



THE UNIVERSITY OF
TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE

DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
AND COUNSELING

**Counselor Education Programs
2017 Program Evaluation Report**

Vital Statistics

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) requires that programs make certain information publically available each year.

	CMHC	SC	PhD
Currently enrolled students	19 + 10 new	7 + 7 new	25 + 4 new
Graduates in 2016-2017	8	6	5
Program completion rate	17/18 94%	12/17 71%	13/17 76%
Employment rate	6/6 100%	6/6 100%	5/5 100%
National Counselor Examination Pass	3/3 100%	n/a	n/a
Professional School Counselor Praxis Pass	n/a	7/7 100%	n/a

- Reports generated for Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017.
- CMHC = MS in Clinical Mental Health Counseling, SC = MS in School Counseling, PhD = Counselor Education Doctoral Program.
- Program completion rate indicates proportion of students who complete degree requirements within expected time to degree (2-3 years for full-time MS students, 3-4 years for part-time MS students, 3-4 Years for full-time PhD students, 4-6 years for part-time PhD students)
- Employment rate indicates proportion of students who desired employment who were employed or engaged in full-time advanced academic study within six months of graduation. Many graduates secure employment prior to graduation.

Program Objectives & Major Program Activities

The program faculty has been engaged in a number of activities relevant to this report:

- During the 2015-2016 Academic Year, the program faculty explored and updated overarching program objectives, mission, and vision; aligned curricula to newly-released 2016 CACREP standards; and engaged in a comprehensive revision of program evaluation and student assessment plans
- During the 2016-2017 Academic Year, the program faculty implemented new systematic program evaluation and student assessment strategies consistent with the 2016 CACREP Standards. Dr. Pamela Brott was hired as core faculty member and assumed leadership of the School Counseling Program.

Sources of Data

The following sources of data were utilized in developing this report

- Graduate performance on the National Counselor Examination
- Graduate performance on the Professional School Counselor Praxis Examination
- Student performance on written comprehensive examinations
- Student performance on final internship ratings from instructors and site supervisors
- Alumni follow-up surveys
- Site-supervisor and employer follow-up surveys
- Admissions, enrollment, and graduation data for the 2016-2017 cycle
- Faculty observations and discussions during semesterly systematic program evaluation meetings

MS Program Evaluation Findings

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, all rubrics and evaluation forms are completed using a 3-point scale where 0 = does not meet expectations, 1 = meets expectations, and 2 = exceeds expectations. Thus, an average of 1 indicates acceptable performance. Means below 1 indicate opportunity for improvement. Means closer to 2 indicate very strong performance.

Objective 1: Graduates will have foundation knowledge necessary for success as professional counselors

- A total of 19 students sat for the comprehensive examination in 2016-2017. Rubrics involved a 0 = Does Not Meet, 1 = Meets, and 2 = Exceeds expectations scale and were blind rated by 3 faculty members for each response. Mean ratings are highlighted below. **Counseling theories** received highest ratings, and **group counseling** and **program evaluation** received the lowest ratings. **Human growth and development** represented the area with the largest positive change (+0.22), and **group counseling** had the largest negative change (-0.22).
 - Professional orientation and ethical practice – $M = 1.03$
 - Social and cultural diversity - $M = 1.08$
 - Human growth and development - $M = 1.08$
 - Career development – $M = 1.06$
 - Helping relationships – essential skills – $M = 1.06$
 - Helping relationships – theories – $M = 1.16$
 - Helping relationships – crisis – $M = 1.05$

