

Ph.D. in Mental Health Counseling PLV (5-2019 Report)

Narrative

The Ph.D. in Mental Health Counseling began in Fall, 2013 and was the first doctorate in this discipline in the United States. Students entering this program have already completed a 60-credit Master's degree in Mental Health Counseling and typically have their NYS licensure. The overarching goal of this program is to train students in research methods and statistical analysis such that they will be able to contribute to the substantive scientific body of knowledge in the counseling field. To meet that end, 50% of first-year courses are devoted to methodological and statistical pedagogy and training.

The following research-oriented learning outcomes were assessed: (1) Demonstrate the ability to choose data analytic strategies appropriate to the evaluation of stated research hypotheses, (2) Demonstrate an understanding and ability to critique empirical articles with respect to measurement strategies, sampling, statistical analysis, and research design, (3) Demonstrate the ability to evaluate statistical analyses and graphical representations of data via IBM-SPSS, (4) Demonstrate the application of statistical procedures and research designs tailored to the needs of quasi-experimental and correlational research and (5) . Demonstrate the ability to write literature reviews appropriate to the doctoral level, including summarizing rather than listing research findings, choosing appropriate sources, and integrating conflicting findings. For 2019, Research Comprehensive exams from 2018 ($n = 6$) were evaluated by three faculty members teaching in the doctoral program. Each rater evaluated learning outcomes 1, 3, and 4 per exam using the following rating scale: 5 – Outstanding 4 – Exceeds Expectations 3 – Competent 2 – Needs Improvement 1 – Unacceptable. In addition, 2019 pre-dissertation proposals (prepared by students at the end of the second year of the program) were evaluated by two faculty members co-teaching MHC 832: Dissertation Seminar 2 for learning outcomes 1, 2, 4 and 5, utilizing the same rating scale. Finally, to address one subset of CACREP content domains not evaluated in earlier assessments, six learning outcomes related to qualitative research methods were developed (see new qualitative research methods summary grid for specific outcomes). End-year reports ($n = 6$) from MHC 707: Qualitative Methods in Counseling Research, scheduled Spring 2019, were evaluated on each outcome by the instructor of the course using the aforementioned rating scale.

As background, based on the assessment evidence collected in 2018, we continued to incorporate curriculum changes implemented last year as ratings have trended upward over the course of our assessment time frame. A summary of these changes are as follows. In order to increase skills reflected in learning outcome 1, empirical articles incorporating statistical applications reviewed in both MHC 705: Statistics and Research Design 1 and MHC 706: Statistics and Research Design 2 will be emphasized more strongly. For learning outcome 2, measurement modules should be included in both MHC 705 and MHC 706, emphasizing quantitative approaches, and in MHC 830: Research Design: Special Topics Seminar, emphasizing theoretical and applied measurement concepts. To improve skills reflected in learning outcome 3, increased usage of real-world databases and IBM-SPSS output interpretation will be incorporated in MHC 705 and MHC 706. To increase skills reflected in learning outcome 4, more articles incorporating quasi-experiments and illustrating the importance of describing and interpreting partial statistical effects will be introduced in MHC 706. In addition, as the number of students have increased, we will formalize, for next year, an assessment of our doctoral dissertations.

Given the primary focus of our program is on training outstanding researchers, we set the following goals for our students: (1) Overall ratings of 3.5 and above, (2) no students falling below Competent, and (3) 75% of students falling above Competent.

Results for 2018 comprehensive exams are presented first (student $n = 6$, two ratings each). Table 1 contains the means and SD,s for each outcome for this year as well as results from our 2016 and 2018 assessments as comparisons. Tables 3-6 contain frequency distributions for each comprehensive exam learning outcome. For Learning Outcome 1, a mean rating of 3.56 (relative to means of 3.25, 2.93, and 3.69, for 2016, 2017, and 2018, respectively) was obtained. 89% of exams were at or above Competent. For Learning Outcome 2, a mean rating of 3.79 (relative to means of 3.33 and 3.14, for 2016 and 2017, respectively) was obtained. 100% of exams were at or above Competent. For Learning Outcome 3, a mean rating of 3.53 (relative to a means of 3.12, 3.17, and 3.38, for 2016, 2017, and 2018) was obtained. 92% of exams were at or above Competent. For Learning Outcome 4, a mean rating of 3.44 (relative to means of 3.17, 3.08, and 3.54, for 2016, 2017, and 2018, respectively) was obtained. 97% of exams were at or above Competent.

