0. Core Committee Discussion of Upcoming Review of Plans

Committee members reviewed materials that were provided by the counselor education program for each assessment plan. Discussion was held on some points of the assessment plans and items that may need clarification.

I. Call Meeting to Order & Approval of October 22, 2004 Minutes

Dr. Dickey asked for introductions from all the committee members. He outlined the purpose of the review meeting and the purpose of QCom, as it has been established.

II. Review of Counselor Education Programs

A. Overview of Ed.S. Programs and Plans

1. School-track

Dr. Evans provided an overview of the Ed.S. program. She explained how the program prepares students to enter the professional realm and that the school-track is the longest (in academic hours) program in the state. She reported that the school-track has enjoyed a 100% placement rate over the last several years. Typically, it takes students 2 1/2 to 3 years to complete this track of the program and how faculty and students overlap in some areas of this track and the marriage/family track. This track of the program is a very intense contact-hour program, therefore, several courses are limited in the number of students that can be enrolled. She reported a 5 to 1 faculty/student practicum ratio and a 10 to 1 ratio for internships.

2. Marriage/Family track

Dr. Gold explained the marriage/family track of the Ed.S. program. It is an off-shoot of the school-counseling track and prepares students to work with troubled students and some relationships. He outlined the diverse pool of students who are enrolled and highlighted their relationship with the Epworth Children’s Home. He reported that this track attracts students who are interested in changing careers and it usually takes students approximately three years to complete the program. During the admissions interview every student is interviewed by all faculty members and he mentioned that many of the students are attracted from out of state. They are assessed multiple times throughout the program in different ways. In addition, there is an internal process for counseling students out of the program if sufficient progress is not being shown. He reported that in recent national results, these students tend to finish in the 84% for the national licensing exam, for which they self-select to take. He explained that changes in the program over the year from the move of offering a masters-level program to now offering a specialist-level program.

B. Overview of Ph.D. Program and Plan

Dr. Gold provided an overview of the Ph.D. program and its three main areas, all of which assume a certain level of expertise in a clinical setting. This is an evening-only part-time program, with approximately 36 students currently enrolled. Because of a careful academic structure, students can plan out their course work approximately three years in advance. The faculty, however, encourage students to become more involved in the research realm. This is the only Ph.D. program in the state.
III. Committee Discussion of Recommendations & Procedures for Counselor Education Programs

A. School-track of Ed.S.

Dr. Evans reported that CACREP requires annual assessment of each student as part of its accrediting criteria. Typical assessments occur during the practicum and internship experiences. She reported that faculty meet regularly to discuss students’ progress as they review course grades and other assessments. Faculty often counsel students as a result of what is discovered during these meetings and the one-on-one meetings. Records are kept of these meetings through minutes of meetings under “student reviews.” Dr. Knapp asked how faculty decisions are made with the data that are collected. Drs. Evans and Gold responded that as an example of this, a course has recently been eliminated as a result of student feedback. In addition, survey data from graduates and employers are used in different ways to determine program needs. Also, a student is always present at faculty meetings. Program faculty informed the group that aggregated data from students are collected. Dr. Van Scoy suggested how the program could collate the data that are already collected so that program changes and decisions could be made in a more systematic way.

Dr. Meeks asked for clarification on how ADEPT is used within the program. Dr. Evans clarified how ADEPT is integrated in the program requirements and coursework for the students. Their progress with ADEPT is not a sole requirement, but instead the process is integrated in the program requirements so that students are better prepared to handle the real system when they enter their professional job. Dr. Meeks explained the ADEPT requirements for counselor education students and Dr. Evans highlighted how the current evaluation forms are related to the ADEPT dimensions.

Dr. Wertz asked how the program keeps track of where their students attain jobs. Ms. Lane reported on how the employer surveys are conducted via each graduate. Dr. Wertz expressed concern in being able to track this systematically and how valuable employer’s input is, but how difficult it may be in tracking who these employers are. In addition, he asked if the program has been able to conduct this in a systematic way so as to use this input as a strong assessment of the quality of their graduates.

B. Marriage/Family track of Ed.S.

Dr. Gold reported that while it may be difficult to develop one rubric for evaluation, students are encouraged to cultivate their own skills (in relation to expected general competencies) in handling clients.

Dr. Dickey asked for clarification on faculty and how they use data to inform program decisions and changes. Dr. Gold acknowledged that at this time they are short on full-time faculty (2) but that many faculty are utilized from other departments and colleges since students are required to complete many core classes in health education, neuro-psychiatry, and research. He acknowledged that they rely heavily on student and employer feedback and Ms. Lane’s compilation of these data.

Dr. Meeks asked for clarification on the true midpoint in the program and how a student’s progress is measured from this midpoint to the end. Dr. Gold acknowledged her question and followed up by explaining how students are assessed on certain competencies. Dr. Dickey emphasized that more clarification could be helpful as to how the student’s attainment of competencies is accounted for and measured. With this suggestion, she emphasized that an organizational change like this could help faculty to more quickly determine how data can show how well the students are doing.

C. Ph.D. plan

Dr. Dickey asked for other examples of assessments at this level. Dr. Gold offered that the qualifying examination stands as a mid-type of assessment for all candidates. Dr. Meeks encouraged him to better clarify this item in the plan. Additionally, Dr. Gold mentioned that faculty’s formal and informal conversations lend some type of assessment of students. In one example, this has led to some counseling from faculty that would encourage the student to stop-out of the program. The committee members asked what clear evidence or process is in place that highlights activities that may happen on a more informal nature. Dr. Gold displayed the tabular format that each faculty receives in order to evaluate the student’s progress in the program. He emphasized that expectations of doctoral student...
professional behavior are recorded in the graduate manual as related to organization and administration in the CACREP standards. There are six areas in this section of the CACREP standards. Dr. Van Scoy expressed an interest in this process and encouraged Dr. Gold to include this more clearly in a revised version of the assessment plan.

Dr. Dickey reminded the group to submit their completed review forms to Ms. Connolly as soon as they can. The members expressed their concerns about the plans and what items may be recommended to strengthen the plans. Dr. Meeks expressed concern that particular state needs may be missing somewhat in one area and asked the committee how its recommendations could help the program understand more clearly what state mandates could be a part of the assessment plans. In doing this, Dr. Van Scoy asked if the State had any prescribed guidelines that would help the program implement those requirements in a clear way.

IV. Committee Discussion of Ed.D. Curriculum & Instruction Recommendation Report
Dr. Dickey asked for members’ approval of this recommendation report. A motion was made, seconded, and moved to approve the report. Dr. Dickey told the group that he would forward the report to the applicable program faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.