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Mission Statement
The mission of the Ph.D. program in Counseling at ODU is to prepare professional counselors to provide leadership in the profession of counseling. Counseling leaders must be excellent counselors, supervisors, teachers, researchers, and scholars. The program is designed to enhance the counseling skills of doctoral students, prepare counselors for the roles of clinical and administrative supervision, develop the teaching skills of students, teach students to conduct research, and prepare students to become counseling scholars. The program prepares doctoral students to become university faculty members in counselor education programs and leaders in a variety of counseling specializations (e.g., clinical mental health counseling, school counseling).

1. Goal
Meet Student Learning Outcomes
The mission statement and the program objectives were developed by faculty while keeping in mind CACREP learning objectives (e.g., common-core content and field placement requirements). In addition, they were created following the development of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Key professional Dispositions (KPDs). After their initial development, they were shared with our advisory board in order to obtain feedback and make adjustments as needed. The advisory board is made up of current students in our programs, alumni from our master’s and doctoral programs, working counselors, counselor educators, school counseling professionals, and the leadership team from the Counseling Program (CACREP Coordinator, Graduate Program Director of the master’s and the Ph.D. programs, school and clinical mental health counseling specialty coordinators, and the Clinical Coordinator).

1.1 Outcomes
Counseling
Develop an in-depth understanding of individual and group counseling theories and processes and how they are applied with clients.

1.1.1 Measures of Outcome
Key Performance Indicators - COUN 842 & COUN 869
KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS COUN 842: ADD Case Formulation Assignment COUN 869: ADD Case Conceptualization Assignment Assignments are scored numerically from 1
1.1.1.1 Target / Benchmark
Outcome: Counseling - KPI: COUN 842 & COUN 869 [Exceeded]

TARGET / BENCHMARK

Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

RESULTS / FINDINGS

The KPI for Counseling is that “Students will show knowledge of case conceptualization process from multiple theoretical perspectives.” All students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on one or both assessments of this KPI.

INTERPRETATION AND USE OF RESULTS

2020-2021 INTERPRETATION **Please use the following prompts as a guide to analyze at least two results within the report**

1) Interpretation of Results:

Our doctoral students continue to perform at high levels in demonstrating their counseling skills and abilities. The KPI is assessed with two assignments: one case formulation paper as part of COUN 842: Advanced Theories, and one case study presentation (based on active case) as part of COUN 869: Doctoral Practicum. The KPI for both assignments is achieving an 80%, but our students the past year averaged 95%, with all students meeting or exceeding the KPI. The emphasis on developing a personal theory of counseling, and on being multiculturally aware in terms of applying theory, are strengths demonstrated in this learning outcome for 2020-2021. The instructors for COUN 842 and 869 have expertise directly in counseling theory, case conceptualization, and assessment, and appear to continue to be strong candidates for providing instruction addressing the Counseling KPI. Students performed slightly higher than the previous year’s students. This may be due to the relatively small numbers of students reporting KPIs for this area, as fewer students were accepted into the cohort reporting results for 2020-2021, hence a restricted range of performance.

2) Modifications or Previous Changes:

The only modifications made to this learning outcome and related assessments is that all students needed to complete courses online, including fieldwork (practica and internships) requirements. This was prompted by the COVID-19 pandemic and the shutdown of most in-person services occurring in 2020 and extending to 2021. Curriculum were modified to enhance online learning capabilities, and students were...
exposed to content on tele-mental health counseling. The effect of these changes are being reported here; students appeared to adapt well to the demands of coping with the pandemic, meeting or exceeding the KPI standard.

3) Planned Use of Results:
The Counseling faculty discussed the doctoral program throughout the year out our monthly faculty meetings. While changes in the course sequence related to enhancing student learning for research, teaching, and supervision, were discussed extensively and approved, no major changes were made to the methods of teaching or evaluation related to the counseling skills of the doctoral students. Across all counseling programs (not only the Ph.D. program), there will be a greater attempt to integrated crisis counseling and response into courses partially at the request of fieldwork supervisors. This change will be discussed in the section on responding to fieldwork evaluations of students later in this report.