For 2019 pre-dissertation proposals (student $n = 6$, two ratings each), the results were as follows. Table 2 contains the means and SD,s for each learning outcome and results from 2017 and 2018 for comparison. Tables 7-10 contain frequency distributions for each pre-dissertation proposal learning outcomes. For Learning Outcome 1, a mean rating of 3.17 was obtained compared to a mean of 2.87 and 3.70 for 2017 and 2018. 97% of exams were at or above Competent. For Learning Outcome 2, a mean rating of 3.75 was obtained compared to 2.88 and 3.50 for 2017 and 2018. 94% of exams were at or above Competent. For Learning Outcome 4, a mean rating of 3.42 was obtained compared to 2.69 and 3.30 for 2017 and 2018. 97% of exams were at or above Competent. For Learning Outcome 5, a mean rating of 3.67 was obtained compared to 2.38 and 3.60 for 2017 and 2018. 94% of exams were at or above Competent.

Tables 11-16 contains frequencies distributions for MHC 707 student project ratings ($n = 6$, one rating each) for qualitative learning outcomes one through six. For each learning outcome, 100% of student projects at or exceeded Competent. For learning outcome six (diversity/multiculturalism), 67% of projects were rated Exceeds Expectations or Outstanding.

CACREP site visitors concurred that the quality of research training within the program was exemplary. Despite the laudable focus on quantitatively oriented training, pedagogy regarding qualitative research methods was lacking, which was not commensurate with one of the CACREP accreditation standards. Another concern raised by the site team was the lack of an additional professional practice training component in the curriculum.

For learning outcome 1, the mean rating was at or above our goal for both research comprehensives and pre-dissertation proposals and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal. For learning outcome 2, the mean rating was at or above our goal for pre-dissertation proposals and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal. For learning outcome 3, the mean rating was at or above our goal for research comprehensives and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal. For learning outcome 4, the mean rating was at or above our goal for both research comprehensives and pre-dissertation proposals and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal. . For learning outcome 5, the mean rating was at or above our goal

for pre-dissertation proposals and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal. Coupled with the qualitative analyses of our dissertations, curriculum changes implemented over the past two years have led to manifest improvement in student performance for each learning outcome.

We will continue to incorporate curriculum changes implemented last year as ratings have trended upward over the course of our assessment time frame, stabilizing between Competent and Exceeds Expectation. Evaluations for our first wave of qualitative methods tended to be a bit higher, within the Exceeds Expectations category. A summary of these changes are as follows. In order to increase skills reflected in learning outcome 1, empirical articles incorporating statistical applications reviewed in *both MHC 705: Statistics and Research Design 1* and *MHC 706: Statistics and Research Design 2* will be emphasized more strongly. For learning outcome 2, measurement modules should be included in both MHC 705 and MHC 706, emphasizing quantitative approaches, and in *MHC 830: Research Design: Special Topics Seminar*, emphasizing theoretical and applied measurement concepts. The curriculum within *MHC 832: Dissertation Seminar 2* added enhanced coverage of measurement concepts. To improve skills reflected in learning outcome 3, increased usage of real-world databases and IBM-SPSS output interpretation was incorporated in MHC 705, MHC 706, MHC 830, and MHC 832. To increase skills reflected in learning outcome 4, more articles incorporating quasi-experiments and illustrating the importance of describing and interpreting partial statistical effects will be introduced in MHC 706.

