 1071

Program Purpose Statement: The Ph.D. program in Counselor Education prepares students to develop and implement advocacy and social justice leadership activities that impact the needs of institutions of higher education, communities, schools (P-12), and the counseling profession.

Assessment Coordinator: Larry Hovey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Advocacy leadership skills (Phase 1) - Students acquire the basic knowledge and skills on which future counseling courses (Phase 1 &2) will build. | **Course Level Assessment** - Each of the P1 courses (EPCE 6335 and 6336 are assessed via an A&E rubric. EPCE 6337 is assessed via an End-of-Phase rubric. | **Assessment Cycle:** 2018 - 2019  
**Result Type:** Criterion Met  
A&E: n = 31, mean = 4.75 (SD = 0)  
EOP: n = 17, mean = 4.75 (SD = 0) (09/30/2019) | **Actions for Improvement:** Research courses are being reviewed to determine if students are acquiring the research skills required to conduct PhD-level research projects. Specific research courses have been added to the course requirements. CACREP Standards and course syllabi continue to be reviewed as required. A survey is in the process of being prepared for each course asking students to rate their understanding of the CACREP Standards presented in each specific course. Faculty will be asked to rate their |
<p>| Outcome Status: Active | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>presentation of CACREP Standards in each course taught. (09/30/2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:</td>
<td>Beginning PhD students have shown some improvement in writing skills due to the added writing course. The changes in the foundation courses have also added to the students' skill sets. CACREP standards have been reviewed and syllabi revised as needed. (09/30/2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions for Improvement:</td>
<td>For students in the Fall 2018 Cohort, EPCE 6350 (Introduction to Scholastic Writing) has been added to increase students' writing ability. Also, the courses listed as foundations have changed. Course syllabi will be revised to show specific CACREP Standards for each course. A survey will be prepared for each course asking students to rate their learning in each course according to the CACREP Standards specific to the course. Faculty will also rate their performance as to presenting the CACREP Standards in each course. The data provided will determine changes needed to better student learning. (10/19/2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Cycle:</td>
<td>2017 - 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result Type:</td>
<td>Criterion Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;E: n=28, mean = 4.50, SD = 0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP: n=11, mean = 4.70, SD = 0.30 (10/17/2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions for Improvement:</td>
<td>The face-to-face interview allowed the faculty to make informed decisions as to how potential students would</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Cycle</th>
<th>Result Type</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 2017</td>
<td>Criterion Met</td>
<td>For the Fall 2017 doctoral cohort, applicants will be required to take part in a face-to-face interview with the faculty. This is expected to help faculty assess the &quot;fit&quot; of potential students to the program. Additionally, it gives the potential students some understanding of the program's TO and advocacy. CACREP Standards will be reviewed and Syllabi revised to show changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 - 2016</td>
<td>Criterion Met</td>
<td>EPCE 6355 (Scholastic Writing and Teaching) was changed to be offered during Spring semester with EPCE 6094 (Counseling Internship II) in order to help students complete the Application Research Project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Action Complete (Prior to 2015-2016) | Criterion Met | Student Action for Improvement A remediation plan is developed for students who do not achieve mastery of the objectives. The plan is individualized and may include one or a combination of the following:  
- Repeat the course(s)  
- Repeat specific components of the course(s) |

### Assessment Methods

**Assessment Cycle: 2016 - 2017**  
**Result Type: Criterion Met**  
A&E: n=24, mean = 4.30, SD = 0.47  
EOP: n=16, mean = 4.75, SD = 0.28 (07/10/2017)

### Results

**Assessment Cycle:** Action Complete (Prior to 2015-2016)  
**Result Type:** Criterion Met  
Results of A&E and End of Phase Assessments  

Means were acquired from scores of individual students enrolled in the P1 courses over the past three semesters with the following results:

- EPCE 6335 – 4.07  
- EPCE 6350 (D&C) – 0

### Actions for Improvement

- Interact with both faculty and within the cohort. CACREP Standards were reviewed and syllabi revised. (10/30/2018)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Level Assessment - The End-of-Phase course for P1 is EPCE 6350 Advanced Ethics. Assessment is by the Ethics Rubric. <strong>Criterion:</strong> A score of 3 or more on a 5 point scale.</td>
<td>End of Phase EPCE 6350 (E) – 0 (6350 (D&amp;C) and 6350 (E) were not taught during this time period.) The overall mean for the P1 courses was 4.07. (06/06/2015)</td>
<td><strong>Assessment Cycle:</strong> 2018 - 2019 <strong>Result Type:</strong> Criterion Met A&amp;E: n=31, mean =4.75 (SD=0) EOP: n=17, mean=4.75 (SD=0) (09/30/2019)</td>
<td>• Enroll in an equivalent course • Meet with the faculty member and successfully complete additional assignments • Meet with all EPCE faculty to discuss the content of a remediation plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Related Documents:**
- PhD TO Scores (Spring 2015).docx
- PC 2014 End of Year Report.docx

