

Sam Houston State University
College of Education
Department of Counselor Education
Annual Assessment Evaluation 2016 – 2017



Letter from Department Chair

I am pleased to present the Sam Houston State University, Department of Counselor Education, 2016-2017 Annual Report. As I review the content of this report, I am filled with pride at the accomplishments of the students and faculty in the Department of Counselor Education. This report highlights the numerous educational efforts of a very successful year for our department. While we are not without areas for improvement and growth, we have been successful this year in implementing a quality CACREP standards driven program aimed at training highly knowledgeable, skilled professional counselors to enter the work force as master's level clinical mental health counselors, school counselors, and doctoral level counselor educators and supervisors.

I would like to highlight a few of the many efforts and accomplishments of our program during the 2016-2017 academic year:

- We continued to improve our applicant screening procedure to assess applicants' qualifications for all programs as well as their fit for the counseling profession.
- The agenda for our monthly faculty department meetings includes as standing items a review of student issues related to learning outcomes and dispositions, CACREP updates and check-in, as well as programmatic concerns and areas for review.
- Our advisory board plays a very important role in creating a productive partnership between academic preparation and community needs for our students.
- The counseling program is a data driven program in that we routinely modify students' learning experiences and activities based on feedback from site supervisor evaluations, results from CPCE, NCE and TExES (School Counseling Certification Examination), as well as results from surveying our graduates.
- We had a 100% pass rate for our school counseling students taking the TExES.
- We conducted a thorough review of department core syllabi to make sure all are consistent in how they meet CACREP core and specialty standards.
- We continued our work on the CACREP self-study for the Marriage, Couples, Family Counseling track.
- On-going improvement efforts to meet CACREP standards and improve our program as we have continued to improve our comprehensive assessment plan.

The faculty in the Department of Counselor Education take great pride in offering a quality CACREP program to students who are seeking a career in the counseling field. We are making a difference for our communities and schools by graduating well prepared entry level counselors. I am pleased to submit this annual report as evidence of our quality program.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Rice, Chair
Department of Counselor Education

2016-2017 Faculty, Staff and Student Assistants

Faculty

Full-Time (Tenure Track)

Dr. Kathleen Rice (Department chair 2018-Present)

Dr. Mary Nichter, Department Chair (2016-2018)

Dr. Rick Bruhn

Dr. Yvonne Garza-Chaves

Dr. Richard Henriksen Jr.

Dr. David Lawson, II

Dr. Chi-Sing Li

Dr. Levi McLendon

Dr. Rebecca Robles-Pina

Dr. Sheryl Serres

Dr. Jeffrey Sullivan

Dr. Richard Watts

Staff

Ms. Dee Dee Dirk, Department Administrative Assistant

Ms. Magen Jordan

Student Assistants

Brianna Hickman

Sydney Paul

Stephanie Presa

Overview Program Evaluation

The Program Evaluation and Assessment Process is overseen by the Department of Counselor Education's CACREP Liaison and the Program Assessment Coordinator. All department faculty and staff are participants in the evaluation process. The Evaluation Plan is systematic and ongoing from year to year. Multiple methods of assessment are used throughout the academic year. Annual assessments include evaluations of current students' academic, professional, and personal development, level of learning based on students' accomplishment of student learning outcomes, development in professional identity, including research and advocacy, ethical and legal issues, and advanced counseling skills. All faculty members evaluate the programs, curriculum, coursework, admissions process, and current student functioning. Site supervisors evaluate current internship students and overall program outcomes. Graduates are evaluated by assessing alumni knowledge of student learning outcomes and employer evaluations.

Stakeholders that include faculty, staff, students, alumni, employers, and field supervisors are all involved in the evaluation and assessment process. The overall process consists in the following;

Master's Programs Systematic Developmental Assessment of Individual Students

1. **Screening of Applicants** involves initial paper review of academic, personal, and professional qualifications. Most qualified applicants are interviewed face-to-face and are evaluated for suitability to program.
2. **Initial Advising** involves student and advisor reviewing expectations and completing a Temporary Plan of Study based on the student's emphasis of School Counseling, Clinical Mental Health Counseling or Marriage, Couple, and Family Counseling.
3. **Student Potential Scales** are used to evaluate the overall academic performance, professional, and personal development of each student and is completed by the instructor at completion of each class throughout the student's tenure in the master's and doctoral programs. The forms are kept electronically by the department. The Student Potential Scale is one of the assessment tools used to help make decisions about students' admission to candidacy for the master's degree in counseling.
4. **Review and Retention** of students occurs monthly at program faculty meetings where students with academic, personal, or professional concerns are discussed and action plans are devised. Summer reviews are conducted on an as needed basis.
5. **Student Learning Outcomes** are assessed and reviewed continuously throughout the year with the focus being on evaluations of student outcomes in each course.

Evaluation of Program Mission, Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 5 SLOs | X | | | | X | | | | | X | | |
| 6 Faculty Review | | | | | | | | X | X | | | |
| 7 Advisory Review | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| 8 Graduate Survey | X | | | | X | | | | | X | | |
| 9 Supervisor Evaluation | X | | | | X | | | | | X | | |
| 10 Employer Survey | | | | | X | | | | | X | | |

Doctoral Program Systematic Developmental Assessment of Individual Students

1. A review by program faculty of programs, curricular offering, and characteristics of program applicants.
2. Formal follow-up studies of program graduates to assess graduate perceptions and evaluations of major aspects of the program.
3. Formal studies of site supervisors and program graduate employers that assess their perceptions and evaluations of major aspects of the program.
4. Assessment of student learning and performance on professional identity, professional practice, and program area standards.
5. Evidence of the use of findings to inform program modifications.
6. Distribution of an official report that documents outcomes of the systematic program evaluation, with descriptions of any program modifications, to students currently in the program, program faculty, institutional administrators, personnel in cooperating agencies (e.g., employers, site supervisors), and the public.