Our CACREP site team feedback necessitated a number of assessment changes; not only to our curriculum, but to our assessment process in general. We needed to add two courses to our curriculum: Qualitative Methods & an advanced course in professional practice. *MHC 707: Qualitative Research Methods in Counseling Research* was added this Spring and the additional evaluation of qualitative research learning outcomes was based on work from this course. We recognize that the course, for this year, had been scheduled too late in the program, given that students were not able to incorporate qualitative methods into the pre-dissertation proposal seminars, MHC 831 and 832. Starting next year, the course will be offered in the first year of the program. Moreover, we need to expand the focus of our assessment initiatives to encompass more comprehensively CACREP doctoral program standards. So, in addition to our current focus on Standard 4: *Research and Scholarship*, we need to include specific assessment processes for the remaining five Standards: *1 – Counseling, 2 – Supervision, 3 – Teaching, and 5 – Leadership and Advocacy*. Furthermore, now that we have a larger number of completed dissertations, we will develop, for next year, a formal evaluation of dissertations utilizing existing learning outcomes in addition to an expanded list of learning outcomes closely aligned to CACREP standard four. Finally, this upcoming academic year, we will generate a curriculum map for our entire doctoral curriculum against the five CACREP standards. This will allow a review of possible gaps in our curriculum as well as identify any additional student work products necessary to address our full range of assessment.

Quantitative & General Methodological Learning Outcomes

<i>Learning Outcome</i>	<i>Methodology used to assess learning outcome</i>	<i>Semester when assessment data were collected</i>	<i>Analysis of results</i>	<i>Evaluation of results</i>	<i>Action plans taken based on evaluation</i>
1. Demonstrate the ability to choose data analytic strategies appropriate to the evaluation of stated research hypotheses.	For 2019, Research Comprehensive exams from 2018 ($n = 6$) were evaluated by three faculty members teaching in the doctoral program. Each rater evaluated three of four learning outcomes per exam using the following rating scale: 5 – Outstanding 4 – Exceeds Expectations 3 – Competent 2 – Needs Improvement 1 – Unacceptable. In addition, 2019 pre-dissertation proposals (prepared by students at the end of the second year of the program, $n = 5$) were evaluated by two faculty members co-teaching MHC 832: Dissertation Seminar 2 for learning outcomes 1, 2, 4 and 5, utilizing the same rating scale. In addition, qualitative analyses of a subset of our dissertations were performed. Finally,	Spring 2018 & Spring 2019	Research comprehensive exam: For Learning Outcome 1, a mean rating of 3.56 (relative to means of 3.25, 2.93, and 3.69, for 2016, 2017, and 2018, respectively) was obtained. 89% of exams were at or above Competent. Pre-dissertation proposals: For Learning Outcome 1, a mean rating of 3.17 was obtained compared to a mean of 2.87 and 3.70 for 2017 and 2018. 97% of exams were at or above Competent.	We set the following goals for our students: (1) Overall ratings of 3.5 and above, (2) no students falling below Competent, and (3) 75% of students falling above Competent. For this learning outcome, the mean rating was at or above our goal for both research comprehensives and pre-dissertation proposals and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal.	We will continue to incorporate curriculum changes implemented last year as ratings have trended upward over the course of our assessment time frame. In addition, as the number of students have increased, we will formalize, for next year, an assessment of our doctoral dissertations. Finally, Our CACREP site team feedback necessitates a number of assessment changes; not only to our curriculum, but to our assessment process in general. We added two courses to our curriculum: Qualitative Methods & an advanced course in professional practice. Moreover, we need to expand the focus of our assessment initiatives to encompass more comprehensively CACREP doctoral program standards. So,

	<p>feedback on our curriculum from our recent CACREP accreditation visit was incorporated into our evaluation.</p>				<p>in addition to our current focus on Standard 4: <i>Research and Scholarship</i>, we need to include specific assessment processes for the remaining five Standards: 1 – <i>Counseling</i>, 2 – <i>Supervision</i>, 3 – <i>Teaching</i>, and 5 – <i>Leadership and Advocacy</i>.</p>
<p>2. Demonstrate an understanding and ability to critique empirical articles with respect to measurement strategies, sampling, statistical analysis, and research design.</p>	<p>For 2019, Research Comprehensive exams from 2018 ($n = 6$) were evaluated by three faculty members teaching in the doctoral program. Each rater evaluated three of four learning outcomes per exam using the following rating scale: 5 – Outstanding 4 – Exceeds Expectations 3 – Competent 2 – Needs Improvement 1 – Unacceptable. In addition, 2019 pre-dissertation proposals (prepared by students at the end of the second year of the program, $n = 5$) were evaluated by two faculty members co-teaching MHC 832: Dissertation Seminar 2 for learning outcomes 1, 2, 4 and 5, utilizing the same rating scale.</p>	<p>Spring 2018 & Spring 2019</p>	<p>Research Comprehensive Exams:</p> <p>For Learning Outcome 2, a mean rating of 3.79 (relative to means of 3.33 and 3.14, for 2016 and 2017, respectively) was obtained. 100% of exams were at or above Competent.</p> <p>Pre-dissertation proposals:</p> <p>For Learning Outcome 2, a mean rating of 3.75 was obtained compared to 2.88 and 3.50 for 2017 and 2018. 94% of exams were at or above Competent.</p>	<p>We set the following goals for our students: (1) Overall ratings of 3.5 and above, (2) no students falling below Competent, and (3) 75% of students falling above Competent. For this learning outcome, the mean rating was at or above our goal for pre-dissertation proposals and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal.</p>	<p>We will continue to incorporate curriculum changes implemented last year as ratings have trended upward over the course of our assessment time frame. In addition, as the number of students have increased, we will formalize, for next year, an assessment of our doctoral dissertations. Finally, Our CACREP site team feedback necessitates a number of assessment changes; not only to our curriculum, but to our assessment process in general. We added two courses to our curriculum: Qualitative Methods & an advanced course in professional practice. Moreover, we need to expand the focus of our assessment</p>

