



THE UNIVERSITY OF  
**TENNESSEE**  
KNOXVILLE

DEPARTMENT OF  
EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY  
AND COUNSELING

**Counselor Education Programs  
2019 Program Evaluation Report**

**Vital Statistics**

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

	CMHC	SC	PhD
<b>Currently enrolled students</b>	22 + 15 new	12 + 11 new	18 + 4 new
<b>Graduates in 2018-2019</b>	9	5	6
<b>Program completion rate</b>	11/15 73%	9/9 100%	13/15 87%
<b>Employment rate</b>	9/9 100%	5/5 100%	6/6 100%
<b>National Counselor Examination Pass</b>	5/5 100%	n/a	n/a
<b>Professional School Counselor Praxis Pass</b>	n/a	6/6 100%	n/a

- Reports generated for Summer 2018, Fall 2018, Spring 2019.
- CMHC = MS in Clinical Mental Health Counseling, SC = MS in School Counseling, PhD = Counselor Education Doctoral Program.
- Program completion rate computed on rolling basis and 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. All graduates reporting.

## Program Objectives & Major Program Activities

The program faculty engaged in a number of activities relevant to this report. During the 2018-2019 Academic Year (AY18-19):

- the faculty prepared to implement curricular updates that will begin in Fall 2019
- the program continued to implement new face-to-face admissions processes and follow-up surveys for MS applicants
- the program submitted a self-study for CACREP reaccreditation and was granted a site visit for late Fall 2019 or early Spring 2020.

## Sources of Data

The following sources of data were utilized in developing this report

- Graduate performance on the National Counselor Examination (NCE)
- Graduate performance on the Professional School Counselor Praxis Examination (SC-Praxis)
- Student performance on the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE)
- Student performance on essay 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 AY18-19 cycle
- Faculty observations and discussions during systematic program evaluation meetings held at the end of each fall and spring semester, systematic student assessment meetings held toward the end of each fall and spring semester, and the annual planning retreat held at the end of each summer semester

## 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

- The program used the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE) as an exit examination and key performance indicator (KPI) throughout the academic year. A total of 9 students sat for this examination. Individual student results were converted to Z-scores so that a 0 indicates performance at the national standard deviation, and positive or negative values indicate distance from the national standard deviation. The mean total score was more than one standard deviation higher than the national norm ( $M = 1.23$ ,  $SD = 1.36$ ), and all but one student passed the examination (student passed on second examination). **Counseling & Helping Relationships** and **Assessment** received highest ratings, and **Social & Cultural Diversity** received the lowest ratings. Overall, there was greater spread in scores compared to previous years. Mean ratings are highlighted below.
  - Professional orientation and ethical practice  $M = 0.70$  ( $SD = 1.45$ )