Table 2. Ph.D. Program Assessments, Evaluations and Transition Points

| | Aug | Sept | | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | March | April | May | June | July |
|---------------------------|-----|------|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-----|------|------|
| 1 Screening Applicants | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| 2 Initial Advising | X | | | | | | X | | | | X | | |
| 3 Student Potential Scale | X | | | | | X | | | | | X | | |
| 4 Review & Retention | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| 5 SLOs | X | | | | | X | | | | | X | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 6 Faculty Review | | | | | | | | | X | X | | | |
| 7 Advisory Review | | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| 8 Graduate Survey | X | | | | | X | | | | | X | | |
| 9 Supervisor Evaluation | X | | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| 10 Employer Survey | | | | | | X | | | | | X | | |

Table 3 presents the timeline used to complete the assessment procedures and the individuals who are responsible for completing each procedure.

Table 3. Evaluation Timeline and Responsible Party for All Programs

| Process Evaluation | | |
|--|--|---------------|
| Assessment Measure | Responsible Party | Schedule |
| # Students Enrolled | CACREP Liaison | Each Semester |
| Student Demographics | CACREP Liaison | Each Semester |
| Student Course Evaluations | Faculty | Each Semester |
| Student Supervisor Evaluations | Faculty | Each Semester |
| # Staff; # Faculty; # Adjuncts | CACREP Liaison | Each Semester |
| Internal and External Funding Sources | Department Chair | Each Semester |
| Review of Mission, Goals, and Objectives | Faculty | Annual |
| Review of Curriculum Matrix | Faculty | Annual |
| Review of Syllabi | Faculty | Annual |
| Review of Assessment Process | CACREP Liaison, Assessment Coordinator | Annual |
| Outcome Evaluation | | |
| Assessment Measure | Responsible Party | Schedule |
| CPCE pass rate | Comprehensive Exam Coordinator | Each semester |
| NCE pass rate | NBCC Coordinator | Fall & Spring |
| Student Learning Outcomes | Faculty | Each Semester |
| Supervisor Evaluations | Faculty | Each Semester |
| GPA | Faculty | Each Semester |
| # Admission to Candidacy | Program Coordinator | Each Semester |
| Employment Rates | Program Coordinator | Each Semester |
| Exit Survey | Department Chair | Each Semester |
| Alumni Survey | Department Chair | Annual |
| Supervisor Survey | Faculty | Each Semester |
| Employer Survey | Faculty | Each Semester |
| Program Development Review | Faculty | Annual |

| | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| Doctoral Comps | Doctoral Program Coordinator | Annual |
| Dissertation | Doctoral Program Coordinator | Each Semester |

Evaluation of Program Inputs

Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, Staff

During the 2016-2017 academic year the department employed 11 full-time faculty. Faculty workload consists of teaching (4 fall-4 spring-4 summer, teaching loads), research (faculty receive a one teach course reduction in each fall and spring semester so they can conduct research activities) service, and administrative activities with 40% of time devoted to teaching, 40% of time devoted to research, and 20% service. The department also employs from 10 to 20 part-time faculty who teach core, elective, and clinical courses on an as needed basis under the supervision of the full-time faculty. The number of adjunct faculty who taught courses during the past years was maintained at 48% of total courses taught or below in compliance with our accreditation standard of below 50%. For the Doctoral program, Counselor Education faculty taught all of the Counselor Education and Supervision core courses. No part-time faculty are employed to teach at the doctoral level. All but one of the doctoral faculty are categorized as core faculty. The Department of Counselor Education has one Assistant to the Chair, one administrative associate 1, and one full-time administrative assistant 1 and one part-time administrative assistant for the two counseling clinics.

Site Supervisors and Advisory Board

Internship site supervisors continue to play an invaluable role in the education and development of our students. Site supervisors provide ratings on skill-based SLOs during each internship semester of the MA and MED programs as well as completing a survey assessing the effectiveness of the overall MA and MED program objectives. Finally, doctoral students' site supervisors also provide ratings on skill-based SLOs during each scheduled internship semester of the doctoral program as well as completing a survey assessing the effectiveness of the overall doctoral program objectives.

Site Supervisors Program Evaluations

CMHC Counseling

In the section below you will find the results of the site supervisors evaluations of the master's degree programs. Information on all questions asked is provided.

Data for Supervisor Evaluation of COUN 6386

Clinical Mental Health Counseling (CMHC)

Using a Likert Scale data collection format, the tables below represent supervisor ratings of the following statements regarding their experiences with and evaluation of the performance of Sam Houston State University (SHSU) master's level counseling.

1. SHSU prepares counseling students to follow ethical counseling practices.
2. SHSU prepares counseling students to provide counseling services appropriate to the needs of the clients served at the agency (i.e. Clinical Mental Health, School).
3. SHSU prepares counseling students to carry out the daily functions of a professional counselor in an agency or school setting.
4. SHSU prepares counseling students to meet the counseling needs of clients from diverse backgrounds
5. SHSU prepares counseling students to complete notes and records in accordance with the guidelines/procedures of the agency or school.

Additionally, a second table is provided, for each semester, which represents the number and types of comments offered by supervisors regarding either student intern performance, or recommendations for the SHSU counseling program. Supervisors were asked to offer the following information:

“Please provide feedback as to how SHSU might improve the preparation of counseling students to meet the changing needs of clients and the changing demands of the agency or school.”

Survey Results per Semester

Summer 2016

| | 5 Strongly Agree | 4 Agree | 3 Undecided | 2 Disagree | 1 Strongly Disagree | |
|------------|------------------------|------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------|
| Question # | | | | | | Avg. Score |
| 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.71 |
| 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.57 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.57 |
| 4 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.42 |
| 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4.28 |
| Comments | Positive | | Growth Promoting | | None | |
| | 0 | | 1 | | 6 | |

POSITIVE:

None

SUGGESTIONS FOR GROWTH:

1. Interns seem to struggle greatly with goal setting and case notes.

Fall 2016

| | 5 Strongly Agree | 4 Agree | 3 Undecided | 2 Disagree | 1 Strongly Disagree | |
|------------|------------------------|------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------|
| Question # | | | | | | Avg. Score |
| 1 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.89 |
| 2 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.83 |
| 3 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.83 |
| 4 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.89 |
| 5 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.67 |
| Comments | Positive | | Growth Promoting | | None | |
| | 3 | | 2 | | 13 | |

POSITIVE:

1. SHSU is doing a wonderful job! We look forward to continuing to work with your students.
2. We are always pleased with SHSU students they are well-prepared for the work that we do here.
3. We have enjoyed working with our students from SHSU and find them prepared to the work assigned.