**Program Action for Improvement**
- Continue to refine and improve our database.
- The data indicated more information/course content is needed in such areas as crisis counseling, techniques, grief/loss, pharmacology, etc.
- Added an additional course "Dysfunctional Behavior for Children" to our degree plan.
- Identified problematic issues that were evident in student professionalism, such as students' use of technology in the classroom and students not presenting themselves in a professional manner. (06/06/2015)

**Actions for Improvement:**
Research courses are being reviewed to determine if students are acquiring the research skills required to conduct PhD-level research projects. Specific research courses have been added to the course requirements. CACREP Standards and course syllabi continue to be reviewed as required. A survey is in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>process of being prepared for each course asking students to rate their understanding of the CACREP Standards presented in each specific course. Faculty will be asked to rate their presentation of CACREP Standards in each course taught. (09/30/2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:</strong> Beginning PhD students have shown some improvement in writing skills due to the added writing course. The changes in the foundation courses have also added to the students' skill sets. CACREP standards have been reviewed and syllabi revised as needed. (09/30/2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions for Improvement:</strong> For students in the Fall 2018 Cohort, EPCE 6350 (Introduction to Scholastic Writing) has been added to increase students' writing ability. Also, the courses listed as foundations haCourse syllabi will be revised to show specific CACREP Standards for each course. A survey will be prepared for each course asking students to rate their learning in each course according to the CACREP Standards specific to the course. Faculty will also rate their performance as to presenting the CACREP Standards in each course. The data provided will determine changes needed to better student learning.ve been changed to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Cycle:** 2017 - 2018  
**Result Type:** Criterion Met  
A&E: n=28, mean = 4.50, SD = 0.5  
EOP: n=11, mean = 4.70, SD = 0.30 (10/30/2018)
### Impact (Phase 2)

- Create, implement and evaluate the impact of an Advocacy and Social Justice Leadership activity that positively influences institutions of higher education, communities, schools (P-12), and the counseling profession.

Students will implement counseling skills and techniques inside the classroom under the direct supervision of faculty.

**Outcome Status:** Active

### Course Level Assessment

- **Course Level Assessment -** Each of the P2 courses (EPCE 6355, Scholastic Writing and Teaching and 6354, Advanced Group Counseling) are assessed via an A&E Rubric. EPCE 6355 is also assessed via an EOP rubric.

**Criterion:** A score of 3 or higher on a 5 point scale.

**Related Documents:**

- [P2 Rubric Grant Writing.docx](#)

---

### Impact (Phase 2) - Create, implement and evaluate the impact of an Advocacy and Social Justice Leadership activity that positively influences institutions of higher education, communities, schools (P-12), and the counseling profession.

Students will implement counseling skills and techniques inside the classroom under the direct supervision of faculty.

**Outcome Status:** Active

### Course Level Assessment

- **Course Level Assessment -** Each of the P2 courses (EPCE 6355, Scholastic Writing and Teaching and 6354, Advanced Group Counseling) are assessed via an A&E Rubric. EPCE 6355 is also assessed via an EOP rubric.

**Criterion:** A score of 3 or higher on a 5 point scale.

**Related Documents:**

- [P2 Rubric Grant Writing.docx](#)

---

### Impact (Phase 2) - Create, implement and evaluate the impact of an Advocacy and Social Justice Leadership activity that positively influences institutions of higher education, communities, schools (P-12), and the counseling profession.

Students will implement counseling skills and techniques inside the classroom under the direct supervision of faculty.

**Outcome Status:** Active

### Course Level Assessment

- **Course Level Assessment -** Each of the P2 courses (EPCE 6355, Scholastic Writing and Teaching and 6354, Advanced Group Counseling) are assessed via an A&E Rubric. EPCE 6355 is also assessed via an EOP rubric.

