

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: Ed.D. Counselor Education and Supervision (CES)

SUBMITTED BY: Dr. William Sterner

DATE: SEPTEMBER 21, 2017

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED:

- ALL DIRECT AND INDIRECT DATA COLLECTED ARE BEING STORED ON A SECURE ELECTRONIC DATABASE (PIE OR DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING).
- ALL DIRECT AND INDIRECT DATA COLLECTED ARE ALSO STORED IN PAPER FORM.
- SAMPLES OF STUDENT WORK ARE STORED IN THE COUNSELING DEPARTMENT FILES (STUDENT RECORDS ROOM –6TH FLOOR BALLSTON CENTER).

PLEASE REFER TO THE FOLLOWING LIST TO DEFINE THE COMMON ACRONYMS FOR PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN THIS REPORT:

CES: COUNSELOR EDUCATION AND SUPERVISION

CACREP: COUNCIL OF THE ACCREDITATION OF COUNSELING AND RELATED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

NCATE: NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE ACCREDITATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

NBCC: NATIONAL BOARD FOR CERTIFIED COUNSELORS

ACA: AMERICAN COUNSELING ASSOCIATION

ASCA: AMERICAN SCHOOL COUNSELOR ASSOCIATION

VCA: VIRGINIA COUNSELORS ASSOCIATION

VSCA: VIRGINIA SCHOOL COUNSELORS ASSOCIATION

THIS REPORT WILL ADDRESS THE DOCTORAL PROGRAM (Ed.D.) IN COUNSELOR EDUCATION AND SUPERVISION HOUSED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELING:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From the 2017-2018 Marymount University Graduate Catalog

Program description from the Course Catalog: Counselor Education and Supervision (Ed.D.)

Since Fall 2016, new students are no longer accepted into the Ed.D. in counselor education and supervision, accredited by CACREP. Students currently enrolled in the program should consult the catalog received at the time of matriculation for program requirements.

From the 2015-2016 Marymount University Graduate Catalog (please note: revised outcomes were submitted for catalog changes for the 2016-2017 Marymount University Graduate Catalog. No revisions were listed and the outcomes below do not reflect the current outcomes that are being assessed in this report. No changes were made to the 2017-2018 Marymount University Graduate Catalog from 2016-2017 submission):



This doctoral program prepares professional counselor educators and supervisors who will function in a wide variety of settings and who will demonstrate advanced clinical and supervisory competencies and effective ethical decision making and practices. Students will be prepared to serve as the next generation of leaders in the counseling profession as educators, researchers, clinicians, and supervisors.

Students admitted for doctoral study must have completed programs of study that meet Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) entry-level (master's) standards.

Upon successful completion of this program, students will be able to

- *develop an identity as counselor educators and demonstrate evidence of professional leadership potential;*
- *demonstrate clinical skills and show the ability to articulate the practice and philosophy through writing, supervision, and teaching;*
- *show evidence of effective teaching strategies and the utilization of appropriate technology, clinical practices, supervision skills, consultative skills, and research; and*
- *demonstrate multicultural competence in teaching, research, supervision, and clinical practice.*

List all of the program’s learning outcomes: (regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year	Year of Next Planned Assessment
1. Students will develop an identity as counselor educators and will demonstrate evidence of professional leadership potential	Never assessed	X	2017
2. Students will demonstrate advanced clinical skills and effective treatment planning in the practice of professional counseling	2017		*2018
3. Students will demonstrate effective clinical supervision skills and approaches in clinical supervision	2017		*2018
4. Students will effectively conduct and analyze research that adds to the knowledge base of the counseling profession	2017		*2018
5. Students will show evidence of effective teaching strategies.	Never assessed	X	2017

**per consultation with Ann Bourdinot, we will assess every year unless the final student graduates by the time the 2018 PIE report is due.*

Describe how the program’s outcomes support Marymount’s mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan:

The University Mission, Strategic Plan, School of Education and Human Services Strategic Plan, and the Mission of the Department of Counseling emphasize academic excellence at the graduate level. The mission of the doctoral program is to train doctoral level students who will be the next generation of leaders in the counseling profession serving as counselor educators (university level teachers), supervisors, researchers, and clinicians. The Ed.D. is the terminal degree in the field of counselling.

As of Fall 2016, the program is no longer admitting students.



Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment:

The department is continually assessing learning outcomes and discussing various measures to implement to make the programs stronger. All the counseling programs are accredited by an external accreditation body, the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Educational Related Programs (CACREP) 2009 Standards. The self-studies were submitted in Spring 2016, on campus CACREP Team visit conducted in August 2016, and follow-up report submitted to CACREP. The only standard not met was due to the need for updated information regarding the FTE-to-student ratio. In January 2017, CACREP granted reaccreditation for all four specializations through 2025. Typically, CACREP reaccredits for a period of seven (7) years but all four specializations were reaccredited for eight (8) years. We are currently reviewing 2016 CACREP Standards to ensure compliance.