SUGGESTIONS FOR GROWTH:

1. Stress the importance of informed consent prior to each session.
2. More focus on documentation, treatment, and planning.

Spring 2017

| | 5 Strongly Agree | 4 Agree | 3 Undecided | 2 Disagree | 1 Strongly Disagree | |
|------------|------------------------|------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------|
| Question # | | | | | | Avg. Score |
| 1 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.94 |
| 2 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.65 |
| 3 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.71 |
| 4 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.56 |
| 5 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4.59 |
| Comments | Positive | | Growth Promoting | | None | |
| | 2 | | 3 | | | |

POSITIVE:

1. I am always happy to work with SHSU students as they are extremely well prepared.

2. I have really been pleased with the most recent interns we have had during the past few years.

SUGGESTIONS FOR GROWTH:

1. Needs practice in writing in a clinical manner.
2. Help students understand and be able to work with clients in poverty, especially clients with server mental health needs that live in poverty. I believe that SHSU does a great job in preparing students for the world of counseling in general.
3. Continue to address multicultural/diversity issues to help students feel confident in serving a diverse clientele.

CMHC Program Modifications

1. More emphasis is placed on students learning and applying clinical documentation across the curriculum. Emphasis is placed on documentation from the first practicum course (pre-practicum) to the final one, internship. Additionally, the requirement of documentation practice in pre-practicum is a newly added requirement – based on needs for students to have more practice and be better prepared and skillful conceptualizing and writing case notes based on feedback from the CMHC Advisory Committee.
2. All CMHC students are now required to take a course in Trauma Counseling.
3. Internship session analysis has been updated and revised to increase student self-reflection.

School Counseling

Data for Supervisor Evaluation of COUN 6386

School Counseling (SC)

Using a Likert Scale data collection format, the tables below represent supervisor ratings of the following statements regarding their experiences with and evaluation of the performance of Sam Houston State University (SHSU) master's level counseling students.

1. SHSU prepares counseling students to follow ethical counseling practices.
2. SHSU prepares counseling students to provide counseling services appropriate to the needs of the clients served at the agency (i.e. Clinical Mental Health, School).
3. SHSU prepares counseling students to carry out the daily functions of a professional counselor in an agency or school setting.
4. SHSU prepares counseling students to meet the counseling needs of clients from diverse backgrounds

5. SHSU prepares counseling students to complete notes and records in accordance with the guidelines/procedures of the agency or school.

Additionally, a second table is provided, for each semester, which represents the number and types of comments offered by supervisors regarding either student intern performance, or recommendations for the SHSU counseling program. Supervisors were asked to offer the following information:

“Please provide feedback as to how SHSU might improve the preparation of counseling students to meet the changing needs of clients and the changing demands of the agency or school.”

Survey Results per Semester

Summer 2016

| | 5 Strongly Agree | 4 Agree | 3 Undecided | 2 Disagree | 1 Strongly Disagree | |
|------------|------------------------|------------|------------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------|
| Question # | | | | | | Avg. Score |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | |
| Comments | Positive | | Growth Promoting | | None | |
| | 0 | | 0 | | 1 | |

POSITIVE:

1.

SUGGESTIONS FOR GROWTH:

1.

Fall 2016

| | 5 Strongly Agree | 4 Agree | 3 Undecided | 2 Disagree | 1 Strongly Disagree | |
|------------|------------------------|------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------|
| Question # | | | | | | Avg. Score |
| 1 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.77 |
| 2 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.69 |
| 3 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4.54 |
| 4 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.69 |
| 5 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4.62 |

| | | | |
|----------|----------|------------------|------|
| Comments | Positive | Growth Promoting | None |
| | 2 | 4 | 7 |

POSITIVE:

1. Students cannot fully understand school counseling until they have “hands on” experience. Providing internships to students is the best way to teach them.
2. I personally think the program is awesome, but sometimes on the job training is the only way to learn everything.

GROWTH PROMOTING:

1. It would be helpful to have strong emphasis on the TEA developmental guidance program goals and comprehensive system.
2. Implement opportunities for students to create digital practicum portfolios.
3. Giving interns an opportunity to experience crisis counseling in the school setting is very difficult for several reasons. Time constraint- the crisis may not occur when the intern is available. Student in crisis may not feel comfortable with an unknown person in the room.
4. I believe it would be beneficial for SHSU to collaborate with directors of guidance in various school districts to develop a full understanding of the roles counselors fulfill on their campuses.

Spring 2017

| Likert Scale | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
|--------------|----------|---|------------------|---|------|------------|
| Question # | | | | | | Avg. Score |
| 1 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.83 |
| 2 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.83 |
| 3 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.58 |
| 4 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.67 |
| 5 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.67 |
| Comments | Positive | | Growth Promoting | | None | |
| | 2 | | 2 | | 8 | |

POSITIVE:

1. Your student has fulfilled all the requirements of the job in an exemplary manner. Cannot think of anything to improve.
2. It has been a wonderful experience to have your student serve at Fort Bend Christian Academy this semester.

GROWTH:

1. I would like to see students visiting or job shadowing at various agencies.
2. Take more time to prepare specifically for interviews.

School Counseling Program Modifications

1. All school counseling interns have professors who are certified school counselors, make site visits to all schools at the beginning of the semester, and engage in on-going communication with site supervisors via electronic communication and telephone throughout the semester.
2. School counseling students engage in additional field experiences while completing their school counseling specific courses.