- Group work – $M = .87$
- Assessment and testing – $M = 1.00$
- Program evaluation – $M = 0.86$
- Historically, the program has maintained a 100% pass rate for the National Counselor Examination. In Fall 2016, 1 student sat for and passed the NCE, in Spring 2017, 2 students sat and passed the NCE. Score reports indicated that our graduates performed approximately one SD above the mean for CACREP programs in **professional orientation & ethical practice, assessment, and research & program evaluation**. Our students performed approximately one SD below the mean for **group**. In terms of work behaviors, our students were stronger other CACREP programs in **fundamental counseling issues** and **professional development, supervision, and consultation**. Data should be viewed with caution given the small sample size.
- Consistent with prior years, the program had a 100% ($n = 7$) pass rate for SC students who sat for the Professional School Counselor Praxis examination in 2016-2017. Scores ranged from 173 to 185 with a median of 181 ($M = 180.14$, $SD = 3.93$). This is well-above the minimum score required for passing in TN (156) and ETS-reported median scores (170). This demonstrates especially strong foundation knowledge in School Counseling professional orientation.
- Two-thirds ($n = 8$) of 2015 graduates completed the 2-year **Master's Alumni Follow-Up Survey**. Alumni rated their development of knowledge and understanding in the CACREP core areas on a scale of 0 (not very well) to 2 (very well). The highest-rated areas were counseling skills ($M = 2.0$), professional orientation and ethical practice ($M = 1.88$), social and cultural diversity ($M = 1.88$), career development ($M = 1.75$), group counseling ($M = 1.75$), and counseling theories ($M = 1.63$). The lowest-rated areas were human growth and development ($M = 1.38$), crisis ($M = 1.25$), assessment and testing ($M = 1.00$), and program evaluation and development ($M = 1.00$).
- A total of 13 site supervisors who hosted UT internship students completed the formal **Site Supervisor Survey** and rated performance on a scale of 0 (not very well) to 2 (very well). Supervisors indicated strong levels of preparation across most core areas with several outliers indicating greatest areas for improvement related to assessment and testing, research and program evaluation, and crisis.
 - Professional orientation ($M = 1.85$, $SD = 0.38$)
 - Social and cultural diversity ($M = 1.92$, $SD = 0.28$)
 - Human growth and development ($M = 1.85$, $SD = 0.38$)
 - Career development ($M = 1.69$, $SD = 0.48$)
 - Essential counseling skills ($M = 1.77$, $SD = 0.44$)
 - Counseling theories ($M = 1.92$, $SD = 0.28$)
 - Crisis ($M = 1.54$, $SD = 0.52$)
 - Group ($M = 1.85$, $SD = 0.38$)
 - Assessment and testing ($M = 1.33$, $SD = 0.65$)
 - Research and program evaluation ($M = 1.31$, $SD = 0.75$)

Objective 2: Graduates will be able to develop therapeutic relationships that are deeply healing, culturally sensitive, developmentally appropriate, and ethical.

- On the alumni survey, graduates often endorsed the highest rating “very well” regarding their preparation to develop deeply healing therapeutic relationships ($M = 1.88$).
- Site supervisors were nearly unanimous in rating preparation to develop deeply healing therapeutic relationships as very well ($M = 1.92$)
- To assess this objective more thoroughly, the program implemented revised field experience forms and tracking systems in Fall 2016.

- Examination of final ratings by internship site supervisors ($n = 16$) indicated very strong endorsement of relationship skills in practice. Specific ratings were as follows:
 - Establishes emotional connections and builds rapport with clients/students ($M = 1.94$)
 - Conveys empathy, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness ($M = 1.94$)
 - Demonstrates active listening skills relevant to content, feeling, and meaning (e.g., paraphrasing, reflection of content, reflection of feeling, reflection of meaning, reflection of themes, summarization) ($M = 1.88$)
 - Uses appropriate questioning skills (e.g., open-ended, probing, therapeutically) ($M = 1.88$)
 - Uses effective nonverbal communication (e.g., eye contact, head nods, voice, tone, posture; external behavior consistent with internal affect; appropriate timing) ($M = 2.00$)
- Counseling skills rated least strongly by site supervisors included collaboration with stakeholders ($M = 1.69$), assessment for imminent danger and intervention ($M = 1.69$), and use of theory-based interventions and techniques ($M = 1.63$).
- Site supervisors indicated good endorsement of developmental sensitivity ($M = 1.75$), attention to culture ($M = 1.87$), and integration of theory, culture, and development in case conceptualization ($M = 1.69$)

Objective 3: Graduates will demonstrate professional dispositions including Commitment, Openness, Respect, Integrity, and Self-Awareness.