**Criterion:** A score of 3 or higher on a 5 point scale.

**Related Documents:**

- [P2 Rubric Grant Writing.docx](#)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Type: Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Assessment Cycle: 2017 - 2018 |
| Result Type: Criterion Met |
| A&E: n=14, mean = 4.50, SD = 0.32 |
| EOP: n=14, mean = 4.25, SD = 0.50 (10/19/2018) |

**Actions for Improvement:**
- Rate their understanding of the CACREP Standards presented in each specific course. Faculty will be asked to rate their presentation of CACREP Standards in each course taught. (09/26/2019)
- **Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:** CACREP standards have been reviewed and syllabi revised as needed. (09/30/2019)

| Assessment Cycle: 2016 - 2017 |
| Result Type: Criterion Met |
| A&E: n=15, mean = 4.50, SD = 0.67 |
| EOP: n=15, mean = 4.33, SD = 0.73 (07/10/2017) |

**Actions for Improvement:**
- Course syllabi will be revised to show specific CACREP Standards for each course. A survey will be prepared for each course asking students to rate their learning in each course according to the CACREP Standards specific to the course. Faculty will also rate their performance as to presenting the CACREP Standards in each course. The data provided will determine changes needed to better student learning. (10/19/2018)
- **Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:** CACREP Standards were reviewed and syllabi revised to show changes. The APEX project was tied to EPCE 6350 Research which helped students learn research protocols and ensured that such protocols were included. (10/30/2018)
### Assessment Methods

#### Results

**Assessment Cycle:** 2015 - 2016  
**Result Type:** Criterion Met  
A&E: n=42, mean 4.50, SD=0.62 (06/01/2016)

**Assessment Cycle:** Action Complete (Prior to 2015-2016)  
**Result Type:** Criterion Met  
Results of A&E and End of Phase Assessments

Means were acquired from scores of individual students enrolled in the P2 courses over the past three semesters with the following results:

- EPCE 6354 – 3.81
- End of Phase
- EPCE 6350 (SW) – 0

(6350 (SW) was not taught during this time period.)

The overall mean for the P2 courses is 3.81. (06/06/2015)

**Assessment Cycle:** 2018 - 2019  
**Result Type:** Criterion Met  
A&E: n = 14; mean = 4.75 (SD = 0)  
EOP: n = 9; mean = 4.75 (SD = 0) (09/30/2019)

**Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:** Make the Trademark Outcome (TO) more distinct on our website. (07/06/2015)

**Actions for Improvement:** Three courses (EPCE 6336, 6337, 6355) were approved and given course numbers by the GAAC Committee. Previously, these courses had been offered as EPCE 6350 (Seminar in Counseling). (06/01/2016)

**Actions for Improvement:** Action for Improvement  
- developed a 10-item rubric on classroom professionalism and citizenship  
- data to inform teaching and learning that CACREP and other accrediting bodies now require  
(06/06/2015)

**Course Level Assessment -** The End-of-Phase course for P2 is EPCE 6350, Scholastic Writing and Teaching is assess by the Grant Writing Rubric.  
**Criterion:** A score of 3 or higher on a 5 point scale for the end of phase assessment.

**Actions for Improvement:** Research courses are being reviewed to determine if students are acquiring the research skills required to conduct PhD-level research projects. Specific research courses have been added to the course requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CACREP Standards and course syllabi continue to be reviewed as required. A survey is in the process of being prepared for each course asking students to rate their understanding of the CACREP Standards presented in each specific course. Faculty will be asked to rate their presentation of CACREP Standards in each course taught.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(09/30/2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement: CACREP standards have been reviewed and syllabi revised as needed. (09/30/2019)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Cycle:** 2017 - 2018  
**Result Type:** Criterion Met  
A&E: n=14, mean = 4.50, SD = 0.32  
EOP: n=14, mean = 4.25, SD = 0.50 (10/30/2018)  

**Actions for Improvement:** Course syllabi will be revised to show specific CACREP Standards for each course. A survey will be prepared for each course asking students to rate their learning in each course according to the CACREP Standards specific to the course. Faculty will also rate their performance as to presenting the CACREP Standards in each course. The data provided will determine changes needed to better student learning. (10/30/2018)  

**Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:** CACREP Standards were reviewed and syllabi revised to show changes. The APEX project was tied to EPCE 6350 Research which helped students learn research protocols and ensured that such protocols were included (10/30/2018)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Assessment Methods</strong></th>
<th><strong>Results</strong></th>
<th><strong>Actions for Improvement</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Cycle:</strong> 2016 - 2017</td>
<td><strong>Result Type:</strong> Criterion Met</td>
<td><strong>EOP:</strong> $n=15$, mean = 4.33, SD 0.73 (07/10/2017)</td>
<td><strong>Actions for Improvement:</strong> CACREP Standards will be reviewed and Syllabi revised to show changes. The APEX project will be primarily tied to EPCE 6350 Research as this will help students learn research protocols and ensure that such protocols are included. (09/27/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Cycle:</strong> 2016 - 2017</td>
<td><strong>Result Type:</strong> Criterion Met</td>
<td><strong>EOP:</strong> $n=15$, mean = 4.33, SD 0.73 (07/10/2017)</td>
<td><strong>Actions for Improvement:</strong> Rubrics were reviewed and revised. (06/01/2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Cycle:</strong> 2015 - 2016</td>
<td><strong>Result Type:</strong> Criterion Met</td>
<td><strong>End of Phase:</strong> $n=20$, mean = 4.42, SD=1.21 (06/01/2016)</td>
<td><strong>Actions for Improvement:</strong> Research courses are being reviewed to determine if students are acquiring the research skills required to conduct PhD-level research projects. Specific research courses have been added to the course requirements. CACREP Standards and course syllabi continue to be reviewed as required. A survey is in the process of being prepared for each course asking students to rate their understanding of the CACREP Standards presented in each specific course. Faculty will be asked to rate their</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Needs assessment (Phase 3)** - Conducts needs assessments (e.g., focus groups) with the target population (including client/student/agency/government/institution) to identify external barriers that impair their quality of life.

**Outcome Status:** Active

**Outcome Type:** Student Learning

**Course Level Assessment** - Each of the P3 courses (EPCE 6360, Advanced Practicum, 6366, Advanced Supervision, and 6094, Advanced Internships) are assessed with A&E Rubrics. EPCE 6094 (Advanced Internship 2) is assessed with an EOP rubric.

**Criterion:** A score of 3 or higher on the A&E rubric.

**Related Documents:**
- P3 Needs Assessment Rubric.docx
- P3 Rubric Leadership Skills.docx
- CACREP Report Excerpts.docx