	<p>In addition, qualitative analyses of a subset of our dissertations were performed. Finally, feedback on our curriculum from our recent CACREP accreditation visit was incorporated into our evaluation</p>				<p>initiatives to encompass more comprehensively CACREP doctoral program standards. So, in addition to our current focus on Standard 4: <i>Research and Scholarship</i>, we need to include specific assessment processes for the remaining five Standards: 1 – <i>Counseling</i>, 2 – <i>Supervision</i>, 3 – <i>Teaching</i>, and 5 – <i>Leadership and Advocacy</i></p>
<p>3. Demonstrate the ability to evaluate statistical analyses and graphical representations of data via IBM-SPSS.</p>	<p>For 2019, Research Comprehensive exams from 2018 ($n = 6$) were evaluated by three faculty members teaching in the doctoral program. Each rater evaluated three of four learning outcomes per exam using the following rating scale: 5 – Outstanding 4 – Exceeds Expectations 3 – Competent 2 – Needs Improvement 1 – Unacceptable. In addition, 2019 pre-dissertation proposals (prepared by students at the end of the second year of the program, $n = 5$) were evaluated by two faculty members co-teaching MHC 832: Dissertation Seminar 2</p>	<p>Spring 2018 & Spring 2019</p>	<p>Research comprehensive exam: For Learning Outcome 3, a mean rating of 3.53 (relative to a means of 3.12, 3.17, and 3.38, for 2016, 2017, and 2018) was obtained. 92% of exams were at or above Competent.</p>	<p>We set the following goals for our students: (1) Overall ratings of 3.5 and above, (2) no students falling below Competent, and (3) 75% of students falling above Competent. For this learning outcome, the mean rating was at or above our goal for research comprehensives and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal.</p>	<p>We will continue to incorporate curriculum changes implemented last year as ratings have trended upward over the course of our assessment time frame. In addition, as the number of students have increased, we will formalize, for next year, an assessment of our doctoral dissertations. Finally, Our CACREP site team feedback necessitates a number of assessment changes; not only to our curriculum, but to our assessment process in general. We added two courses to our curriculum: Qualitative Methods & an advanced course in professional</p>