Student Dispositions Assessment

Each semester in each individual course master's student's dispositions related to their development as professional counselors are assessed on an individual level. These assessments allow faculty to assess the growth, strengths, and areas needing improvement for each individual student. The counselor potential scales are used to evaluate students' on a semester by semester basis, at the time of candidacy, and during the annual review of students. Included below are the aggregate scores on the potential scales for 2017-2018. This is the first time we were able to aggregate the scores and look at the dispositions of the master's students holistically. Students are evaluated on a Likert scale that ranges from Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (6). Individual students who receive a 4 or below on any of the scales are asked to meet with their advisor. Faculty will discuss the meaning of the aggregate scores found below in October 2018 to determine if there is a need to address any part of the scale or if there are any overall concerns that need to be addressed.

| Number | Counselor Potential Scales | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|--------|---|------|--------------------|
| 1 | Knowledge: The students is able to retain and understand content knowledge associated with core program courses relevant to her/his respective track as evidenced by high grades in this course and/or on assignments. | 5.44 | 0.77 |

| | | | |
|---|--|------|------|
| 2 | Skill Development: The student excels in the application of content knowledge in counseling situations as evidence by case study assignments, review of practice tapes, or other application oriented activities and written work. | 5.31 | 0.79 |
| 3 | Professional Behavior: I have no concerns about the student's behavior inside or outside of class in situations associated with the counseling program. Behavioral issues may include one or more of the following: frequent tardiness and/absences; texting and/or talking in class; unethical actions; lack of involvement in reflection; disrespectful behavior towards faculty, supervisors, practice clients, and/or colleagues that does not improve following direct intervention. | 5.49 | 0.92 |
| 4 | Openness to Diversity: The student displays behaviors consistent with cultural social justice, advocacy, and conflict resolution, other culturally supported behavior that promote optimal wellness and growth of | 5.71 | 0.57 |

| | | | |
|---|---|------|------|
| | the human spirit, mind, or body. | | |
| 5 | Ethical Behavior: The student demonstrates the ability to apply and adhere to ethical and legal standards in clinical mental health counseling or school counseling. | 5.65 | 0.66 |
| 6 | Progress: The student is making excellent progress toward the attainment of their degree requirements (e.g. theoretical understanding and application, working toward completion of dissertation, practicum/internship skill development, etc.). | 5.51 | 0.81 |

Doctoral Program Feedback and Program Changes

Feedback from students and program response: Ph.D. program fall 2016-summer 2017

Doctoral students expressed an interest in having a voice and a place at the table when changes in the doctoral program are considered. As those decisions were made at faculty meetings at the main campus and during the day time when many students were working, it was determined that each doctoral cohort should select a representative who could attend called meetings and represent views of the students. Additionally the representatives were to serve as a communication link between faculty and the doctoral students. An election of representatives from Cohorts 13, 14, and 15 was held. Representatives were invited to several meetings when doctoral program issues and potential changes were discussed.

In the spring 2017 semester, students of Cohorts 12 and 13 took the doctoral comprehensive examination. Prior to the exams the Doctoral Director offered options for dates for the on-campus examination dates and based on student feedback, the specific dates were selected. Additional feedback was given by students about the environment and structure of the two days of examination leading to changes the following year. These changes included a shift in the number of content area examinations per day (limited to two), and a swap of two content areas where one had been a take-home component and was to be written during the two days, and vice versa.

Feedback was received from students which influenced the sequencing of courses for Cohort 14's second summer semester. As the Doctoral Director was planning for the summer 2017 schedule, feedback was solicited about the required courses in both the second and third summers of the program. A meeting was held with Cohort 14 and a plan to expand the second summer semester required courses from two to three courses was explained. The rationale included the difficulty of students taking three courses including the teaching internship in the third summer since that internship required teaching on a fourth night of the semester. This was burdensome to the students. After consideration and discussion, Cohort 14 agreed to take three courses as long as two of the courses were taught in a hybrid manner, and only required a physical presence in the classroom on two nights. This left another night open for the classroom observations and practice lessons for the College Teaching course that is required in the second summer semester curriculum.

Advisory Council Board Meeting Minutes – Includes Program Modifications

April 21, 2017

Welcome: Dr. Robles-Pina

- Review of agenda
- Theme of the meeting is Technology

Dr. Nichter (Chair)

- Welcomes everyone
- Highlights the reason for the board and how important what they do is and this is a time for us to receive their feedback

Dr. Robles-Pina

- Introduces Dee Dee Dirk, assistant to the Chair, Cindy Gallatin Doctoral Assistant and office staff: Kayla Arrendell (not present), Kellie Lyons (not present) and Magen Jordan (present).

Dr. Watts (Parliamentarian)

- Asked everyone to read through the minutes and if there were any corrections, The following corrections were made:
 - Minutes was added to title

- Denise Sabola is now Denise Cipolla
- Meeting concluded at 11:57am not pm

Dr. Nichter (Chair)

- Starting to align our curriculum with CACREP 2016 Standards, per Dr. Henriksen we have to be using the new standards by 2020, two years before our next CACREP reevaluation.
- Told everyone she will be retiring this year, in either January or May 2018
- Talked about our amazing faculty. Those in attendance were Robles-Pina, McClendon, Li, Serres, Nichter, Sullivan, Watts, Henriksen, Garza-Chaves & Bruhn
- Introduced Dr. Levi McClendon our newest faculty member who will be the advisor for our school counseling program.
- We also lost to faculty this year: Dr. Amanda LaGuardia who is now at the University of Cincinnati and Dr. Haley Stulmaker who has gone into the private sector. We will be introducing two new faculty next year; we have already hired and are just waiting for the paperwork to go through.
- Last night we welcomed Cohort 15 in our Doctoral program.

Advisory Council members introductions (16 present): Le'Ann Solomson(SFASU), Denise Cipolla(CFISD), Darlene Davenport(CFISD), Karen Frederick(HBU), Rohanna Sykes(KISD), Mary Hestand (CFISD), Clare Lucas(Children's Safe Harbour), Kim Lowry(MISD), Robert F (FSC6), Victor Love(private Practice), Theora Noble (Woodlands Family Institute), Shannon Miller (TCBHC), Jennifer Kempton (HISD), Jeanie McCusker(MISD), Regina Gies(MISD), Denise Peterson(Scotty's House).