- On the alumni survey, three-quarters of graduates often endorsed the highest rating “very well” regarding cultivation of professional dispositions ($M = 1.75$).
- Site supervisors were nearly unanimous in rating preparation to cultivate professional dispositions as very well ($M = 1.92$).
- The program prides itself on unified attention to professional dispositions (CORIS) from admissions to coursework to field experiences. To assist in exploring this objective more thoroughly in the future, the program implemented revised annual student review and feedback systems with attention to CORIS in Fall 2016.
- Final ratings by internship site supervisors ($n = 16$) indicated very strong endorsement of student dispositions: commitment ($M = 1.94$), openness ($M = 1.88$), respect ($M = 1.88$), integrity ($M = 1.94$), self-awareness ($M = 1.75$). These findings are consistent with faculty ratings during systematic student assessment.

Objective 4: Graduates will be culturally sensitive and ethical advocates for self, clients, and profession through counseling interventions, programming, and professional and community engagement.

- Comprehensive examination ratings on advocacy items indicated an average score of 0.93 (slightly below Meets Expectations)
- On the alumni survey, alumni rated preparation for advocacy the lowest of all areas ($M = 1.38$).
- In contrast, site supervisors were nearly unanimous in rating advocacy competencies as very well ($M = 1.92$).
- To assist in exploring this objective more thoroughly, the program implemented revised field experience forms and tracking systems in Fall 2016. Site supervisors ($n = 16$) indicated students were strong, respectful advocates for clients ($M = 1.81$) and the counseling profession ($M = 1.63$)

Objective 5 - CMHC: Graduates will be well-skilled in the full range of tasks needed for clinical mental health counseling including interventions for prevention and treatment of a broad range of mental health issues; roles of mental health counselors; and settings and service delivery models.

- Comprehensive examination ratings on CMHC setting items indicated an average score of 1.05 (Meets Expectations).
- Only 2 CMHC graduates completed the survey, CMHC alumni ($n = 2$) reported satisfactory preparation for a full range of tasks for CMHC ($M = 1.00$) and techniques and interventions ($M = 1.00$). They indicated concern related to assessment and diagnosis ($M = 0.00$), integrated care ($M = 0.50$), and advocacy ($M = 0.50$). Results should be viewed with caution given very small sample size.
- CMHC site supervisors ($n = 11$) were quite positive regarding ratings for a full range of tasks needed for CMHC ($M = 1.80$) and strategies for advocating ($M = 1.80$); however, they indicated opportunity for growth related to assessment and diagnosis for treatment planning ($M = 1.40$) and techniques and interventions for a broad range of issues ($M = 1.40$).
- To assist in exploring this objective more thoroughly, the program implemented revised field experience forms and tracking systems in Fall 2016. Although they still indicated satisfaction with specific interns' performance, CMHC site supervisors ($n = 8$) rated these work areas lower than all other areas on the evaluation form: navigates service delivery models and programs ($M = 1.57$), uses formal and information assessment strategies to guide diagnosis and assessment ($M = 1.43$), and demonstrates effective case management skills ($M = 1.43$).

Objective 5 – SC: Graduates will be well-skilled in the full range of tasks needed to coordinate a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program that addresses the academic, career, and social-emotional development of K-12 students.

- Comprehensive examination ratings on SC items indicated an average score of 0.88, a decrease of 0.25 from 2015-2016.
- SC graduates ($n = 6$) who completed the survey reported strengths in techniques of personal/social counseling ($M = 2.00$) and use of accountability data ($M = 1.50$). They were generally satisfied with a full range of tasks, interventions to promote academic development, and interventions to promote college and career readiness ($M = 1.33$).
- Among site supervisors ($n = 8$), there was most positive consensus regarding techniques of personal/social counseling ($M = 2.00$) and interventions to promote college and career readiness ($M = 1.63$). The lowest-rated items related to full range of tasks ($M = 1.50$), use of accountability data ($M = 1.50$), and interventions to promote academic development ($M = 1.38$).
- To assist in exploring this objective more thoroughly, the program implemented revised field experience forms and tracking systems in Fall 2016. SC site supervisors ($n = 8$) rated individual interns' performance specific SC tasks strongly: promotes academic development ($M = 1.88$), promotes college and career readiness ($M = 2.00$), promotes social-emotional development ($M = 2.00$), and engages in opportunities to be an advocate for all students ($M = 1.88$). They rated two areas low relative to others: demonstrates skills for developing and managing a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program ($M = 1.50$) and demonstrates accountability by using data and sharing results ($M = 1.63$).