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>

Provide a response to last year's University Assessment Committee review of the program's learning assessment report:

N/A. As of Fall 2016, the program is no longer admitting students.

Outcomes Assessment 2016-2017

Learning Outcome 1:

(#1 listed in original Learning Outcomes) Students will develop an identity as counselor educators and will demonstrate evidence of professional leadership potential

Assessment Activity

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
<p>OM#1: Counselor educator identity development was assessed in CE702: Professional Issues in Counselor Education and Supervision through the <i>Career Path Assignment</i> that focused on professional identity from a counselor educator perspective (direct).</p>	<p>OM#1: The rubric (see exhibits) measures demonstrated professional counselor educator identity development during the first year of the Ed.D. program. A score of 84% is deemed acceptable in this course. A score of 84% is a B in the department grading scale and is the minimum grade accepted for the class.</p>	<p>OM#1: The data collected consists only of doctoral students admitted in the CES program enrolled in CE702 (2 cohorts). The faculty member of the course uses a rubric to assess identity development. Eleven (11) students were used for this assessment report.</p>	<p>OM#1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The faculty member assigned to the class (the class has been staffed with same faculty for all cohorts) personally evaluates the identity development for all students and provides an overall mean score to the department assessment coordinator for this report. Eleven (11) students from 2 cohorts were assessed using the <i>Career Path Assignment</i> for the report. A minimum score of 84% is deemed acceptable. <p>Findings: Career Path Assignment was the direct measure for CE702. Eleven (11) students were included for this analysis (2 cohorts). The minimum acceptable score is 84%, which is a B in the departmental grading distribution and is the minimum score required for the class. Scores ranged from 90%-97%, with a mean score of 93.6% for cohort 1 and 94.83% for cohort 2. Overall mean score for both cohorts was 94.27%, which was well above the minimum score deemed acceptable.</p>
<p>OM#2: Residency requirement (indirect).</p>	<p>OM#2: All doctoral students are required to complete residency requirements as outlined on the <i>Residency Requirement Form</i> (See exhibits), which demonstrate evidence of identity as a counselor educator and professional leadership potential. Criteria for residency include: 1) Completion of 24 semester</p>	<p>OM#2: The data collected involved a review of all completed <i>Residency Requirement Forms</i> from 2013-2016 for all doctoral students enrolled at the end of their second consecutive fall semester. The data collected consisted of a review of the content listed on the residency form to ensure that the description</p>	<p>OM#2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All <i>Residency Requirement Forms</i> were collected from the student files. Examination of the form was conducted to ensure that students completed the required 24 credit hours, completed two scholarly projects, engaged in at least two departmental service requirements, and engaged in at least two professional service requirements. Confirmation was evidenced by the completed form which included project name, dated completed, and

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
	<p>hours of Counselor Education major course requirements; 2) Assisting faculty members on two scholarly projects intended to lead to either manuscripts submitted for publication in peer-reviewed journals or presentation proposals submitted for peer-reviewed program consideration at state, regional, or national conferences; 3) Engaging in a minimum of two departmental service activities, to include master's interviews, orientations, doctoral interviews, and open houses; and 4) Actively engaging in professional service. Two components comprise this requirement: A) Holding elected or appointed office in a local (e.g., Chi Sigma Iota, Doctoral Student Association, Branch of the VA, MD, and D.C., Counseling Association), state (e.g., VA, MD, and DC Counseling Association or its divisions), regional (e.g., Southern Region of the American Counseling Association), or national (e.g., American</p>	<p>met the stated requirements, as well as what was outlined in the student handbook. Also, advisers were contacted to verify that the content for each criterion was established and that they had supporting documentation demonstrating evidence of completion of the activity. Dates were also checked to ensure that the residency requirements occurred during the designated period.</p>	<p>signatures from the student, adviser, doctoral coordinator, and department chair. Findings: 17 out of 17 (100%) students completed all residency requirements based on criteria outlined above on the Residency Requirements Forms.</p>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
	Counseling Association or its divisions, American College Personnel Association) professional organization or by chairing or serving as a member of a committee of one of these organizations, or B) serving on a university, college, or departmental committee or task force		

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students *(Use both direct and indirect measure results):*

Career Path Assignment rubric (direct measure): All students met the minimum score deemed acceptable for this assignment. The scores for this assignment for both cohorts were well above the minimum acceptable score for this course, with the mean of 94.27%. Students must score a minimum score of an 84% on this assignment. An 84% is a B in the department’s grading scale. Students appeared to effectively demonstrate evidence of identity development as counselor educators from this direct measure.