**Assessment Cycle:** 2018 - 2019

**Result Type:** Criterion Met

**A&E:** $n = 34$; mean = 4.75 (SD = 0)

**EOP:** $n = 8$; mean = 4.75 (SD = 0) (09/30/2019)

**Actions for Improvement:** Research courses are being reviewed to determine if students are acquiring the research skills required to conduct PhD-level research projects. Specific research courses have been added to the course requirements. CACREP Standards and course syllabi continue to be reviewed as required. A survey is in the process of being prepared for each course asking students to rate their understanding of the CACREP Standards presented in each specific course. Faculty will be asked to rate their
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>presentation of CACREP Standards in each course taught. (09/30/2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:</strong> CACREP standards have been reviewed and syllabi revised as needed. (09/30/2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Assessment Cycle:** 2017 - 2018 | **Result Type:** Criterion Met | A&E: n=35, mean = 4.25, SD = 0.49  
EOP: n=11, mean = 4.75, SD = 0.20 (10/19/2018) | **Actions for Improvement:** Course syllabi will be revised to show specific CACREP Standards for each course. A survey will be prepared for each course asking students to rate their learning in each course according to the CACREP Standards specific to the course. Faculty will also rate their performance as to presenting the CACREP Standards in each course. The data provided will determine changes needed to better student learning. (10/19/2018) |
<p>| <strong>Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:</strong> CACREP Standards were reviewed and Syllabi revised to show changes. Students in EPCE 6094 (Doctoral Internship) taught comprehensive examination preparation to the master's students in EPCE 5094 (Master's Internship) which helped the master's students study for the examination. The qualifying examination format change has allowed students to present relevant counseling experience in presentations, publications, and teaching experience; it also allowed discussion of dissertation topics and research required. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Cycle:</strong> 2016 - 2017&lt;br&gt;<strong>Result Type:</strong> Criterion Met&lt;br&gt;A&amp;E: n=49, mean = 4.44, SD = 0.43&lt;br&gt;EOP: n=15, mean = 4.64, SD = 0.58 (07/10/2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions for Improvement:</strong>&lt;br&gt;CACREP Standards will be reviewed and Syllabi revised to show changes.&lt;br&gt;Students in EPCE 6094 (Doctoral Internship) are teaching comprehensive examination preparation to the master's students in EPCE 5094 (Master's Internship). Qualifying Examination format has been changed to a presentation format covering areas including: conference presentations, journal articles authored or co-authored, dissertation topic and research, and service. (09/27/2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Cycle:</strong> 2015 - 2016&lt;br&gt;<strong>Result Type:</strong> Criterion Met&lt;br&gt;A&amp;E: n=42, mean=4.13, SD=0.66 (06/01/2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions for Improvement:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Application Research Project will be introduced in EPCE 6360 (Advanced Practicum). This change will allow the Project to begin one semester earlier than in 2015-2016. Mandatory Orientation for all new PhD students entering the program. (06/01/2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Assessment Cycle:** Action Complete (Prior to 2015-2016)<br>**Result Type:** Criterion Met<br>Results of A&E and End of Phase Assessments<br>Means were acquired from scores of individual students enrolled in the P3 courses over the past three semesters with the following results:<br>EPCE 6360 – 0<br>EPCE 6366 – 0 | | | **Actions for Improvement:**<br>Program Actions for Improvement<br>• Expand and advertise our Trademark Outcomes (TOs) to site supervisors, advisory board members, and prospective employers so all understand the distinctive nature of our graduates.<br>• Review and discuss
**Student Learning Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPCE 6094 – 4.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>feedback from data and surveys making changes as appropriate. (06/06/2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPCE 6094 – 4.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6360 and 6366 were not taught during this time period.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall mean for the P3 courses was 4.59.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means are determined for each standard covered in each course. An example of one semester of CACREP Standards can be found here. (LINK) (06/06/2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Related Documents:**
CACREP Standards Fall 2014 - Summer 2015.xlsx

---

**Course Level Assessment** - The End-of-Phase course for P3 is EPCE 6394, Advanced Internship 2, and is assessed with the Advocacy Leadership Skills Evaluation and the Evaluation of Needs Assessment and Service Implementation Rubrics.

**Criterion:** A score of 3 or more on a 5 point scale.

**Assessment Cycle:** 2018 - 2019
**Result Type:** Criterion Met
**A&E: n = 34; mean = 4.75 (SD = 0)**
**EOP: n = 8; mean = 4.75 (SD = 0)** (09/30/2019)

**Actions for Improvement:**
Research courses are being reviewed to determine if students are acquiring the research skills required to conduct PhD-level research projects. Specific research courses have been added to the course requirements. CACREP Standards and course syllabi continue to be reviewed as required. A survey is in the process of being prepared for each course asking students to rate their understanding of the CACREP Standards presented in each specific course. Faculty will be asked to rate their presentation of CACREP Standards in each course taught. (09/30/2019)

**Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:** CACREP standards have been reviewed and syllabi revised as needed. (09/30/2019)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Cycle:** 2017 - 2018  
**Result Type:** Criterion Met  
Course syllabi will be revised to show specific CACREP Standards for each course. A survey will be prepared for each course asking students to rate their learning in each course according to the CACREP Standards specific to the course. Faculty will also rate their performance as to presenting the CACREP Standards in each course. The data provided will determine changes needed to better student learning. (10/30/2018)

**Assessment Cycle:** 2016 - 2017  
**Result Type:** Criterion Met  
EOP: n=15, mean = 4.64, SD = 0.58 (07/10/2017)

**Assessment Cycle:** 2015 - 2016  
**Result Type:** Inconclusive  
Results are forthcoming. (06/01/2016)

**Transformation Initiative** - The College of Education is currently undergoing a college-wide transformation.  
**Outcome Status:** Inactive  
**Outcome Type:** Program

**Directly related to Objective**

**Assessment Cycle:** Action In Progress (Prior to 2015-2016)  
**Result Type:** Inconclusive  
Program assessment results are pending due to major overhaul of all college assessment activities beginning FY 2012. Initial reforms focused on developing higher order trademark outcomes (program purposes), student learning outcomes, assessments, and criteria for success. Results will become available as students move into each phase of the program. (11/13/2013)