Other Quality Indicators

- Alumni rated their overall preparation strongly ($M = 1.75$): 6 said they were *very prepared* and two said they were *prepared*. Alumni noted strengths in overall program experience ($M = 1.86$), accessibility of faculty ($M = 1.86$), feedback from faculty ($M = 1.86$), quality of advising ($M = 1.71$), quality of instruction ($M = 1.71$), and quality of field experience ($M = 1.71$). Although still satisfied, alumni rated program coverage of relevant content less favorably ($M = 1.43$).
- Site supervisors rated the program's overall quality of preparation very favorably: 11 indicated excellent and 2 indicated good ($M = 1.85$); no one rated the program as needing improvement.
- Site supervisors rated quality of communication and support from program faculty favorably ($M = 1.69$). No participant rated support as needing improvement.

MS Program Changes, Improvements, and Response

- The program updated to 2016 CACREP standards in AY 2015-2016; this update involved minor adaptations throughout curriculum and an upgrade to a 60-hour SC program beginning with those who enrolled in Fall 2016. SC program changes include three new required courses: *Counseling Children and Adolescents*, *Psychopathology in School and Mental Health Settings*, and *Methods of Teaching Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*. Students may also select one *additional* elective. These additions will likely address requests for depth of coverage in certain areas, especially as they relate to the academic environment. The program should closely monitor impact of new curriculum on student outcomes.
- In 2015-2016, the program piloted standardized rubrics for use with comprehensive examinations, and these procedures were implemented in full during 2016-2017. The program will need to establish baseline understanding prior to making changes based on these rubrics.
- In 2015, the faculty implemented a revised course *COUN 545 Critical Issues in Counseling: Lifespan Development* to meet the core curricular area and to include attention to crisis and addiction. These areas emerged as areas that may need improvement based on student performance and feedback. As students who completed the new course move through the program, the faculty should monitor impact of this course on student experience.
- The faculty should consider opportunities to enhance attention to program evaluation, especially as students take this coursework outside the program area.
- During the systematic program evaluation meeting in Spring 2017, the faculty discussed student need for preparedness related to crisis intervention. This course is currently offered as an elective every other year. Faculty will discuss role of this course in Fall 2017 planning meeting.
- During the systematic program evaluation meeting in Spring 2017, the faculty discussed observations that students were overloaded with curriculum in the summer semester. In Fall 2017, faculty will explore curricular timing and sequencing to optimize learning.
- During the systematic program evaluation meeting in Spring 2017, the faculty discussed a pattern of strong applications from out of state but loss of qualified applicants due to funding. The faculty is currently exploring opportunities to strengthen diversity of program via support for out of state applicants. The faculty also implemented a follow-up survey for applicants who declined our invitations to attend the program. Beginning in Spring 2018, the faculty will utilize on-campus interviews in attempts to better reach diverse applicants.
- During the systematic program evaluation meeting in Spring 2017, the faculty discussed need for a more unified counseling environment to assist with hands-on practice and engagement exercises. The faculty is exploring this initiative with the department head.

Counselor Education Doctoral Program Evaluation Findings

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, all rubrics and evaluation forms are completed using a 3-point scale where 0 = does not meet expectations, 1 = meets expectations, and 2 = exceeds expectations. Thus, an average of 1 indicates acceptable performance. Means below 1 indicate opportunity for improvement. Means closer to 2 indicate very strong performance.

Objective 1: Graduates will explore and engage in culturally sensitive, developmentally appropriate, ethical, and evidence-informed counseling relationships that prepare them to train master's level professionals and contribute to the development of counseling theory and practice.

- Three students sat for the comprehensive examination in Summer 2017. Rubrics involved a 0 = Does Not Meet Expectations, 1 = Meets Expectations, and 2 = Exceeds Expectations scale and were blind rated by 3 faculty members. Ratings for the counseling area were as follows:
 - Theoretical conceptualization – $M = 0.78$
 - Evidence-based practice - $M = 0.67$
 - Legal, ethical, and cultural strategies – $M = 1.00$
 - Developmental considerations – $M = 1.11$
 - Systemic understanding – $M = 1.11$
 - Professional writing style – $M = 1.00$
- A total of 7 students completed COUN 655, doctoral practicum, this academic year. Faculty supervisor ratings indicated highest performance related to professional work behaviors ($M = 1.86$) and developmental and cultural sensitivity ($M = 1.71$). The remaining areas ranged from $M = 1.14 - 1.29$ (therapeutic relationship skills, intervention skills, planning skills, case conceptualization skills, and management of ethical and legal considerations).
- Two 2015 graduates rated their counseling preparation very well, and one rated it well.