- Social and cultural diversity  $M = 0.21$  ( $SD = 1.28$ )
  - Human growth and development  $M = 0.89$  ( $SD = 1.09$ )
  - Career development  $M = 0.61$  ( $SD = 1.27$ )
  - Helping relationships  $M = 1.42$  ( $SD = 0.78$ )
  - Group work  $M = 0.66$  ( $SD = 1.09$ )
  - Assessment and testing  $M = 1.12$  ( $SD = 0.90$ )
  - Research & program evaluation  $M = 0.72$  ( $SD = 0.97$ )
- Five students sat for and reported passing the NCE, maintaining the program's 100% first attempt pass rate. However, at time of this writing CCE had only made score reports available for Fall 2018 ( $n = 3$ ). We converted aggregate scores to z-scores to compare our students' performance to the national mean. Mean total scores were 1.62 SD above the national mean, and all subscale scores were also above the national mean. **Professional Orientation and Ethical Practice, Helping Relationships, and Career Development** received highest scores. **Assessment, Social and Cultural Diversity, and Research and Program Evaluation** received lowest scores. For work behaviors, **Professional Practice** and **Counseling Process** scales were strongest. Z-scores are provided below.
    - Professional orientation and ethical practice 0.69
    - Social and cultural diversity 1.22
    - Human growth and development 1.14
    - Career development 1.64
    - Helping relationships 1.62
    - Group work 0.88
    - Assessment and testing 0.88
    - Research & program evaluation 1.66
    - Fundamental counseling issues 1.73
    - Diagnostic and assessment services 1.32
    - Professional development, sup, and con 0.24
    - Professional practice 1.63
    - Counseling process 1.44
  - Consistent with prior years, the program had a 100% ( $n = 6$ ) pass rate for SC students who sat for the Professional School Counselor Praxis examination in AY18-19. Scores ranged from 164 to 188 ( $M = 176.33$ ,  $SD = 11.41$ ). This is well-above the minimum score required for passing in TN (156) and somewhat higher than ETS-reported median scores (170). Due to a change in how scores were reported to the university, subscale analysis is not possible this year. In all, it appears graduates have solid foundation knowledge for the School Counseling setting.
  - 56% ( $n = 9$  of 16) of 2017 graduates completed the 2-year **Master's Alumni Follow-Up Survey**; these included 4 CMHC students and 5 SC students. Alumni rated their development of knowledge and understanding in the CACREP core areas on the following scale: 0=not very well, 1=well, and to 2=very well. The highest-rated areas were *professional orientation and ethical practice* ( $M = 1.89$ ), *counseling skills* ( $M = 1.67$ ), and *social and cultural diversity* ( $M = 1.56$ ). The lowest-rated areas were *research and program evaluation* ( $M = 0.67$ ), *assessment and testing* ( $M = 0.89$ ), and *crisis* ( $M = 1.00$ ).
  - 69% ( $n = 11$  of 16) site supervisors who hosted UT internship students completed the formal **Site Supervisor Survey** and rated overall program performance on a scale of 0=not very well, 1= well, and 2=very well. Supervisors indicated strong levels of preparation across most core areas with several outliers indicating greatest strengths in *essential counseling skills* and *professional orientation and ethical practice*; they noted greatest areas for improvement related to

*assessment and testing* and *crisis*. Scores were considerably higher for this group of interns compared to last year, typically increasing about 0.30.

- Professional orientation and ethical practice  $M = 1.73$
- Social and cultural diversity  $M = 1.64$
- Human growth and development  $M = 1.64$
- Career development  $M = 1.64$
- Essential counseling skills  $M = 1.82$
- Counseling theories  $M = 1.64$
- Crisis  $M = 1.36$
- Group  $M = 1.45$
- Assessment and testing  $M = 1.18$
- Research and program evaluation  $M = 1.45$

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

- Alumni often endorsed the highest rating “very well” regarding their preparation to develop deeply healing therapeutic relationships ( $M = 1.89$ ).
- Site supervisors were nearly unanimous in rating preparation to develop deeply healing therapeutic relationships as very well ( $M = 1.91$ )
- Final Internship II ratings by site supervisors ( $n = 11$ ) indicated very strong endorsement of relationship skills in practice. Specific ratings were as follows:
  - Establishes emotional connections and builds rapport with clients/students ( $M = 1.91$ )
  - Conveys empathy, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness ( $M = 1.91$ )
  - 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) ( $M = 1.72$ )
  - Uses appropriate questioning skills (e.g., open-ended, probing, therapeutically relevant) ( $M = 1.72$ )
- Counseling skills rated least strongly by site supervisors included
  - Demonstrates intentional use of theory-based interventions and techniques ( $M = 1.54$ ).
  - Demonstrates ability to assess for imminent danger and intervene effectively (e.g., crisis, suicide, abuse/neglect) ( $M = 1.54$ )
  - Collaborates with stakeholders in clients/students’ lives (e.g., family, school, workplace, other helpers) ( $M = 1.54$ )
- Site supervisors indicated very strong endorsement of ethical sensitivity and behavior ( $M = 1.91$ ) and strong endorsement of developmental sensitivity ( $M = 1.72$ ), attention to culture ( $M = 1.63$ ), and integration of theory, culture, and development in case conceptualization ( $M = 1.54$ ).

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

- All alumni noted that the program cultivated professional dispositions “CORIS” with two-thirds rating preparation as “very well” and one-third rating “well” ( $M = 1.67$ )
- Site supervisors also rated preparation to cultivate professional dispositions highly ( $M = 1.91$ ).
- Final Internship II ratings by site supervisors ( $n = 11$ ) indicated very strong endorsement of student dispositions: commitment ( $M = 1.91$ ), openness ( $M = 1.91$ ), respect ( $M = 1.91$ ), integrity ( $M = 1.82$ ), and self-awareness ( $M = 1.82$ ). These findings are consistent with faculty ratings.