### Outcomes

#### Supervision
Understand the theoretical and clinical applications of supervision and be able to employ supervisory skills with counselors and counselor trainees.

#### Measures of Outcome

**Key Performance Indicators - COUN 846 & COUN 868**

- **KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS COUN 846**: ADD - Final Self-Assessment of Supervision Skills
- **COUN 868**: ADD - Supervision Case Presentation

Assignments are scored numerically from 1 through 100.

#### Target / Benchmark

**Outcome: Supervision - KPI: COUN 846 & COUN 868**

**Exceeded**

- **TARGET / BENCHMARK**: Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

- **RESULTS / FINDINGS**: The KPI for Supervision is that “Students will demonstrate skills of clinical supervision.” All students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on the second assessment of this KPI.
*Please use the following prompts as a guide*

1) Interpretation of results:
For 2020-2021, 9 students submitted supervision case studies during completion of their COUN 868: Doctoral Internship course. Out of these number, 100% received a score of 90% or higher exceeding the KPI benchmark of 80%. Our students appear to be well-prepared to provide supervision to other students during their internships across clinical mental health, college, and school counseling settings. They appear to employ models and techniques of clinical supervision, are supervisee and relationship oriented, and can act with a high degree of ethical conduct and decision-making. We wish to note that, especially in the Fall of 2020, students were completing their supervision fieldwork in telemental health and in-person settings as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Their performance as students and as supervisors was exemplary.

2) Reflection on actions or changes made to improve:
One notable change is that, due to the low enrollment of the cohort starting in 2019-2020, COUN 846 was not offered in the 2020-2021 academic year and no KPI information is reported here. All students reporting information for the KPI associated with COUN 868 completed COUN 846 in the 2019-2020 academic year. Many of the students reporting information acted as supervisors at a local regional health center where we place on average 8 master’s students and 3-4 doctoral students each year to support a hospital-based integrated behavioral health program. The clinical, supervisory, and leadership opportunities afforded to students as a result of this ongoing collaboration appear to invaluable.

As a result of COUN 846 not being offered this past year, students will complete this course and the associated KPI approximately one to two semesters before their COUN 868. We hope this causes more immediacy of learning as students won’t have a one year lag time between their COUN 846 and COUN 868 experiences. This change is part of wider resequencing of the COUN Doctoral Program coursework resulting from feedback from students and their site supervisors. It doesn’t necessarily address an urgent problem, but rather we believe will enhance the experiences students are already having and also help our program match course sequencing plans at other peer institutions. The results of this change will be reported in the 2021-2022 WEAVE report.
3) Use of results:
Student performance is reviewed at each program meeting, and also in the bi-weekly program leadership meetings. Comprehensive review of all program data occurs once a year in the Spring semester. For this KPI, the GPD, the clinical coordinator for all counseling programs, and the coordinator of student screening converse as needed to address any issues that come up during the semester. We will continue these review practices, and also continue to ensure that highly qualified experts in clinical supervision continue to teach both courses associated with learning outcomes in this area. Finally, we will continue to ensure that our students have access to high-quality internship sites, such as the health center mentioned above.

### 1.3 Outcomes

**Teaching**
Develop sound pedagogy and teaching methods which can be applied in teaching and presenting.

### 1.3.1 Measures of Outcome

**Key Performance Indicators - COUN 820 & COUN 842**

**KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**
- COUN 820: ADD - Teaching Presentation
- COUN 842: ADD - Theory Presentation

Assignments are scored numerically from 1 through 100.

### 1.3.1.1 Target / Benchmark

**Outcome: Teaching - KPI: COUN 820 & COUN 842**

*Exceeded*

**TARGET / BENCHMARK**
Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

**RESULTS / FINDINGS**

The KPI for Teaching is that “Students will learn effective methods of teaching that includes active learning.” All students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on the second assessment of this KPI.

*Please use the following prompts as a guide*

1) **Interpretation of results:**
During the 2020-2021, 4 students completed the theory presentation assignment associated with COUN 842, each earning a 100% on the assignment. The students appear to be well-prepared to present in general and provide instruction on
counseling theories specifically. Strengths in this area include the expertise of the instructor for COUN 842, a nationally-recognized expert in counseling theories, and that presentations are commonly used throughout the program as either capstone or major assignments. Weaknesses for this year include that COUN 820 was not taught due to the low enrollment of this year’s doctoral cohort and a reorganization of the course sequence in the doctoral program; it should be noted that the lack of COUN 820 this year did not appear to hamper the students performance.