Objective 2: Graduates will provide culturally sensitive, ethical and developmentally appropriate supervisory relationships that promote skills of developing clinicians and provide gatekeeping for the profession.

- Three students sat for this comprehensive examination. Ratings for the supervision were:
 - Roles and responsibilities – $M = 0.78$
 - Theoretical foundations – $M = 0.89$
 - Evaluation, remediation, and gatekeeping – $M = 0.78$
 - Legal, ethical, and cultural considerations – $M = 0.78$
 - Integration – $M = 1.00$
 - Professional writing – $M = 0.78$
- A total of 10 final supervision internship rating forms were completed by faculty instructors during AY 2016-2017. The most highly rated areas were related to student dispositions ($M = 1.9$) and management of ethical and legal considerations ($M = 1.7$). The lowest rated items were evaluation, remediation, and gatekeeping skills ($M = 1.0$) and application of theoretical frameworks and models ($M = 1.1$).
- Alumni ($n = 3$) were unanimous in rating their supervision preparation very well.

Objective 3: Graduates will demonstrate culturally sensitive, developmentally appropriate, and ethical teaching, assessment, and evaluation methods relevant to educating counselors.

- Three students sat for this comprehensive examination. Ratings for teaching were as follows:
 - Pedagogy – $M = 1.22$
 - Instructional design and delivery – $M = 1.00$
 - Assessment of learning – $M = 0.89$
 - Integration – $M = 1.11$
 - Professional writing style – $M = 0.89$
- A total of 6 final teaching internship rating forms were completed by faculty instructors during AY 2016-2017. The most highly rated areas were related to student dispositions ($M = 2.0$), management of ethical and legal considerations ($M = 1.5$), developmental and cultural sensitivity ($M = 1.5$), and professional work behaviors ($M = 1.5$). The lowest rated item was instructional and curriculum design and delivery ($M = 1.0$).
- Two 2015 graduates rated their teaching preparation well, and one rated it very well.

Objective 4: Graduates will comprehend and apply diverse methods for answering research questions relevant to the counseling profession.

- Three students sat for this comprehensive examination. Ratings were as follows:
 - Rationale for research – $M = 0.89$
 - Research question - $M = 0.89$
 - Research design – $M = 1.11$
 - Data analysis – $M = 1.00$
 - Full conceptualization – $M = 1.00$
 - Professional writing – $M = 1.00$
- To assist in exploring this objective more thoroughly, the program implemented a dissertation rubric at end of Fall 2016; however, no dissertations were defended by Spring 2017.
- Examination of student annual reports indicated that multiple students were recognized for scholarship in the last two academic years. These included multiple college awards: Outstanding Doctoral Dissertation, First Place recognition at Annual Graduate Student Research Colloquium, Dean's Award for Student of Excellence, and Dean's Award for Professional Development.
- Annual reports for current students reported a total of 12 peer-reviewed journal articles and 22 other scholarly works. In the last 2 years, current doctoral students have made more than 180 professional, peer-reviewed presentations at conferences (unduplicated count).
- Two 2015 graduates rated their research preparation well, and one rated it very well.

Objective 5: Graduates will be culturally sensitive and ethical advocates and leaders for self, clients, and the counseling profession through interventions, programming, and professional and community engagement.

- Three students sat for this comprehensive examination. Ratings were as follows:
 - Theories and skills of leadership – $M = 1.33$
 - Current topical issues – $M = 1.22$
 - Professional advocacy – $M = 1.11$
 - Multicultural and social justice considerations – $M = 1.22$
 - Integration – $M = 1.22$