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

- Alumni rated preparation for advocacy as falling between “well” and “very well” ( $M = 1.56$ ).
- Site supervisors also rated preparation to advocate for self, clients, and profession favorably ( $M = 1.72$ ).
- On final Internship II evaluations, site supervisors ( $n = 11$ ) indicated students were strong, respectful advocates for clients ( $M = 1.64$ ) and the counseling profession ( $M = 1.70$ ).

**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.**

- 5 CMHC students sat for the essay comprehensive examination during this assessment cycle. All students passed the essay. Rubric scores indicated strengths applying the following items to CMHC settings: social and cultural diversity ( $M = 1.47$ ), advocacy ( $M = 1.23$ ), and overall integration ( $M = 1.23$ ). Lower-rated areas included human growth and development ( $M = 1.13$ ), service delivery models ( $M = 1.13$ ), counselor roles ( $M = 1.00$ ), and program evaluation ( $M = 1.10$ ).
- CMHC graduates ( $n = 4$ ) who completed the 2-year alumni survey reported strongest preparation for a full range of tasks for CMHC ( $M = 1.75$ ). Their lowest rankings related to techniques and interventions for a broad range of mental health issues ( $M = 1.00$ ), assessment and diagnosis for treatment planning and caseload management ( $M = 1.25$ ), interdisciplinary strategies ( $M = 1.25$ ), and advocacy strategies ( $M = 1.25$ ).
- CMHC site supervisors ( $n = 4$ ) were quite positive in most areas, rating preparation for a full range of tasks ( $M = 1.75$ ), techniques and interventions ( $M = 1.75$ ), interdisciplinary strategies ( $M = 1.75$ ), and advocacy strategies ( $M = 1.75$ ) strongly. They rated assessment and diagnosis for treatment planning and caseload management lowest ( $M = 1.50$ ).
- On final Internship II evaluations, CMHC site supervisors ( $n = 4$ ) rated student performance specific to CMHC settings as meeting or exceeding expectations: navigates service delivery models and programs ( $M = 1.75$ ), uses formal and information assessment strategies to guide diagnosis and assessment ( $M = 1.50$ ), and demonstrates effective case management skills ( $M = 1.50$ ).

**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.**

- 4 SC students sat for the essay comprehensive examination during this assessment cycle. All students passed the essay. Rubric scores indicated strengths applying the following items to SC settings: social and cultural diversity ( $M = 1.29$ ), human growth and development ( $M = 1.21$ ), advocacy ( $M = 1.17$ ), service delivery models ( $M = 1.21$ ), and overall integration ( $M = 1.29$ ). Lower-rated areas included: counselor roles ( $M = 1.04$ ) and program evaluation ( $M = 0.96$ ).

- SC graduates ( $n = 5$ ) who completed the 2-year alumni survey reported strengths in techniques of personal/social counseling ( $M = 1.60$ ). They were less favorable in ratings related to full range of tasks for school counseling ( $M = 1.00$ ), interventions to promote academic development ( $M = 0.80$ ), interventions to promote college and career readiness ( $M = 0.80$ ), and accountability ( $M = 0.60$ ). It is important to note that these alumni were attending the program immediately prior to the shift to 60 credit hours *and* during a time of faculty transition. These contextual factors are likely at play in their ratings. Evaluation from the next academic year will more accurately represent the current program.
- Among site supervisors ( $n = 7$ ), there was most positive consensus regarding preparation for techniques of personal/social counseling ( $M = 1.86$ ), accountability ( $M = 1.86$ ), and a full range of tasks needed for school counseling ( $M = 1.71$ ). Site supervisors were generally satisfied with interventions to promote college and career readiness ( $M = 1.57$ ); however, there was more opportunity for growth related to promotion of academic development ( $M = 1.29$ ).
- On final Internship II evaluations, SC site supervisors ( $n = 7$ ) rated student performance specific to SC settings strongly: demonstrates skills for developing and managing a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program ( $M = 1.57$ ), promotes academic development ( $M = 1.86$ ), promotes college and career readiness ( $M = 1.71$ ), promotes social-emotional development ( $M = 2.00$ ), engages in opportunities to be an advocate for all students ( $M = 2.00$ ), and demonstrates accountability by using data and sharing results ( $M = 1.86$ ).