2) Reflection on actions or changes made to improve:
There are three major changes that affected student learning this area. One is, due to low enrollment, they did not complete COUN 820 prior to COUN 842. This did not appear to affect their performance in COUN 842. Second, COUN 842 was taught in a hybrid format as a result of continued modifications enacted to cope with the COVID-19 pandemic. This did not appear to negatively impact performance, and may have positively influenced it according to anecdotal evidence provided by the instructor and in student comments from the SOS. Finally, the small class size appears to have positively influenced the environment and the amount of time each student could receive from the instructor; this was also noted as a positive anecdotaly by the instructor and in the students’ SOS comments. This changes were not planned to persist per se, as they are primarily a result of the COVID 19 pandemic. Although COUN 820 is planned to be taught later in the curriculum going forward, it will still be taught before COUN 842.

3) Use of results:
Student performance is reviewed every Counseling program meeting, during the bi-weekly program leadership meetings, and program evaluation data is comprehensively reviewed once annually in the Spring. We will continue to assign highly qualified instructors to teach both courses associated with this KPI. The influence of online and hybrid learning will be discussed at the first program meeting in Fall of 2021. The impact of the reorganization of the doctoral course sequence will be reported as part of the 2021-2022 program evaluation cycle.

1.4 Outcomes
Research and Scholarship
Develop knowledge of research and program evaluation methods that can be applied at
Measures of Outcome
Key Performance Indicators - COUN 835 & COUN 898


Assignments are scored numerically from 1 through 100.

Target / Benchmark

Outcome: Research and Scholarship - KPI: COUN 835 & COUN 898

Exceeded

Students will score 80 or higher on both KPI’s

The KPI for Research and Scholarship is that “Students will develop appropriate research questions for professional research and publication.” All students received a KPI score of 80 or higher on both assessments of this KPI in 2020-2021.

1) Interpretation of results:

In 2020-2021, 15 students completed both assessments associated with this KPI; the average rating for the first assessment was 92 out of 100 and the average rating for the second assessment was 95 out of 100. Strengths associated with this assessment include the students’ writing ability, and the instructional style engaged in by both faculty which has a focus on experiential learning, scaffolding, and adult education principles. The use of practical examples of research, and building upon students’ prior knowledge and experience of research, are also strengths. The courses were also taught online this past year due to the COVID-19 pandemic; this may have positively influenced students’ engagement; they appeared to score slightly higher on average across both assessments then the previous years’ cohort of students.

2) Reflection on actions or changes made to improve:

Along with teaching both classes online, the main change involved a re-sequencing of both classes so that COUN 835 is taught earlier in the curriculum. The students in COUN 898 would’ve taken COUN 835 two semesters prior, whereas the current COUN 835 students will take it 2 years later. This was done based on review of feedback from instructors indicating that students appear to struggle developing research questions in both COUN 835 and 898. The premise of the change is that by including COUN 835 earlier in the curriculum that students will be exposed to the
skill set associated with research question formation as a foundational skill for their program. The intended outcome is that students have an easier time engaging with research throughout the program, including in COUN 898.

3) Use of results:
Program evaluation information is discussed at each Counseling program meeting, the bi-weekly program leadership meetings, and a comprehensive review occurs annually in the Spring. The changes described above occurred as a result of discussions occurring in meetings throughout the 2019-2020 school year. Any results from the change in course sequence will be reported in next year’s program evaluation cycle/WEAVE cycle. We will continue to ensure that highly qualified faculty are assigned to teach both courses, and continue to review data and feedback.

1.5 Outcomes
Leadership and Advocacy
Students will demonstrate ethical and culturally relevant leadership and advocacy practices.

1.5.1 Measures of Outcome
Key Performance Indicators - COUN 801 & COUN 848
KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS COUN 801: ADD - Leadership Self-Assessment and Goals Paper COUN 848: ADD - Advocacy Proposal Assignments are scored numerically from 1 through 100.