	<p>for learning outcomes 1, 2, 4 and 5, utilizing the same rating scale. In addition, qualitative analyses of a subset of our dissertations were performed. Finally, feedback on our curriculum from our recent CACREP accreditation visit was incorporated into our evaluation</p>				<p>practice. Moreover, we need to expand the focus of our assessment initiatives to encompass more comprehensively CACREP doctoral program standards. So, in addition to our current focus on Standard 4: <i>Research and Scholarship</i>, we need to include specific assessment processes for the remaining five Standards: 1 – <i>Counseling</i>, 2 – <i>Supervision</i>, 3 – <i>Teaching</i>, and 5 – <i>Leadership and Advocacy</i></p>
<p>4. Demonstrate the application of statistical procedures and research designs tailored to the needs of quasi-experimental and correlational research.</p>	<p>For 2019, Research Comprehensive exams from 2018 ($n = 6$) were evaluated by three faculty members teaching in the doctoral program. Each rater evaluated three of four learning outcomes per exam using the following rating scale: 5 – Outstanding 4 – Exceeds Expectations 3 – Competent 2 – Needs Improvement 1 – Unacceptable. In addition, 2019 pre-dissertation proposals (prepared by students at the end of the second year of the program, $n = 5$) were evaluated by</p>	<p>Spring 2018 & Spring 2019</p>	<p>Research Comprehensive Exams:</p> <p>For Learning Outcome 4, a mean rating of 3.44 (relative to means of 3.17, 3.08, and 3.54, for 2016, 2017, and 2018, respectively) was obtained. 97% of exams were at or above Competent.</p> <p>Pre-dissertation Proposals:</p> <p>. For Learning Outcome 4, a mean rating of 3.42 was obtained compared to 2.69 and 3.30 for 2017 and 2018. 97% of</p>	<p>We set the following goals for our students: (1) Overall ratings of 3.5 and above, (2) no students falling below Competent, and (3) 75% of students falling above Competent. For this learning outcome, the mean rating was at or above our goal for both research comprehensives and pre-dissertation proposals and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal.</p>	<p>We will continue to incorporate curriculum changes implemented last year as ratings have trended upward over the course of our assessment time frame. In addition, as the number of students have increased, we will formalize, for next year, an assessment of our doctoral dissertations. Finally, Our CACREP site team feedback necessitates a number of assessment changes; not only to our curriculum, but to our assessment process in general. We added two courses to our</p>

	<p>two faculty members co-teaching MHC 832: Dissertation Seminar 2 for learning outcomes 1, 2, 4 and 5, utilizing the same rating scale. In addition, qualitative analyses of a subset of our dissertations were performed. Finally, feedback on our curriculum from our recent CACREP accreditation visit was incorporated into our evaluation</p>		<p>exams were at or above Competent.</p>		<p>curriculum: Qualitative Methods & an advanced course in professional practice. Moreover, we need to expand the focus of our assessment initiatives to encompass more comprehensively CACREP doctoral program standards. So, in addition to our current focus on Standard 4: <i>Research and Scholarship</i>, we need to include specific assessment processes for the remaining five Standards: 1 – <i>Counseling</i>, 2 – <i>Supervision</i>, 3 – <i>Teaching</i>, and 5 – <i>Leadership and Advocacy</i>.</p>
<p>5. Demonstrate the ability to write literature reviews appropriate to the doctoral level, including summarizing rather than listing research findings, choosing appropriate sources, and integrating conflicting findings</p>	<p>For 2019, Research Comprehensive exams from 2018 ($n = 6$) were evaluated by three faculty members teaching in the doctoral program. Each rater evaluated three of four learning outcomes per exam using the following rating scale: 5 – Outstanding 4 – Exceeds Expectations 3 – Competent 2 – Needs Improvement 1 – Unacceptable. In addition, 2019 pre-dissertation proposals (prepared by students at</p>	<p>Spring 2018 & Spring 2019</p>	<p>Pre-dissertation proposal:</p> <p>For Learning Outcome 5, a mean rating of 3.67 was obtained compared to 2.38 and 3.60 for 2017 and 2018. 94% of exams were at or above Competent.</p>	<p>We set the following goals for our students: (1) Overall ratings of 3.5 and above, (2) no students falling below Competent, and (3) 75% of students falling above Competent. For this learning outcome, the mean rating was at or above our goal for pre-dissertation proposals and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal.</p>	<p>We will continue to incorporate curriculum changes implemented last year as ratings have trended upward over the course of our assessment time frame. In addition, as the number of students have increased, we will formalize, for next year, an assessment of our doctoral dissertations. Finally, Our CACREP site team feedback necessitates a number of assessment changes; not only to our curriculum, but to our</p>

	<p>the end of the second year of the program, $n = 5$) were evaluated by two faculty members co-teaching MHC 832: Dissertation Seminar 2 for learning outcomes 1, 2, 4 and 5, utilizing the same rating scale. In addition, qualitative analyses of a subset of our dissertations were performed. Finally, feedback on our curriculum from our recent CACREP accreditation visit was incorporated into our evaluation</p>				<p>assessment process in general. We added two courses to our curriculum: Qualitative Methods & an advanced course in professional practice. Moreover, we need to expand the focus of our assessment initiatives to encompass more comprehensively CACREP doctoral program standards. So, in addition to our current focus on Standard 4: <i>Research and Scholarship</i>, we need to include specific assessment processes for the remaining five Standards: 1 – <i>Counseling</i>, 2 – <i>Supervision</i>, 3 – <i>Teaching</i>, and 5 – <i>Leadership and Advocacy</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