### Other Quality Indicators

- Alumni rated their overall preparation favorably ( $M = 1.33$ ): 6 said they were *prepared* and 3 said they were *very prepared* to enter the field. All alumni reported satisfaction with overall program experience ( $M = 1.44$ ), with 5 reporting they were *satisfied* and 4 reporting they were *very satisfied*.
- Alumni noted strengths in quality of instruction in courses ( $M = 1.78$ ) and quality of practicum and internships ( $M = 1.78$ ). They were satisfied with accessibility of faculty ( $M = 1.44$ ), feedback from faculty ( $M = 1.44$ ), and quality of advising ( $M = 1.33$ ). Although still satisfied, alumni rated program coverage of relevant content less favorably ( $M = 1.00$ ).
- Narrative exploration of written feedback by alumni indicated identified strengths in practicum and internship experience; courses on theories, ethics, and skills; and personal awareness/development/communication. Areas for growth included inconsistency in the diagnosis course and opportunities to update course content to match current practice.
- Site supervisors rated the program's overall quality of preparation very favorably: all 11 rated this item as "excellent" ( $M = 2.00$ ).
- Site supervisors rated quality of communication and support from program faculty favorably ( $M = 1.73$ ). No participant rated support as needing improvement

### MS Program Changes, Improvements, and Response

- To understand results in context, one must understand that 2019 alumni participants completed their programs in 2018; they started the program in 2014 or 2015. In the time since these alumni began enrollment in the program, the faculty hired three new core faculty members and rolled out full implementation of 2016 CACREP Standards. Some of these changes will address discrepancies between current student performance as evidenced by examinations and field experience ratings and 2-year alumni data. The program should monitor impact of new curriculum on outcomes.

- Beginning in Spring 2018, the program required *Applied Suicide Intervention Skills Training (ASIST)*, a 2-day, 15-hour standardized suicide intervention curriculum prior to seeing clients in *COUN 555 Practicum in Counseling*. This responds to feedback regarding opportunities for growth related to crisis. This requirement continued during this year as the faculty prepares to implement a required course in crisis for those who begin the program in Fall 2019.
- In Spring 2018, the program held the first on-campus interviews in attempts to better reach diverse applicants. In addition, the program employed a follow-up survey designed to help us understand why students choose to attend other programs. Faculty discussed survey findings in Fall 2018 planning retreat and continued to attend carefully to supporting out-of-state candidates. This included nomination of diverse candidates for EPC diversity fellowship and support for assistantship-seeking on campus. These efforts have resulted in enhanced regional and demographic diversity among MS cohorts beginning Fall 2018 and Fall 2019.
- Over the past three years, the faculty has discussed the need for a unified counseling environment to assist with hands-on practice and engagement exercises throughout the curriculum. During this academic year, renovations and furnishing of a clinic environment were completed, and we went live with a state-of-the-art recording and observation system to be used throughout the program. In Fall 2019, the program will open the Counselor Training Clinic, offering free supplemental counseling services to the university community.
- Although not explicitly reflected in official program data, during the most recent academic year the faculty became aware of opportunities to incorporate more explicit attention to diversity and inclusion within our program as a whole, specific courses, and in context of a series of critical incidents on campus. This led to a series of faculty and student dialogues and ultimately resulted in several initiatives to solidify our commitment to “culturally sensitive, developmentally appropriate, and ethical” practice. In Summer 2019, we organized a committee of faculty members, MS students, and PhD students to examine formal and informal curricula and propose initiatives to bolster attention to diversity and inclusion. In addition, the group launched a “summer challenge” for community members to take action related to their own multicultural counseling competence. Approximately ½ of our community joined the challenge and have engaged in conversation and exploration. We will continue to report on findings and activities related to this area.
- The faculty continues to implement changes inspired by recent program evaluation activities. These changes include.
  - In response to scores and feedback about research and program evaluation, the program met with Educational Statistics and Measurement faculty to discuss students’ needs and potential solutions. This conversation resulted in a change from *EDPY 550 Applied Statistical Concepts* to *EDPY 682 Educational Research Methods*. Beginning in Spring 2018, we encouraged all students to begin substituting this course. Students who begin in AY18-19 are all taking a special section of EDPY 682 offered for COUN majors. Beginning AY19-20, EDPY 682 is required.
  - In response to feedback about inconsistencies in the diagnosis and treatment planning course given rotating teaching schedules between Counselor Education and School Psychology faculty members, we determined that this course needed to be taught by a core faculty member. In AY18-19, the department offered separate sections unique to discipline. Beginning in AY19-20, this course will be relocated to a long semester to accommodate psychopharmacology content. *COUN 540 Psychopharmacology for School and Mental Health Settings* will be discontinued.
  - Beginning in AY19-20, all MS students will be required to take *COUN 563 Crisis Intervention for Counselors*. Those who began in AY18-19 were strongly advised to complete as an elective.