1.5.1.1 Target / Benchmark
Outcome: Students will demonstrate ethical and culturally relevant leadership and advocacy practices. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS COUN 801: Leadership Self-Assessment and Goals Paper COUN 848: Advocacy Proposal Both assignments are evaluated with rubrics. Exceeded

TARGET / BENCHMARK
Students will score 80 or higher on one or both KPI’s.

RESULTS / FINDINGS
For 2020-2021, 100% of students achieved a 80% or higher on the second KPI.

INTERPRETATION AND USE OF RESULTS
1) Interpretation of results:
For 2020-2021, 13 students completed the advocacy proposal in COUN 848. COUN 801 was not taught due to low enrollment. The average rating on the advocacy
proposal was 94 with a range of 80 to 98. The modal rating was 94. Strengths associated with this cohort include their writing abilities, and willingness to discuss difficult topics in what remains a politically-charged learning environment (a state that has persisted for approximately the past 4-5 years). The relatively low score (still a passing score) was associated with individual circumstances for that specific student that are not commonly experienced in this course or in our program. As a result of the COVID 19 pandemic, the course was taught online and that may have influenced the performance of one or more students. A weakness noted here is the lack of COUN 801 data to report; we should have data for this course to report in the next evaluation cycle.

2) Reflection on actions or changes made to improve:
In addition to being taught online, the course was relatively larger in terms of the student roster. This was a result of a re-sequencing of the coursework in this program and the merging of two doctoral cohorts. They may have resulted in individual students receiving less time and attention, however the overall the performance of the students indicate this was not a determining factor. We will continue to monitor student SOS reports to see if the larger class sizes, and any other aspect of the course, is contributing to difficulties.

3) Use of results:
Program evaluation information is reviewed at every program meeting, in the bi-weekly program leadership meetings, and is comprehensively reviewed once annually. Learning objectives associated with this course are a topic of emphasis at program meetings, partially due to the charged political climate and how leadership and advocacy are both informed by professional dispositions. We believe the students continue to report meaningful learning gains in this domain, and that the assignments used are valid. We will continue to closely monitor students’ SOS reports to discern if other factors need to be addressed. As the topics associated with this area do naturally touch on areas of professional interest and even controversy, the apparently difficult nature of some class discussions can’t likely be avoided. The GPD for the program spearheads the effort to ensure adequate advising and mentorship is afforded to all students and will continue to do so.
1.6 Outcomes
Key Professional Dispositions
Demonstrate appropriate professional dispositions in the areas of professionalism, accountability/conscientiousness, self-regulation, and interpersonal skills.

1.6.1 Measures of Outcome
KPD Self Assessments

General Information about the Self Assessment and Relationship to Outcomes: The doctoral program has developed a series of Key Professional Dispositions (KPD’s) on which each student will be assessed. The KPD’s contain four broad behavioral dispositional areas (Professionalism, Accountability/Conscientiousness, Self-Regulation, Interpersonal Skills) broken down into 18 traits or behaviors (see M.S. Ed. KPD’s or folder 4.B.3). KPD’s use a Likert-type scale, that range from 1-5, to assess each of the 18 traits, with 5 indicating “demonstrates competence,” a 1 indicating “harmful,” and a 3 indicating “near competency.”

Data Collection: For doctoral students, KPD’s are measured twice, first at the end of COUN 846: Advanced Supervision and a second time at the end of COUN 869: Practicum. A Qualtrics survey is utilized to collect KPD scores at the end of every semester. These scores are entered into a running list as well as annual spreadsheet to track overall programmatic scores and individual student scores.