**Related Documents:**  
2012-2013 SLO Narrative.docx

**Actions for Improvement:**  
The program was organized into three Phases. Phase One (P1) emphasizing the foundation knowledge and skills required in the discipline. Phase Two (P2) incorporating the knowledge and skills from P1 and assimilating them into practice in guided and hypothetical settings, such as case studies. Phase Three (P3) integrating the knowledge and skills from Phase 1 with the simulated application from Phase 2, and employing them in authentic real world settings. (11/04/2013)

**Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:** P1 through P3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directly related to Objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apply and evaluate activities and end of phase assessments were added to all reform syllabi and piloted to determine efficacy. (12/02/2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transition Assessments** - Beginning in 2011 the college and program engaged in major curricular and assessment reforms. During that time many results under the reformed processes were not available. However, faculty continued to monitor results from earlier student learning outcomes (SLO), focusing on qualifying exams, dissertations, and student scholarly activity.

**Outcome Status:** Inactive  
**Outcome Type:** Student Learning  
**Start Date:** 05/12/2010  
**End Date:** 04/06/2015

**Qualifying Exam** - Qualifying Exam pass rate.  
**Criterion:** 90% of students will pass the exam

**Assessment Cycle:** Action Complete (Prior to 2015-2016)  
**Result Type:** Criterion Met  
(03/10/2015)

**Actions for Improvement:**  
Continue to monitor and discuss these data, but focus on the reform initiatives. (04/01/2015)  
**Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:** Reform initiatives are advanced: e.g., developing trademark outcomes, organizing curriculum into three phases, and developing associated assessments. (05/07/2015)

**Dissertation** - Count completed dissertations.  
**Criterion:** 80% of students will successfully complete and defend a dissertation

**Assessment Cycle:** Action Complete (Prior to 2015-2016)  
**Result Type:** Criterion Met  
(02/05/2015)

**Actions for Improvement:**  
Continue to monitor and discuss these data, but focus on the reform initiatives. (03/10/2015)  
**Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:** Reform initiatives are advanced: e.g., developing trademark outcomes, organizing curriculum into three phases, and developing associated assessments. (04/08/2015)

**Student Projects** - Students will present a program or poster session at a state, regional, or national conference.  
**Criterion:** 75% of the students will present a program or poster session at a state, regional, or national conference either during or within two years of completing the program

**Assessment Cycle:** Action Complete (Prior to 2015-2016)  
**Result Type:** Criterion Met  

**Actions for Improvement:**  
Continue to monitor and discuss these data, but focus on the reform initiatives. (03/11/2015)  
**Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:** Reform initiatives are advanced: e.g., developing trademark outcomes, organizing curriculum into three phases, and developing associated assessments. (04/08/2015)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Assessment Cycle: Action In Progress (Prior to 2015-2016)</th>
<th>Result Type: Inconclusive</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement: Faculty worked to develop a trademark outcome: A distinctive product and skill set separating graduates in that program from individuals in similar fields—thus providing a differential advantage for COE graduates. Future employers were surveyed, professional literature and standards were reviewed, and intense discussions occurred.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will develop the knowledge base and cognitive understanding needed to acquire advanced counseling skills, including but not limited to skills in counseling theory, counseling practice, and sound ethical behaviors. Students will be able to integrate knowledge and develop an Advocacy and Social Justice Leadership Plan that impacts the needs of institutions of higher education, communities, Pre-kindergarten-12th grade (P-12) schools, and the counseling profession.</td>
<td>Program assessment results are pending due to major overall of all college assessment activities beginning FY 2012. Initial reforms focused on developing higher order trademark outcomes (program purposes), student learning outcomes, assessments, and criteria for success. Results will become available as students move into each phase of the program.</td>
<td>(11/20/2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome Status:** Inactive

**Outcome Type:** Student Learning

**Performance** - Satisfactory completion multiple choice exams and/or presentation of papers/projects to be given in the courses of Advanced Theories, Advanced Ethics, and Advanced Diversity and Consultation.

**Related Documents:**
- PC 2014 End of Year Report.docx

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Assessment Cycle: Action In Progress (Prior to 2015-2016)</th>
<th>Result Type: Inconclusive</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement: Program faculty members have followed a rigorous schedule to further program reforms, culminating in a presentation to the Dean’s Executive Council. Feedback was received and incorporating into the reform process. Such presentations are available for review as a “Related Document.” (An end of year presentation document is attached for review.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will apply the knowledge and skills previously developed and begin to integrate and apply reasoning principles associated with leadership within the advocacy and school justice arena. Students will be able to integrate advanced counseling theory, advocacy techniques, and social justice principles into basic leadership principles.</td>
<td>Program assessment results are pending due to major overall of all college assessment activities beginning FY 2012. Initial reforms focused on developing higher order trademark outcomes (program purposes), student learning outcomes, assessments, and criteria for success. Results will become available as students move into each phase of the program.</td>
<td>(11/20/2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome Status:** Inactive

**Outcome Type:** Student Learning

Assessment of student learning will occur through role-playing, case conceptualization, and class presentations using case studies.