- Beginning in AY19-20, all MS students will be required to take *COUN 541 Counseling for Addictions in School and Mental Health Settings*. Those who began in AY18-19 were strongly advised to complete as an elective.
- Beginning in AY19-20, crisis and addiction will be removed from *COUN 545 Lifespan Development and Wellness in Counseling* so students have an entire semester focused on development, including attention to family systems as noted in stakeholder surveys.
- Beginning in AY19-20, the program will roll out a new course sequence designed to distribute student workload and better meet their developmental needs.
- Over the next three years, the faculty will continue to assess impact of these changes on student and stakeholder experience.



## 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 exceptionally 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 during AY18-19. Essays were blind rated by 3 faculty members. Ratings for the counseling area were lower compared to the previous, unusually high, year:
  - Theoretical conceptualization  $M = 0.89$
  - Evidence-based practice  $M = 0.67$
  - Legal, ethical, and cultural strategies  $M = 1.00$
  - Developmental considerations  $M = 0.89$
  - Systemic understanding  $M = 1.00$
  - Professional writing style  $M = 1.00$
- Eight students completed COUN 655, doctoral practicum, this academic year. Faculty supervisor ratings indicated highest performance related to therapeutic relationship ( $M = 1.75$ ) and intervention skills ( $M = 1.75$ ) and planning skills ( $M = 1.63$ ). Several areas were evaluated between meets and exceeds (developmental and cultural sensitivity, professional work behaviors. Areas with the greatest opportunity for growth were case conceptualization skills ( $M = 1.13$ ), management of ethical and legal considerations ( $M = 1.00$ ), and CORIS ( $M = 1.25$ ).
- 80% (4 of 5) 2017 graduates responded to the 2-year alumni survey. 75% rated development of knowledge related to advanced counseling knowledge very well, and 1 rated their preparation well ( $M = 1.75$ ). On the item designed to assess this program objective, alumni rated their overall preparation  $M = 1.50$ .

### **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. Results were lower than the previous year, with 2 of 3 students failing this area on first attempt and passing on second attempt. Examination of context revealed less time to complete this item, suggesting scores were more reflective of context than actual learning. Ratings for the supervision area were:
  - Roles and responsibilities  $M = 1.00$
  - Theoretical foundations  $M = 1.00$
  - Evaluation, remediation, and gatekeeping  $M = 0.22$
  - Legal, ethical, and cultural considerations  $M = 0.78$
  - Integration  $M = 0.56$
  - Professional writing  $M = 1.00$

- A total of 11 final supervision internship rating forms were completed by faculty instructors during AY18-19. Strengths were noted in supervisory relationship skills, management of ethical and legal considerations, and dispositions. The greatest opportunities for improvement focused on application of frameworks and models and evaluation, remediation, and gatekeeping skills.
  - Supervisory relationship skills  $M = 1.55$
  - Application of theoretical frameworks and models  $M = 1.18$
  - Evaluation, remediation, and gatekeeping skills  $M = 1.09$
  - Management of ethical and legal considerations  $M = 1.55$
  - Developmental and cultural sensitivity  $M = 1.36$
  - Professional work behaviors  $M = 1.36$
  - Dispositions – CORIS  $M = 1.55$
- Three 2017 graduates rated their development of foundation supervision knowledge very well, and one rated it well ( $M = 1.75$ ). On the item designed to assess this overall program objective, alumni rated their overall preparation as  $M = 1.50$ .