Qualitative Research Learning Outcomes

<i>Learning Outcome</i>	<i>Methodology used to assess learning outcome</i>	<i>Semester when assessment data were collected</i>	<i>Analysis of results</i>	<i>Evaluation of results</i>	<i>Action plans taken based on evaluation</i>
<p>1. Demonstrate the ability to critically read qualitative research..</p>	<p>For 2019, end-year projects from <i>MHC 707: Qualitative Research Methods in Counseling Research</i> from Spring 2019 ($n = 6$) was evaluated by the instructor of that course. Each of six learning outcomes were evaluated using the following rating scale: 5 – Outstanding 4 – Exceeds Expectations 3 – Competent 2 – Needs Improvement 1 – Unacceptable.</p>	<p>Spring 2018 & Spring 2019</p>	<p>100% of MHC 707 projects were rated Competent or above.</p>	<p>We set the following goals for our students: (1) Overall ratings of 3.5 and above, (2) no students falling below Competent, and (3) 75% of students falling above Competent. For this learning outcome, the mean rating was at or above our goal and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal.</p>	<p>Given the success of MHC 707 resulting in student competence for this outcome, we now need to move this course from the second to the first year of the program. That, way qualitative methodological ideas can be adequately incorporated in the two second year dissertation seminars, MHC 831 and MHC 832.</p> <p>Generally, we need to expand the focus of our assessment initiatives to encompass more comprehensively CACREP doctoral program standards. So, in addition to our current focus on Standard 4: <i>Research and Scholarship</i>, we need to include specific assessment processes for the remaining five Standards: 1 – <i>Counseling</i>, 2 – <i>Supervision</i>, 3 –</p>

					<i>Teaching, and 5 – Leadership and Advocacy.</i>
2. Demonstrate an understanding of the philosophical assumptions that guide qualitative research.	For 2019, end-year projects from <i>MHC 707: Qualitative Research Methods in Counseling Research</i> from Spring 2019 (<i>n</i> = 6) was evaluated by the instructor of that course. Each of six learning outcomes were evaluated using the following rating scale: 5 – Outstanding 4 – Exceeds Expectations 3 – Competent 2 – Needs Improvement 1 – Unacceptable.	Spring 2018 & Spring 2019	100% of MHC 707 projects were rated Competent or above.	We set the following goals for our students: (1) Overall ratings of 3.5 and above, (2) no students falling below Competent, and (3) 75% of students falling above Competent. For this learning outcome, the mean rating was at or above our goal and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal.	Given the success of MHC 707 resulting in student competence for this outcome, we now need to move this course from the second to the first year of the program. That, way qualitative methodological ideas can be adequately incorporated in the two second year dissertation seminars, MHC 831 and MHC 832. Generally, we need to expand the focus of our assessment initiatives to encompass more comprehensively CACREP doctoral program standards. So, in addition to our current focus on Standard 4: <i>Research and Scholarship</i> , we need to include specific assessment processes for the remaining five Standards: 1 – <i>Counseling</i> , 2 – <i>Supervision</i> , 3 – <i>Teaching</i> , and 5 – <i>Leadership and Advocacy</i> .