Dr. Robles-Pina acknowledges Sharese Martin from Doctoral Cohort 6 for winning Jack Staggs Dissertation award.

Report card progress & faculty updates:

Dr. Bruhn (Doctoral):

- Increase financial support of students – We get \$30,000 in scholarship money and use that to pay the tuition for new cohorts.
- Increase number of assistants – hope to hire new assistant for TWC.
- Increase “full-time” orientation – Not Ready for
- Form Research teams – Still in thinking phase, Dr. Lawson is in charge.
- Teach faculty specialty electives – Dr. Watts teaches spirituality and Dr. Lawson is teaching an advanced trauma class.
- Clinical practice track – Not ready
- Doc Training for online/hybrid teaching
- Increase branding and marketing of program – meeting to talk about recruiting options
- Professional day conference – hoping to happen next year

- CEU's to fund scholarship – next year

Dr. Henriksen (CMHC)

- Teach professional writing – Students learn how to write case notes and diagnostic impressions
- More interaction by faculty at internship sites – faculty is visiting them earlier and contacting them frequently by phone and email.
- Students need to understand diagnostic/assessment limitations – Dr. Henriksen and Robles-Pina are redesigning two courses to meet these requirements.
- Improve willingness of students to discuss spirituality – Dr. Watts's offers and elective in spirituality and faculty are discussing more.
- More development with regard to person-directed treatment planning – Trans theoretical model; working with students to help them recognize where the client is and how to move them to where they need to be. Client has more involvement in treatment planning.

Dr. McClendon (School Counseling)

- Testing – House Bill 5 – would like to have someone come in and explain what it is to the students. This is an opportunity for those not college bound, allows specialization starting in high school
- Dr. Solmonson suggested teaching using the comprehensive model - Dr. McClendon explained he has students building framework from bottom up using real data and analyzing and creating a model based on actual data from a school district.
- Capstone Project – Bridges reality with theoretical, how to build relationships and bring people in.

Dr. Robles-Pina – gave everyone an assignment for when they break into groups: How do we intersect social media & counseling?

Dr. McClendon and Danielle Hammond – shared a blackboard link that will allow others to join the meeting who cannot physically be there. Link allows up to 150 people to join, they must have access to blackboard or been sent a guest link.

Everyone broke into his or her respective groups:
Doctoral – room 110 – Cindy Gallatin took notes
CMHC – Room 109 – Dee Dee Dirk took notes
School – Room 111 – Magen Jordan took notes

Doctoral:

Three most pressing issues and recommendations when using technology for training and supervising counseling students:

1. Ethics & Security – understanding the ethics of online department
Provide online training for security, use Hippa or Hytech, which are protected formats.
2. Technology assisted service training – MFT Board – set of rules connected with online assisted services, 15 hours of CEU training, NBCC – distance certification

3. Teach students and faculty how to teach online – add value to the online content: Student to student; student to content; student to teacher

Three most pressing issues and recommendations when using technology for teaching counselors:

1. Encryption for counseling and supervision - suggestions: doxy.me and skype business
2. Driving to TWC twice a week is too much for some students – Suggestion: makes classes hybrid and use technology to make more accessible
3. Faculty is afraid of technology

Dr. Solmonson showed us one of her online classes.

Program Modifications, Completed Modifications

- Majority of previous topics discussed in past years have been addressed or are being addressed
 - 1) Teaching professional writing, documentation, and time management skills (e.g. appearance and scheduling)
 - 2) More interaction by faculty at internship sites or with internship site supervisors
 - 3) Students need to understand diagnostic/assessment limitations and when to make referrals
 - 4) Student training with regard to differential diagnosis (divide diagnosis course into two classes)
 - 5) Improve willingness of students to discuss religion/spirituality with clients when it is identified as part of the client's support system.
 - 6) Increasing number of graduates in the school counseling program and providing variety of experiences
 - 7) More development with regard to person-directed treatment planning – client leading goal development based on readiness (ecological and holistic approach)
 - Students learn to write and submit case notes in pre-practicum to begin their documentation training. Students typically take the pre-practicum course during the second semester enrolled in the master's programs.

Review of Department Mission Statement

Site Supervisors and Advisory Council Members, along with current students, alumni, and employers are called upon to review and evaluate the mission and program objectives. Input from these key stakeholders is used to modify the mission statement and program objectives.

No changes were made to the mission statement or program objectives as a result of feedback from site supervisors and the advisory board.

Program Area Goals

Within the context of department mission, the goals of the Counseling Program are to:

- ❖ Provide assistance to qualified students in learning the knowledge and skills necessary to perform as competent and knowledgeable professionals in the counseling field. This includes encouraging students to develop themselves as well-rounded individuals combining their academic experience, personal values, interests and individual personalities.
- ❖ Provide academic coursework and clinical experience that support and enhance the professional development of the student that holds to the integrity of CACREP standards.
- ❖ Facilitate the Supervised Counseling Practicum in both the Jack Staggs Counseling Clinic and Community Counseling Clinic at the Woodlands Center, primarily for clinical training, where advanced graduate students have opportunities for direct client contact and individual and group supervision from counseling faculty and counselor education doctoral students. Because of the availability of practicum interns, the Supervised Counseling Practicum also provides assessment and counseling for the general public in both the greater Huntsville and Woodlands region.
- ❖ Promote understanding and acceptance of the cultural diversity of our society.
- ❖ Model the standards of integrity, performance, and concern for clients' welfare.

Resources

There were no significant changes in appropriated funding for the counseling programs for this fiscal year. Budget requests for next fiscal year include increased funds to meet CACREP needs and to expand faculty support services. There is also a request to expand the physical facilities of the counseling programs and to update the technology used in the counseling labs. Additional funding has been requested for scholarships in all programs.

Evaluation of Program Outputs

Program Activities

The Counselor Education Department offered an MA program in Counseling with a track in Clinical Mental Health Counseling (CACREP Accredited) and Marriage, Couple, and Family Counseling (MCFC, Non-CACREP Accredited), an MED program in School Counseling (CACREP Accredited), and a Ph.D. program in Counselor Education and Supervision (CACREP Accredited). The Marriage Couple and Family Counseling track is in the process of completing the self-study for submission and will be seeking CACREP Accreditation.