**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. Results showed greatest strength in integration and greatest opportunity in assessment of learning. Ratings were as follows:
  - Pedagogy  $M = 1.00$
  - Instructional design and delivery  $M = 1.00$
  - Assessment of learning  $M = 0.89$
  - Integration  $M = 1.78$
  - Professional writing style  $M = 1.00$
- A total of 9 final teaching internship rating forms were completed by faculty instructors during AY18-19. Ratings for teaching were as follows:
  - Instructional and curriculum design and delivery  $M = 1.22$
  - Application of pedagogical frameworks and models  $M = 1.11$
  - Assessment of learning/student support/remediation  $M = 1.25$
  - Student relationship & classroom management skills  $M = 1.44$
  - Management of ethical and legal considerations  $M = 1.33$
  - Developmental and cultural sensitivity  $M = 1.22$
  - Professional work behaviors  $M = 1.67$
  - Dispositions – CORIS  $M = 1.44$
- Two 2017 graduates rated their development of foundation teaching knowledge very well, and two rated it well ( $M = 1.50$ ). On the item designed to assess this overall program objective, alumni rated their overall preparation somewhat higher  $M = 1.75$ .

**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. Most items showed performance as somewhat lower than expected and lower than previous years. Ratings were as follows:
  - Rationale for research  $M = 0.67$
  - Research question  $M = 0.67$
  - Research design  $M = 0.72$

- Data analysis  $M = 1.00$
- Full conceptualization  $M = 0.78$
- Professional writing  $M = 1.11$
- Dissertation rubrics were available for all 5 dissertations defended during the academic year. In contrast to comprehensive examination ratings collected this year, dissertation rubric ratings showed continuing increases, especially related to presentation of results. Ratings were as follows:
  - Introduction  $M = 1.60$
  - Literature review  $M = 1.60$
  - Methods  $M = 1.50$
  - Results  $M = 1.90$
  - Discussion  $M = 1.50$
  - Overall Style  $M = 1.40$
- Examination of student annual reports indicated that multiple counselor education doctoral students were recognized for scholarship in the last two academic years. These included: NCDG Graduate Student Research Award, Smokey Mountain Counseling Association Graduate Student of the Year (two recipients), Tennessee Association for Counselor Education & Supervision Outstanding Doctoral Student Award, *Counselor Education & Supervision* Editorial Fellow, *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling Graduate Editorial Board*, CEHHS Dean's Professional Award Recipient for Exceptional Academic Work, and ADEC scholarships.
- Over the past two years, annual reports for current students reported a total of 11 peer-reviewed journal articles and 27 other scholarly works.
- In the last 2 years, current doctoral students have made 102 professional, peer-reviewed presentations at conferences.
- During the most recent academic year, all 6 students who completed dissertations received some sort of external funding to support this research.
- One 2017 graduate rated their development of foundation research knowledge very well, and three rated it well ( $M = 1.25$ ). They rated the item designed to assess this overall program objective in the same way.

**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. Whereas other areas were lower than previous years, ratings in this topic area were consistent compared with the previous year. Specific results were as follows:
  - Theories and skills of leadership  $M = 1.00$
  - Current topical issues  $M = 1.11$
  - Professional advocacy  $M = 1.00$
  - Multicultural and social justice considerations  $M = 0.67$
  - Integration  $M = 1.00$
  - Professional writing  $M = 1.22$
- A total of 6 final leadership internship rating forms were completed by faculty instructors during AY18-19. Ratings were as follows:
  - Application of theories and skills of leadership  $M = 1.17$
  - Application of advocacy models and competencies  $M = 1.33$
  - Administrative skills  $M = 1.67$

- Attention to multicultural and social justice issues  $M = 1.83$
- Professional work behaviors  $M = 1.33$
- Dispositions – CORIS  $M = 1.50$
- Examination of two years 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), state (TCA, TACES, TLPCA, TAEOPP, FMCDCA), regional (SACES), and national (CSI, NBCC, EB-ACA, NCDCA, ADEC) professional associations. Students also reported engagement as editorial reviewers for *Counselor Education and Supervision* and *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling*. Finally, students reported a broad range of community engagement at UT and beyond.
- During 2017-2019, multiple students were recognized for leadership and advocacy including selection of students as CSI Leadership Fellows (3 students), CSI Leadership Intern, CES Editorial Fellow (1 student), SACES Revised Emerging Leaders (1 student), and NBCC Minority Fellow (2 students).
- 2017 graduate ratings of leadership and advocacy preparation were somewhat lower than in other areas with Leadership ( $M = 1.25$ ) rated more positively than advocacy ( $M = 0.75$ ). They rated the item designed to assess this overall program objective more positively with half endorsing “very well” and half endorsing “well” ( $M = 1.50$ ).