**Related Documents:**
- PhD-Assessment Plan.docx
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student Learning Outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Assessment Methods</strong></th>
<th><strong>Results</strong></th>
<th><strong>Actions for Improvement</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 - Students will apply the advanced knowledge, skills, and reasoning previously developed to create and implement the Advocacy and Social Justice Leadership Plan. Students will be able to design and implement the Advocacy and Social Justice Leadership Plan that impacts the needs of institutions of higher education, communities, schools, and the counseling profession. <strong>Outcome Status:</strong> Inactive <strong>Outcome Type:</strong> Student Learning</td>
<td>Assessment will occur through a needs assessment evaluation; an advocacy leadership skills evaluation; a grant writing skills evaluation; a counselor-in-training feedback form; a student internship evaluation form; and qualifying examinations.</td>
<td><strong>Assessment Cycle:</strong> Action In Progress (Prior to 2015-2016) <strong>Result Type:</strong> Inconclusive Program assessment results are pending due to major overall of all college assessment activities beginning FY 2012. Initial reforms focused on developing higher order trademark outcomes (program purposes), student learning outcomes, assessments, and criteria for success. Results will become available as students move into each phase of the program. (11/20/2012)</td>
<td>(11/23/2012) <strong>Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:</strong> All phase 2 courses were reviewed and apply and evaluate activities were added. (02/13/2013) <strong>Actions for Improvement:</strong> The program was organized into three Phases. Phase One (P1) emphasizing the foundational knowledge and skills required in the discipline. Phase Two (P2) incorporating the knowledge and skills from P1 and assimilating them into practice in guided and hypothetical settings, such as case studies. Phase Three (P3) integrating the knowledge and skills from Phase 1 with the simulated application from Phase 2, and employing them in authentic real world settings. (03/19/2013) <strong>Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:</strong> All phase 3 courses were revised to include A&amp;E activities and end of phase assessments for Phases 1 through 3 were established. (05/09/2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of counseling - To demonstrate knowledge of counseling theory; counseling interventions, processes, dynamics, and applications; group counseling; supervision theory and practice; multicultural counseling; pedagogy; diversity, social justice and</td>
<td>Qualifying Exam - PhD Qualifying Exam <strong>Criterion:</strong> 90% of students will pass this exam</td>
<td><strong>Assessment Cycle:</strong> Action In Progress (Prior to 2015-2016) <strong>Result Type:</strong> Criterion Met Qualifying Exam Pass rate: 100% (2006=2, 2007=1, 2008=1, 2009=3, 2010=6, 2011=4, 2012=3, 2013=7, 2014=15, 2015=4) (06/02/2009)</td>
<td><strong>Actions for Improvement:</strong> The program was organized into three Phases. Phase One (P1) emphasizing the foundational knowledge and skills required in the discipline. Phase Two (P2) incorporating the knowledge and skills from P1 and assimilating them into practice in guided and hypothetical settings, such as case studies. Phase Three (P3) integrating the knowledge and skills from Phase 1 with the simulated application from Phase 2, and employing them in authentic real world settings. (03/19/2013) <strong>Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement:</strong> All phase 3 courses were revised to include A&amp;E activities and end of phase assessments for Phases 1 through 3 were established. (05/09/2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion:</strong> 90% of students will pass this exam</td>
<td>Qualification Exam - Dissertation <strong>Criterion:</strong> 80% of students will pass this exam</td>
<td><strong>Assessment Cycle:</strong> Action In Progress (Prior to 2015-2016) <strong>Result Type:</strong> Criterion Met</td>
<td><strong>Actions for Improvement:</strong> Continue to monitor (08/18/2010) <strong>Actions for Improvement:</strong> Continue to monitor (08/20/2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>advocacy; major roles of counselor educators, and research methodology;</td>
<td>successfully complete and defend a dissertation</td>
<td>Dissertations completed and graduated: 2006=2, 2007=1, 2008=1, 2009=1, 2010=4, 2011=3, 2012=2, 2013=7, 2014=3, 2015=2 (06/02/2009)</td>
<td>continued to be collected and discussed, beginning in 2011 faculty began to focus on activities and assessments associated with the reform agenda of the college. These include developing a trademark outcome, organizing the curriculum into three phases with associated end-of-phase assessment, developing a scope and sequence, and developing several assessment rubrics. (07/24/2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Status: Inactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-Up: Evidence of Improvement: Between 2011 and 2015 major curricular and assessment advancements occurred as described in various documents related (linked) into this program assessment plan. Some of which include: PC End of Year Report, PHD Scope &amp; Sequence, PHD Assessment Plan 2, P2 Rubric Grant Writing, P3 Needs Assessment Rubric, and CACREP Report Excerpts. (07/24/2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Type: Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actions for Improvement: Continue to monitor (08/18/2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Date: 07/01/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actions for Improvement: Continue to monitor (08/20/2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conduct and Summarize research -**
To demonstrate an understanding of and the ability to conduct and summarize research; and to demonstrate writing skills at the level needed to publish in journals and books and to successfully defend a dissertation.