All counseling programs were reviewed during faculty working meetings and the monthly faculty meetings. All curricular offerings are aligned with CACREP standards and SLOs and key assessments have been incorporated into all course offerings. Knowledge SLOs are measured in all courses and especially in early courses in the programs, while skill SLOs, which are largely based on the acquisition of knowledge, are generally measured in the clinical courses that are taken later in the program.

The mission, goals, and objectives of the Department of Counselor Education were reviewed as part of the CACREP self-study process. The department mission, goals, and objectives are aligned with those of SHSU and the College of Education. During the coming year, the mission statement and objectives for the masters' programs and the doctoral program will be reviewed by faculty, current students, alumni, site supervisors, and advisory council members for possible changes in light of changes in the department of Counselor Education.

The assessment and evaluation procedure were also reviewed this year. Minor modifications were made to the assessment model to guide the assessment and evaluation process. Measures for all parts of the evaluation process were reviewed and revised as needed. This will also become an ongoing process that will occur yearly. Alumni, Supervisor, and Employer surveys were revised as needed.

Program Recipients, Enrollment, and Retention

The following information provides yearly and semester breakdowns of our student populations. It includes demographics, applicants, admittances, and graduation rates.

Counseling Program Demographics (All Programs) Academic Year 2016-2017

| <u>Statistic</u> | <u>2016-2017</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| Total Enrollment | 192 |
| Women | 87.5% |
| Men | 12.5% |
| African American | 15.6% |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native | .01% (1 Student) |
| Asian American | .03% (6 students) |
| Hispanic | 18.2% |
| International | .01% (3 Students) |
| Multiple Heritage | .02% (4 students) |
| White | 56.25% |
| Not Reported | .03% (5 students) |

CLINICAL MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELING PROGRAM

| Statistic | 2016-2017 |
|--|-----------|
| Applicants | 117 |
| Accepted | 52 |
| Number of Students Enrolled | 130 |
| Average Class size | 12 |
| Academic Class 12 (Face to Face and On-line) | |
| Practicum 6 | |
| Internship 12 | |
| Number of Graduates | 47 |

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Completion Rate | 95% |
| GSA-NCE Examination Pass Rate | 93.75% |
| Job Placement Rate* | 85% |

*Represents the percentage of graduates actively seeking employment who responded to survey
The 90% completion rate represents students who were admitted into the CMHC program between 2008 and 2014 and graduated within the expected time frame of six years. The NCE examination pass rate was calculated using the numbers of students who took the NCE exam between 2016 and 2017

SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Statistic | 2016-2017* |
| Applicants | 29 |
| Accepted | 11 |
| Number of Students Enrolled | 29 |
| Average Class Size | |
| Academic Class | 12 (Face to Face and On-line) |
| Practicum | 6 |
| Internship | 12 |
| Number of Graduates | 9 |
| Completion Rate | 100% |
| TEA School Counselor Exam Pass rate | 87.5% |
| Job Placement Rate | 100% |

DOCTORAL COUNSELING PROGRAM**

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Statistic | 2016-2017 |
| Applicants | 28 |
| Accepted | 9 |
| Number of Students Enrolled | 33 |
| Average Class Size | 7 |
| Number of Graduates | 14 |
| Completion Rate (Overall) | 85% |
| Job Placement Rate* | 100% |

*Represents the percentage of graduates actively seeking employment who responded to survey

Summary of Findings

The CMHC program has an average of approximately 130 students per year attending. In general, 17 students have been accepted per semester to meet CACREP FTE requirements. Students are predominately female (88%) and White (56%). The Doctoral program currently admits a maximum of 10 students per cohort and completes admission once per year.

The CMHC program aims to graduate approximately 16 students per semester (e.g., fall, spring, and summer). In general, 17 students have been admitted per semester with faculty anticipating a 10% to 15% attrition rate from first enrollment to graduation.

The School Counseling program has an average of approximately 29 students per year attending. In general, 11 students have been accepted per semester to meet CACREP FTE requirements with faculty anticipating a 10% to 15% attrition rate from first enrollment to graduation. Students are predominately female (97%) and White (55%). The School program aims to graduate approximately 10 students per semester.

Faculty have reviewed recruitment for all programs and will implement changes in the 2017-2018 academic year.

Graduating Master's Students' Satisfaction with Program

| Graduating Class | Gender | | Ethnicity | | | | | | | Unknown |
|------------------|--------|--------|-----------|----------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|---------|
| | Male | Female | White | Hispanic | Asian-American | African-American | Native American | Multiple Races | International | |
| 2016/2017 | 5 | 48 | 32 | 11 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Summary of Findings

1. All graduates found the counseling program to be of high standards, caring faculty and staff, and relevant to current counseling practices.
2. All students found having CACREP accreditation to be a major asset for attending the counselling program at SHSU.

Evaluation of Program Student Learning Outcomes

Professional, Personal, and Academic Review

All students are reviewed at least once a year to assess professional, personal, and academic development. All faculty participate in the review. Students are required to meet a standard of professional ethical behavior, and appropriate personal behavior, as well as participate in professional and personal growth and development activities.

Faculty concerns regarding individual students were discussed at regular monthly faculty meetings and students were reviewed by the faculty using the Counselor Potential Scales (CPS). The CPS was last revised by the faculty in 2013 and was made a part of all Blackboard class support systems. The CPS will be revised to meet the 2016 CACREP standards.

Students are also required to maintain a 3.0 GPA or higher, achieve grades of B or better in all graduate level courses, and achieve a B or better in COUN 5385 (Pre-Practicum in Counseling), COUN 5374 Practicum in Group Counseling), COUN 6376 (Supervised Practicum), and 6386 (Internship). Doctoral students are also evaluated yearly focusing on professional and academic development. With two C's, the student is reviewed by the faculty (according to university policy) and a decision is made concerning the student continuing in the program with a growth plan having been developed or the student may be terminated from the program. A grade of F automatically removes a student from the program and college.