Review and Analysis of Data: Students’ KPD scores are reviewed each semester and average student scores for each KPD are reviewed each academic year. This is intended to monitor each student’s individual performance. Per the Ph.D. Program Handbook, if a student scores below a “3” on any of the 18 dispositions, the faculty member will advise the student about steps he or she can take to develop positive skills in this area. If a student receives an aggregate score of “3” or below on one or more of the four broad behavioral dispositions, a professional development plan will be devised with the student’s advisor and the GPD so the student can work on that area. Lack of improvement in one or more of the broad behavioral dispositional areas can be cause for dismissal from the program. Simple percentages will be used to examine the four broad behavioral dispositions. A simple comparison will be made to assess the program’s strengths and weaknesses and to analyze any differences found as a function of gender and ethnicity. Differences as a function of gender and ethnicity will be discussed in program meetings to examine the reasons why they may exist and what action may need to be taken as a function of such differences.

1.6.1.1 Target / Benchmark
Outcome: Professional Dispositions - Self Assessments

Students will score a 3 or higher on all KPD areas each year.
For the 2020-2021 academic year, 7 students completed either COUN 869; all met the target for this assessment area.

Interpretation.

For 2020-2021, only COUN 869 data are reported as COUN 846 was not offered due to low enrollment and a re-organization of the course sequence. On average, students were rated at a 4 on their dispositions out of 5, which is approximately the same as last year’s cohort. Last year, one student did not meet the objective, and this year all students did, so we consider this year’s cohort to have performed better. A weakness in this year’s reporting is the lack of COUN 846 data; a strength is the quality of placements, the feedback received from site supervisors, and the performance at or above level for all students in their clinical work during the COVID 19 pandemic.

Changes

All students this year would have taken COUN 846 in the prior year based on the former course sequence. Other than the use of online teaching and telemental health counseling to adapt to COVID-19, no changes were made otherwise to how COUN 869 was conducted. The course sequence change is related to ongoing review and discussion the Counseling faculty have engaged in over the past two years, and is designed to promote greater and more immediate competency development in all areas of the program (clinical supervision, counseling, teaching, leadership, and research). Results of these changes will be discussed in next year’s reporting cycle. Ensuring the quality of instructors, site placements, and site supervisors is how student learning is facilitated in this area. The clinical coordinator, program director, and Counseling faculty all work closely together to support this process and will continue to do so.

Use of Data

Program evaluation data, including dispositions, are reviewed at every program meeting, in the bi-weekly Counseling leadership meeting, and are comprehensively reviewed in the Spring. Dispositions are closely reviewed twice, once in the Spring and once in the Fall semesters. Disposition rating sheets are also used in student screening, and form part of the grade in all Counseling fieldwork courses.
1.7 Outcomes
Evaluation of Students in the Field
Students will demonstrate competency in field placement as evidenced by supervisor evaluation scores.

1.7.1 Measures of Outcome
Practicum/Internship Evaluation of Student
Students will be evaluated on performance on a 15-item survey assessing the following areas: site professionalism, supervision, work with clients, and overall performance.

1.7.1.1 Target / Benchmark
Outcome: Professional Development in Field Placement. Met

**TARGET / BENCHMARK**
Students obtain minimum ratings of 3.5 on each of the 15 items, and overall, obtain a score over than a 3.5. In addition, any particular item that scores below a 3.0 will be reviewed and addressed by faculty.

**RESULTS / FINDINGS**
For 2020-2021, 9 students were evaluated. All students met or exceeded the learning objective.

**INTERPRETATION AND USE OF RESULTS**

1) Interpretation of results:
Strengths of student learning in this area includes quality fieldwork placements, the professionalism of the students, and the quality of the site supervisors. Students on average this year were rated at a 4.0 on all items and in the overall ratings. Comments from supervisors indicate students are a pleasure to work with. Students appeared to perform slightly better than the previous year’s cohort.

2) Reflection on actions or changes made to improve:
For this cohort, the main changes are all associated with differences in practice and teaching resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. They taught classes, work with clients over telemental health platforms and in person, designed programs, and provided leadership and clinical supervision during an immensely difficult period. They appeared to rise to the challenge.

3) Use of results:
Program evaluation data are discussed at program meetings, in the bi-weekly Counseling program meeting, and are comprehensively reviewed once a year in the Spring. In addition, instructors of clinical courses closely monitor student performance, and the clinical coordinator monitors formative assessments.
completed throughout the semester. No changes will be implemented as a result of this year’s data; high quality instructors, site supervisors and clinical placements will continue to used in order to maximize student learning.
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