**Dissertation -** Dissertation Criterion: One or two students will successfully defend a PhD dissertation annually; 80% of students will successfully complete and defend a dissertation.

**Assessment Cycle: Action In Progress (Prior to 2015-2016)**

**Result Type: Criterion Met**

**Actions for Improvement:**
Continue to monitor (08/18/2010)

**Actions for Improvement:**
Continue to monitor (08/20/2009)

**Professional Development Activities**

**Assessment Cycle: Action In Progress (Prior to 2015-2016)**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Actions for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development Activities</strong></td>
<td>- Students will present a program or poster session at a state, regional, or national conference. <strong>Criterion:</strong> 75% of the students will present a program or poster session at a state, regional, or national conference either during or within two years of completing the program.</td>
<td>- Student Publications: 2007=2, 2008=5, 2009=1, 2010=1; Student Presentations: 2006=3, 2007=7, 2008=33, 2009=16, 2010=9, 2011=3, 2012=5, 2013=4, 2014=10. (06/02/2009)</td>
<td>Actions for Improvement: Continue to monitor (08/18/2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students will join at least one professional association. <strong>Criterion:</strong> 90% of the PhD students will join at least one professional association.</td>
<td>- Student membership in ACA, 100% (n=9) (06/02/2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Actions for Improvement: Continue to monitor (08/20/2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey - Alumni</strong></td>
<td>- Alumni survey of graduates. <strong>Criterion:</strong> 90% or more of our graduates will find employment that reflects the level of their training.</td>
<td>- Cohort #1: 100% (n=12); Cohort #2: 78% (n=9); Cohort #3: 43% (n=7). Note: Cohort #2 has not completed dissertation and Cohort #3 has not completed coursework at this time. (08/18/2010)</td>
<td>Actions for Improvement: Continue to monitor (08/18/2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey - Student</strong></td>
<td>- Counselor Education Survey. <strong>Criterion:</strong> Current students and graduates of the EPCE Doctoral Program will rate their Counselor Education Program on the Survey at a mean level of 7 or higher on a 10-point scale.</td>
<td>- General aspects: 9.38 (n=9); Knowledge-base: 8.95 (n=9); Skill-base: 8.94 (n=9) (06/02/2009)</td>
<td>Actions for Improvement: Continue to monitor (08/20/2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Outcome Status:** Inactive
- **Start Date:** 07/01/2006
- **Outcome Type:** Student Learning

**Develop professional identity - To develop a professional identity through involvement in professional associations including attendance at conferences and making presentations at conferences. To become an active member of professional counseling associations (e.g., ACA, ACA divisions, TCA, and WTCA).**

**Outcome Status:** Inactive

**Obtain employment - To obtain employment in an academic, educational, agency, private practice, or other professional settings related to counseling.**

**Outcome Status:** Inactive

**Satisfaction - To demonstrate pride and satisfaction in the program that provided training for the doctorate degree.**

**Outcome Status:** Inactive
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point Likert Scale where 1 is low/poor and 10 is high/very good.

**Awareness of educational value** - To perceive that counseling classes offered relevant and effective preparation for a doctorate in counseling

**Outcome Status**: Inactive

**Outcome Type**: Student Learning

**Start Date**: 07/01/2006