### **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. These results have been provided throughout the report.
- Three 2017 graduates rated cultivation of dispositions very well, and one rated it well ( $M = 1.75$ ).
- The faculty conducted a holistic evaluation of student progress, including attention to dispositions. Mean ratings for CORIS items were 1.42 ( $SD = 0.49$ )

### **Other Indicators**

- Overall, alumni reported that they were prepared ( $n = 2$ ) or very prepared ( $n = 2$ ) for their roles as counselor educators.
- Alumni rated their satisfaction with program experiences on a scale from 0 (dissatisfied or not very satisfied) to 2 (very satisfied). The areas rated most favorably ( $n = 1.75$ ) were accessibility of instructors, feedback from instructors, program coverage of relevant content, and collaborative relationships with faculty in research and scholarship. Several areas received overall ratings of 1.50: quality of advising, quality of practicum/internship, and collaborative relationships with faculty in teaching and supervision. The area with greatest opportunity for growth ( $n = 1.25$ ) was quality of instruction in courses. In all, three graduates noted they were very satisfied with overall program experience, and one indicated they were satisfied with the experience; no alumni reported being dissatisfied or not entirely satisfied.
- Given the small size of the program, we conduct employer and site supervisor studies together. A sample of clinical site supervisors ( $n = 4$ ), other site supervisors ( $n = 2$ ), counselor education faculty site supervisors ( $n = 4$ ), and employers of recent graduates ( $n = 2$ ), 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 ( $M = 1.56$ ), supervision

( $M = 1.60$ ), teaching ( $M = 1.64$ ), research and scholarship ( $M = 1.50$ ), leadership ( $M = 1.50$ ), and advocacy ( $M = 1.55$ ).

## 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, in AY15-16 the program faculty revised doctoral field experience requirements to include two sequential semesters of teaching experience, two sequential semesters of internship experience, 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. Just two years ago, doctoral students took their first supervision internship concurrent with enrollment in the supervision course. These processes will not be reflected in 2017 alumni feedback (who likely began the program in 2014 or before). These changes were in response to program evaluation data and faculty observations. The faculty will continue to monitor the impact on student performance, alumni feedback, and site supervisor observations.
- 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. Most dissertation rubrics from this year include those who participated in the seminar. This may help to account for the increases in rubric ratings. Over time, the faculty will monitor impact on student performance and satisfaction.
- In Fall 2017, we revised *COUN 650 Seminar in Counselor Education* to include more focused attention to structuring ideas within academic writing. In Fall 2018, we further revised *COUN 650* to include assignment to research teams with study implementation in the first spring semester of the program. Based on feedback from that group, we are continuing to revise the course to include more focused mentorship of analytical and thematic writing. We hope this will provide a foundation that addresses trends toward lower assessment results related to conceptualization and applications of models and frameworks.
- In Spring 2018, the faculty observed opportunity to enhance the leadership and advocacy internship to include greater conceptual ties and intentionality. The faculty revised associated policies and rating forms, and implemented them in Fall 2018. This may have helped to account for more stability (compared to decreases in other areas) in the leadership and advocacy areas.
- In all, we find it difficult to draw conclusions with just 3-5 students in each evaluation cycle. Of particular note this year was overall decreases in performance on comprehensive examinations. The faculty will meet to discuss opportunities to structure the exam to optimize performance while also considering whether these decreases are idiosyncratic to a group or reflective of quality program processes.
- Although not explicitly reflected in official program data, during the most recent academic year the faculty became aware of opportunities to incorporate more explicit attention to diversity and inclusion within our program as a whole, specific courses, and in context of a series of critical incidents on campus. This led to a series of faculty and student dialogues and ultimately resulted in several initiatives to solidify our commitment to "culturally sensitive, developmentally appropriate, and ethical" practice. In late Spring 2019, the program faculty voted to discontinue offering *COUN 665 Advanced Group and Systems* and implement a required, 3-credit course related to advanced multicultural counseling and social justice

advocacy. We also explored opportunities to wrap in more overt attention to diversity and inclusion within formal doctoral coursework. In Summer 2019, we organized a committee of faculty members, MS students, and PhD students to examine formal and informal curricula and propose initiatives to bolster attention to diversity and inclusion. In addition, the group launched a “summer challenge” for community members to take action related to their own multicultural counseling competence. Approximately ½ of our community joined the challenge and have engaged in conversation and exploration. We will continue to report on findings and activities related to this area.