Residency Requirement Form (indirect measure): All 17 of the 17 students assessed through the residency requirement demonstrated professional leadership potential as evidenced by the activities identified on the official **Residency Requirements Form**. All students completed all required components as outlined above.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

Program establishes early in the curriculum focused efforts to help students identify and target their activities across all courses specific to professional identity development. Evidence presented in the residency requirements allows faculty to evaluate any concerns and to help direct student activities to meet expectations. Also, since the residency requirements and CE702 occur during students’ first year, faculty can direct students to activities that will strengthen identify development and assist in career opportunities as counselor educators. If a student does not meet the minimum residency requirements, students must engage in additional activities as outlined in the handbook to address any deficits. Students are informed by their adviser of any deficits and a plan is established to address deficits. Students unable to complete residency requirements are not permitted to proceed in the program until successful completion of this requirement.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Due to the decision that the doctoral program not admit any further students into the program, the last cohort who was admitted completed this course in spring 2016. Since the program was new, the faculty met throughout the year for program revisions.

Learning Outcome 2:

(#5 listed in original Learning Outcomes) Students will show evidence of effective teaching strategies.

Assessment Activity

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
<p>OM#1: Teaching strategies and skills assessed in CE805: Internship in Counselor Education through video observation with Teaching Internship Taping Rubric (direct).</p>	<p>OM#1: The rubric (see exhibits) measures understanding of curriculum development, understanding of instructional issues, application of skills in consultation with faculty /students, understanding of class management issues, and evidence of content and delivery of information using videotapes. A score of 84% is deemed acceptable in this course. An 84% is a B in the department grading scale and is the minimum grade accepted.</p>	<p>OM#1: The data collected consists only of doctoral students admitted in the CES program enrolled in CE805. The faculty member of the course views and scores each video using a rubric. Five (5) students were evaluated for this assessment report.</p>	<p>OM#1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The faculty member assigned to the class (the class has been staffed with same faculty for all cohorts) personally evaluates teaching skills for students and provides an overall mean score to the department assessment coordinator for this report. 2. Five (5) students and 2 video tapes per students were assessed for the report. A mean score of 84% is deemed acceptable. All students met the minimum score deemed as acceptable for both videos. Final scores ranged from 92.5%-96.3%. <p>Findings: Two tapes are required during CE805. Five students were included in the sample of this report (one cohort of students). The minimum acceptable score is 84%. 84% is a B in the departmental grading distribution and a B is the minimum score required for the class. Scores ranged from 92.5%--96.3% with all scores meeting the minimum score deemed acceptable.</p>
<p>OM#2: Doctoral Student Teaching Evaluations (indirect).</p>	<p>OM#2: Doctoral Student Teaching Evaluations (see exhibits) were distributed to master’s students enrolled in</p>	<p>OM#2: Data collected were teaching evaluations for five students. Evaluations were distributed at the end of the</p>	<p>OM#2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Department compiled the evaluation data and data were analyzed by the Assessment Coordinator. Evaluation questions were based on course objectives.

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
<p>Likert scale of 1-5 (1=Very Poor; 2=Poor; 3=Average; 4=Very Good; 5=Excellent)</p>	<p>the five courses that had a doctoral student assigned for co-teaching. Program aims for a score of <i>Very Good</i> to <i>Excellent</i>. <i>Average</i> is deemed acceptable.</p>	<p>course. Evaluation questions focused on eight (8) Likert responses addressing rating of teaching, preparedness, explanation of content, responsiveness to student questions, classroom and time management, encouraging students to participate, and feedback on course work. Three narrative questions elaborating on the Likert responses were reviewed to ensure consistency with the Likert responses. The number of evaluations received ranged from 8-16, which reflected 100% class participation. Evaluations were summarized by the Accreditation Coordinator.</p>	<p>Eight Likert and three narrative responses were included in the evaluation form.</p> <p>2. Summated Likert responses were calculated for each of the five students. Mean evaluation course scores ranged from 3.98-4.56. Program aims for a score of <i>Good</i> to <i>Excellent</i>. <i>Average</i> is deemed acceptable.</p> <p>Findings: All five students had summated mean course evaluation scores between <i>Good</i> and <i>Excellent</i> (3.98-4.56 out of 5.00)</p>

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students (*Use both direct and indirect measure results*):

Teaching Internship Taping Rubric (direct measure): All students evaluated for this learning outcome have met the minimum score deemed acceptable for CE805 Teaching Internship. Students' scores on the two tapes ranged from 92.5% to 96.3%, well above the minimum score of an 84% for demonstration of teaching skills and strategies. An 84% is a B in the department's grading scale.