Students are also scheduled to meet with their advisor when they receive one grade of C in any of their coursework or if they are issued a dismissal from one of the counseling programs when retention and remediation planning are not successful and the pattern of behavior that led to the original referral continues.

Counselor Potential Scale are used as part of the assessment process to determine if students are approved to become candidates for the Counseling program. Candidacy is a transition for students who when admitted to the program are admitted to take counseling courses. Once approved for candidacy students have been admitted as a candidate for one of the two master's degrees.

CACREP Professional Identity Standards

Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE) and National Counselor Exam (NCE) scores were reviewed to assess knowledge and performance on Professional Identity Standards for MA and MED students. These scores are continuously monitored to determine if there is a need for course and program modifications. The faculty has determined that there are no modifications required at this time. In addition, the Department of Counselor Education completes assessments and reports the findings to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) on an annual basis.

Spring 2017

| Professional Identity Standard | Number of Students passed | Pass Rate |
|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| CPCE Overall Pass Rate | 16 of 19 | 84% |
| C1: Human Growth and Development | 16 of 19 | 84% |
| C2: Social and Cultural Diversity | 15 of 19 | 79% |
| C3: Helping Relationships | 18 of 19 | 95% |
| C4: Group Work | 16 of 19 | 84% |
| C5: Career Development | 17 of 19 | 89% |
| C6: Assessment | 17 of 19 | 89% |
| C7 Research and Program Evaluation | 17 of 19 | 89% |
| C8: Professional Orientation and Ethical Practice | 16 of 19 | 84% |

Fall 2016

| Professional Identity Standard | Number of Students passed | Pass Rate |
|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| CPCE Overall Pass Rate | 22 of 26 | 85% |
| C1: Human Growth and Development | 24 of 26 | 92% |
| C2: Social and Cultural Diversity | 23 of 26 | 88% |
| C3: Helping Relationships | 23 of 26 | 88% |
| C4: Group Work | 24 of 26 | 92% |
| C5: Career Development | 24 of 26 | 92% |
| C6: Assessment | 24 of 26 | 92% |
| C7: Research and Program Evaluation | 25 of 26 | 96% |
| C8: Professional Orientation and Ethical Practice | 24 of 26 | 92% |

All students who failed the initial administration of the CPCE in the Fall 2016 Spring 2017 semesters passed the CPCE on the second administration.

Table NCE Overall Results

| Semester | # of Students passing | Passing Percentage |
|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Spring 2017 | 18 of 19 | 95 |
| Fall 2016 | 11 of 12 | 92 |
| Spring 2016 | 19 of 21 | 91 |
| Fall 2015 | 11 of 11 | 100 |

Doctoral students are assessed on knowledge and performance outcomes through the completion of their comprehensive exams and their dissertations (see Table 1 below). During 2017, six doctoral students completed both the written and oral comprehensive exams. All six students successfully completed the on campus written portion of the exams. For the research take-home portions of the exam five students passed and one student failed the quantitative section of the exam. The one student passed the rewrite for that section. All six students completed the oral exams.

Table 1 Completed Dissertations

| Cohort | Year Entered | # of Students Accepted | Current Students | # of Dissertations Completed |
|--------|--------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| 14 | 2016 | 6 | 6 | N/A |

| | | | | |
|----|------|---|---|-----|
| 13 | 2015 | 9 | 9 | N/A |
|----|------|---|---|-----|

- Doctoral students in cohorts 13 and 14 have not yet reached the point of completing the dissertation. Cohort 13 will complete comps this academic and will begin work on their dissertations in the Summer of 2019. In previous years, approximately 72% of students who started their doctoral studies at SHSU have completed the dissertation and graduated.

Table 2 Doctoral Comprehensive Exams

| Cohort | Year | Students in Cohort | Completed Comps Successfully |
|--------|------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| 14 | 2016 | 6 | 6 |
| 13 | 2015 | 9 | 9 |

Summary of Findings

1. Counselor Potential Scales are being modified to meet specifications in the 2016 CACREP Standards and to be applicable to doctoral students. Data will be provided in the 2017-2018 report.

CACREP STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES(SLOs)

SLOs were measured through Key Assessments in both core and specialty courses for the CMHC and School counseling programs. Performance on SLOs are rated through rubrics with a 1-3 scale (1 = Novice, does not meet standard; 2 = Competent, Meets, standard, 3 = Proficient, exceeds standard). Students are required to achieve a minimum score of 2.0 on each SLO. Students receiving a score lower than a 2.0 on an SLO are required to complete additional assignments until the SLO is met at a level of at least 2.0. Table indicates the term, course where the problem occurred, and actions taken by the faculty.

Table Academic Development Problems

| Term | Course | Course Grade | SLO | # of Students | Action |
|-----------|-----------|--------------|----------|---------------|---|
| Summer 16 | COUN 5334 | | CMHC D.2 | 1 | Student was required to complete a second article review to demonstrate understanding of material |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|---|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | Student successfully completed the repeat of the assignment |
| Fall 2016 | COUN 5379 | C | CMHC I.2 | 1 | <p>This standard was assessed as part of the final exam for the course. When grading the final exam, the instructor realized that technical problems prevented the student's answers from being recorded on Blackboard, which was the platform used for the exam. The instructor contacted the student via email prior to final grades being due asking the student if she wanted to take a zero for the final exam, which result in a final grade of C for the course, or a makeup assignment which the student would complete during the first part of the</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|---|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | spring 2017 semester. The email informed the student that no response by the time grades were due would mean the student would receive a 0 for the final exam and C for the final course grade. The student did not respond to the instructor before final grades were due, so she received a 0 for the final exam and C for the final course grade. |
| Fall 2016 | COUN 5379 | F | ALL | 1 | Discussed concerns with student throughout the semester. Student reported that her assignments were completed poorly or not at all due to her procrastination. |
| Fall 2016 | COUN 5379 | C | CMHC D.2 | 1 | This standard was assessed as part of the final exam for the course. When grading the final exam, |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>the instructor realized that technical problems prevented the student's answers from being recorded on Blackboard, which was the platform used for the exam. The instructor contacted the student via email prior to final grades being due asking the student if she wanted to take a zero for the final exam, which result in a final grade of C for the course, or a makeup assignment which the student would complete during the first part of the spring 2017 semester. The email informed the student that no response by the time grades were due would mean the student would receive a 0 for the final exam and C for</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|---|------------|---|--|
| | | | | | the final course grade. The student did not respond to the instructor before final grades were due, so she received a 0 for the final exam and C for the final course grade. |
| Spring 2017 | COUN 5379 | C | All | 1 | Met with student on several occasions to help her better understand the material and integrate her learning into assignments |
| Fall 2016 | COUN 6386 | F | CMHC F.2 | 1 | Student was allowed extended time to complete assignment, but student never submitted the assignment |
| Fall 2016 | COUN 7373 | C | DOC IV.E.1 | 1 | Allowed extra time for turning in final project. |