- Professional writing – $M = 1.00$
- A total of 8 final leadership internship rating forms were completed by faculty instructors during AY 2016-2017. The most highly rated areas were administrative skills ($M = 1.86$), attention to multicultural and social justice issues ($M = 1.57$), and professional work behaviors ($M = 1.57$). The lowest-rated areas were focused on application of theories and skills of leadership ($M = 1.14$) and application of advocacy models and competencies ($M = 1.00$).
- Examination of student annual reports indicated that students are very active in service to the profession. Sample engagements over the last two academic years included appointed and elected positions in local (SMCA, WTCA), state (TCDA, TLPCA, TACES, TCA, TSCA), regional (SACES), and national (ACA, ADEC, AHC, NCD, CSI, NBCC, ACC, ASCA, AMHCA) professional associations. Students also reported engagement as editorial reviewers for *Journal of Research in Education* and *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*. Finally, students reported a broad range of community engagement at UT and beyond.
- During 2015-2017, multiple students were recognized for leadership and advocacy including selection of students as CSI Leadership Fellows (2 students), CSI Leadership Intern, CES Editorial Fellow, SACES Emerging Leaders (3 students), NBCC Minority Fellow, AHC Emerging Leader, and ACES Emerging Leader.
- Two 2015 graduates rated their leadership and advocacy preparation very well, and one rated it well.

Objective 6: Graduates will demonstrate professional dispositions including Commitment, Openness, Respect, Integrity, and Self-Awareness.

- During this year, the faculty rolled out evaluation forms with focused attention to CORIS.
- Two 2015 graduates rated cultivation of dispositions very well, and one rated it well.
- The faculty conducted a holistic evaluation of student progress, including attention to dispositions. Mean ratings for CORIS items were 1.42 ($SD = 0.52$)

Other Indicators

- Alumni rated their satisfaction with program experiences on a scale from 0 (dissatisfied or not very satisfied) to 2 (very satisfied). Participants were unanimous in rating quality of advising, quality of instruction, and overall program experience as *very satisfied*. The following areas received *very satisfied* ratings from two of three participants: overall preparation, accessibility of faculty, feedback from faculty, quality of practicum and internship, collaborative relationships in teaching/supervision, and collaborative relationships in research/scholarship. The lowest-rated area was program coverage of relevant content; all three participants noted *satisfied*.
- A sample of clinical site supervisors ($n = 6$ of 8), counselor education faculty site supervisors ($n = 4$ of 8), and an employer ($n = 1$) rated their perceptions of program preparation in the five core areas on a scale of 0 (not very well) to 2 (very well); they were asked to opt out of responses for which they were not familiar. They indicated comparable levels of preparation across core areas: counseling ($M = 1.57$, $SD = 0.33$), supervision ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.53$), teaching ($M = 1.50$, $SD = 0.53$), research and scholarship ($M = 1.63$, $SD = 0.52$), leadership ($M = 1.44$, $SD = 0.33$), and advocacy ($M = 1.56$, $SD = 0.73$).

PhD Program Changes and Improvements

- As with other areas in this report, the Doctoral Program in Counselor Education is in the midst of several transitions related to faculty decisions in past years and adoption of the 2016 CACREP Standards. Results above represent feedback and performance from students at various parts in the adoption process. This includes revision of course sequencing and internship requirements to best support development. For example, beginning in Spring 2017, all doctoral students took their first supervision internship concurrent with enrollment in the supervision course.
- In 2015-2016, the program faculty revised doctoral field experience requirements to include two sequential semesters of teaching experience, two sequential semesters of internship experience, and experience in one other area (counseling or leadership) of a student's choice, and one credit of free-choice internship from among the four areas. This change was in response to faculty and student observations. The faculty will continue to monitor the impact on student performance and satisfaction.
- In response to student and graduate feedback, comprehensive examination results, and faculty observations, the faculty began requiring a 1-credit dissertation seminar for advanced doctoral students beginning in Spring 2017. The faculty will continue to monitor the impact on student performance and satisfaction.
- In AY 2016-2017, the program fully implemented standardized rubric ratings on comprehensive examinations, standardized field experience ratings, an annual student reporting process, and a dissertation rubric. The program also substantially revised alumni and site supervisor follow-up surveys in the hopes of better understanding experiences and needs over time. The faculty is currently exploring conflicting results between faculty experiences and student performance on standardized rubrics.
- After discussion at the Spring 2017 systematic program evaluation meeting, the faculty identified a need to ease students into research mentorship. Beginning in Fall 2017 this will include more focused attention to structuring ideas within academic writing (implemented in COUN 650) and assignment of first year doctoral students to ongoing research teams.