Doctoral Student Teaching Evaluations (indirect measure): All five students had a summated mean score on the Likert scale (1 = Very Poor to 5 = Excellent) ranging from 3.98 to 4.56. Program and CE805 aims for a mean score of Good to Excellent. Average is deemed acceptable.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:



If a doctoral student is not meeting the minimum score, additional supervision may be assigned and will be conducted by the faculty member. If the student still does not meet the minimum score, the student is brought up on student review (outlined in the student handbook) and recommendations or remediation by the faculty may occur. If the recommendations or remediation is not effective, transition out of the program may be explored as an option.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Due to the decision that the doctoral program not admit any further students into the program, the last cohort who was admitted completed this course in spring 2016. Since the program was new, the faculty met throughout the year for program revisions.

Appendices

See EXHIBITS following the summary section of this report. When pasting the exhibits into this document, the alignment was reconfigured on some exhibits.

Curriculum Map

These will be sent for review and feedback to the Liberal Arts Core Committee.

GRADUATE CURRICULUM MAP

Degree Program: Ed.D. in Counselor Education and Supervision (CES)

Year: 2017

Program Outcomes:

Program Outcome	Critical Reading ¹	Written Communication	Oral Communication/Persuasive Argument	Identification, Investigation, and Application of Theory and Principles of the Discipline	Scholarly Presentation and the Use Resource Materials
1. Students will develop an identity as counselor educators and will demonstrate evidence of professional leadership potential	1,2	2,3	4		1, 6, 7

¹ Graduate program competencies derived from GSC Committee Requirements for New Graduate Programs: “Achieving these criteria may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to:

1. Course content that is increasingly more complex and rigorous than UG courses (course objectives, learning activities, outcome expectations, etc.)
2. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in reading critically.
3. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in writing clearly.
4. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in arguing persuasively.
5. Coursework that produces graduates competent in identifying, investigating, and applying theory and principles of the discipline to new ideas, problems, and materials.

Program Outcome	Critical Reading ¹	Written Communication	Oral Communication/Persuasive Argument	Identification, Investigation, and Application of Theory and Principles of the Discipline	Scholarly Presentation and the Use of Resource Materials
2. Students will demonstrate advanced clinical skills and effective treatment planning in the practice of professional counseling	1	1	1	5	7
3. Students will demonstrate effective clinical supervision skills and approaches in clinical supervision	1, 2	1, 3		5	7
4. Students will effectively conduct and analyze research that adds to the knowledge base of the counseling profession	1, 2	1, 3	4	5	6, 7
5. Students will show evidence of effective teaching strategies.	1, 2	1, 3		5	6, 7

Curriculum Map:

For each course, indicate which competencies are included using the following key. Please refer to the director of assessment in Planning and Institutional Effectiveness if you need more detailed explanation of the four core competencies.

Level of instruction: F-foundational, A-advanced, M-mastery

Assessment: PR-project, P-paper, E-exam, O-oral presentation, I-internship, OT-other (explain briefly)

Required Course	Critical Reading ¹		Written Communication		Oral Communication/Persuasive Argument		Identification, Investigation, and Application of Theory and Principles of the Discipline		Scholarly Presentation and Use of Resource Materials	
	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess
CE701	A	P, E	A	P, OT-case analysis					A	
CE702	A	P, O	A	O	A	O	A	O	A	OT, conference presentation
CE710	A	P	A	OT case analysis	A	O	M	OT/I battery of assessments	A	
CE720	A	P	A	P	A	O	M	P, E		

6. Competence in the scholarly presentation of the results of independent study and in the use of bibliographic and other resource materials with emphasis on primary sources for data.

7. A capstone or final integrative activity that demonstrates achievement of graduate-level knowledge and application of the theory and principles of the discipline”

CE723	A	O					M	OT/I Group skills in practice		
CE725	A	P	A	P			A	OT practice supervision skills		
CE801			A	OT case analysis	A	OT, Case presentation	A	OT/I Treatment planning and diagnosis with clients		
CE803			M	I	M	OT case presentation	M	I		
CE810	A	PR	A	PR, O	A	O			M	PR, P, O
CE805	A	P, O	M	PR			M	OT/I teaching skills practice		
CE809	M	P	M	P, OT supervision notes	M	OT supervision with MA students	M	OT/I supervision practicum		
CE813	A	PR	A	P, O	A	PR, O	M	PR, O	M	PR, O
CE815	M	P	M	PR/P	M	O	M	P	M, O	P, O
CE899	M	P	M	P, O	M	P, O	M	P/O/OT dissertation	M	P/O/OT dissertation



MARYMOUNT
UNIVERSITY

Arlington, Virginia