Average CACREP SLOs for the MA in Clinical Mental Health Counseling, MED in School Counseling, and the Ph.D. in Counselor Education and Supervision are reported by SLO Area in following tables.

Table 1 CACREP Clinical Mental Health Counseling SLOs (1-3 scale)

| CACREP Clinical Mental Health Counseling SLOs | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------|
| Standard | Student Learning Outcome Area | Score |
| A.1-A.10 | Foundations – Knowledge | 2.93 |

| | | |
|---------|--|------|
| B.1-B.2 | Foundations – Skills and Practices | 2.89 |
| C.1-C.9 | Counseling Prevention – Knowledge | 2.8 |
| D.1-9 | Counseling Prevention – Skills and Practices | 2.93 |
| E.1-E.6 | Diversity and Advocacy – Knowledge | 2.92 |
| F.1-F.3 | Diversity and Advocacy – Skills and Practices | 2.91 |
| G.1-G.4 | Assessment – Knowledge | 2.78 |
| H.1-H.4 | Assessment – Skills and Practices | 2.89 |
| I.1-I.3 | Research and Evaluation – Knowledge | 2.64 |
| J.1-J3 | Research and Evaluation – Skills and Practices | 2.79 |
| K.1-K.5 | Diagnosis – Knowledge | 2.78 |
| L.1-L.3 | Diagnosis – Skills and Practices | 2.86 |

Table 2 CACREP School Counseling SLOs (1-3 scale)

| CACREP School Counseling SLOs | | |
|-------------------------------|---|-------|
| Standard | Student Learning Outcome Area | Score |
| A.1-A.7 | Foundations – Knowledge | 3.0 |
| B.1-B.2 | Foundations – Skills and Practices | 3.0 |
| C.1-C.6 | Counseling Prevention – Knowledge | 2.97 |
| D.1-5 | Counseling Prevention – Skills and Practices | 2.85 |
| E.1-E.4 | Diversity and Advocacy – Knowledge | 3.0 |
| F.1-F.4 | Diversity and Advocacy – Skills and Practices | 2.96 |
| G.1-G.3 | Assessment – Knowledge | 3.0 |
| H.1-H.5 | Assessment – Skills and Practices | 2.98 |
| I.1-I.5 | Research and Evaluation – Knowledge | 3.0 |
| J.1-J3 | Research and Evaluation – Skills and Practices | - |
| K.1-K.3 | Academic Development – Knowledge | 3.0 |
| L.1-L.3 | Academic Development – Skills and Practice | 2.96 |
| M.1-M.7 | Collaboration and Consultation – Knowledge | 3.0 |
| N.1-N.5 | Collaboration and Consultation – Skills and Practices | 2.97 |
| O.1-O.5 | Leadership – Knowledge | 3.0 |
| P.1-P.2 | Leadership – Skills and Knowledge | 2.96 |

Table 3 CACREP Doctoral SLOs (1-3 scale)

| CACREP Doctoral SLOs | | |
|----------------------|---|-------|
| Standard | Student Learning Outcome Area | Score |
| A.1-A.4 | Supervision – Knowledge | 2.92 |
| B.1-B.2 | Supervision – Skills and Practices | 2.83 |
| C.1-C.3 | Teaching – Knowledge | 3.0 |
| D.1-D.3 | Teaching – Skills and Practices | 3.0 |
| E.1-E.4 | Research and Scholarship - Knowledge | 2.96 |
| F.1-F.6 | Research and Scholarship – Skills and Practices | 2.96 |
| G.1-G.4 | Counseling – Knowledge | 2.98 |
| H.1-H.3 | Counseling – Skills and Practices | 3.0 |

| | | |
|---------|--|------|
| I.1-I.5 | Leadership and Advocacy – Knowledge | 2.95 |
| J.1-J.2 | Leadership and Advocacy – Skills and Practices | 2.98 |

Use of Findings to Inform Program Modifications

Suggestions and modifications were reviewed during monthly faculty meetings and during the annual Spring Faculty retreat. Upon review of the program and data collected, faculty recommended the following:

1. Faculty reviewed the CPCE pass/fail criteria. Faculty decided to retain the current standard of passing score of 1 standard deviation below the national mean. Faculty also discussed the process of CPCE retake for sections failed and determined that students would retake the CPCE after the first fail further discussion as to the process for completing comps following a second fail will take place resulting in a standard set of guidelines.
2. Faculty reviewed the current assessment and evaluation plan and agreed that is satisfactory. Work has begun to prepare for the transition of the assessment from the 2009 standards to the 2016 standards.
3. Faculty established a rotation process so that all students in both master's and doctoral programs would be evaluated annually using all available individual assessment data during the evaluation process.
4. Aggregate data for the Counselor Potential Scales is available for the first time for the 2017-2018 academic year. This data will be reviewed during the Faculty Retreat to be held in October 2018.
5. Faculty will continue to monitor SLO outcomes to determine if there is a need to make any program or course adjustments. An effort will be made to ensure that all individual SLO standards are addressed in a specific course, assessed, and that the assessment outcomes are used to evaluate individual students and to make any needed program adjustments or to provide remediation for individual students.