<p>3. Demonstrate the ability to design and conduct a qualitative research study.</p>	<p>For 2019, end-year projects from <i>MHC 707: Qualitative Research Methods in Counseling Research</i> from Spring 2019 ($n = 6$) was evaluated by the instructor of that course. Each of six learning outcomes were evaluated using the following rating scale: 5 – Outstanding 4 – Exceeds Expectations 3 – Competent 2 – Needs Improvement 1 – Unacceptable.</p>	<p>Spring 2018 & Spring 2019</p>	<p>100% of MHC 707 projects were rated Competent or above.</p>	<p>We set the following goals for our students: (1) Overall ratings of 3.5 and above, (2) no students falling below Competent, and (3) 75% of students falling above Competent. For this learning outcome, the mean rating was at or above our goal and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal.</p>	<p>Given the success of MHC 707 resulting in student competence for this outcome, we now need to move this course from the second to the first year of the program. That, way qualitative methodological ideas can be adequately incorporated in the two second year dissertation seminars, MHC 831 and MHC 832.</p> <p>Generally, we need to expand the focus of our assessment initiatives to encompass more comprehensively CACREP doctoral program standards. So, in addition to our current focus on Standard 4: <i>Research and Scholarship</i>, we need to include specific assessment processes for the remaining five Standards: 1 – <i>Counseling</i>, 2 – <i>Supervision</i>, 3 – <i>Teaching</i>, and 5 – <i>Leadership and Advocacy</i>.</p>

<p>4. Demonstrate an understanding of the major approaches to qualitative research and how they may be applied to the counseling field.</p>	<p>For 2019, end-year projects from <i>MHC 707: Qualitative Research Methods in Counseling Research</i> from Spring 2019 ($n = 6$) was evaluated by the instructor of that course. Each of six learning outcomes were evaluated using the following rating scale: 5 – Outstanding 4 – Exceeds Expectations 3 – Competent 2 – Needs Improvement 1 – Unacceptable.</p>	<p>Spring 2018 & Spring 2019</p>	<p>100% of MHC 707 projects were rated Competent or above.</p>	<p>We set the following goals for our students: (1) Overall ratings of 3.5 and above, (2) no students falling below Competent, and (3) 75% of students falling above Competent. For this learning outcome, the mean rating was at or above our goal and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal.</p>	<p>Given the success of MHC 707 resulting in student competence for this outcome, we now need to move this course from the second to the first year of the program. That, way qualitative methodological ideas can be adequately incorporated in the two second year dissertation seminars, MHC 831 and MHC 832.</p> <p>Generally, we need to expand the focus of our assessment initiatives to encompass more comprehensively CACREP doctoral program standards. So, in addition to our current focus on Standard 4: <i>Research and Scholarship</i>, we need to include specific assessment processes for the remaining five Standards: 1 – <i>Counseling</i>, 2 – <i>Supervision</i>, 3 – <i>Teaching</i>, and 5 – <i>Leadership and Advocacy</i>.</p>

<p>5. Demonstrate an understanding of conducting qualitative research considering issues related to diversity and multiculturalism</p>	<p>For 2019, end-year projects from <i>MHC 707: Qualitative Research Methods in Counseling Research</i> from Spring 2019 ($n = 6$) was evaluated by the instructor of that course. Each of six learning outcomes were evaluated using the following rating scale: 5 – Outstanding 4 – Exceeds Expectations 3 – Competent 2 – Needs Improvement 1 – Unacceptable.</p>	<p>Spring 2018 & Spring 2019</p>	<p>100% of MHC 707 projects were rated Competent or above.</p>	<p>We set the following goals for our students: (1) Overall ratings of 3.5 and above, (2) no students falling below Competent, and (3) 75% of students falling above Competent. For this learning outcome, the mean rating was at or above our goal and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal.</p>	<p>Given the success of MHC 707 resulting in student competence for this outcome, we now need to move this course from the second to the first year of the program. That, way qualitative methodological ideas can be adequately incorporated in the two second year dissertation seminars, MHC 831 and MHC 832.</p> <p>Generally, we need to expand the focus of our assessment initiatives to encompass more comprehensively CACREP doctoral program standards. So, in addition to our current focus on Standard 4: <i>Research and Scholarship</i>, we need to include specific assessment processes for the remaining five Standards: 1 – <i>Counseling</i>, 2 – <i>Supervision</i>, 3 – <i>Teaching</i>, and 5 – <i>Leadership and Advocacy</i>.</p>

<p>6. Demonstrate an understanding of ethical issues in qualitative research, including steps needed to protect participants</p>	<p>For 2019, end-year projects from <i>MHC 707: Qualitative Research Methods in Counseling Research</i> from Spring 2019 ($n = 6$) was evaluated by the instructor of that course. Each of six learning outcomes were evaluated using the following rating scale: 5 – Outstanding 4 – Exceeds Expectations 3 – Competent 2 – Needs Improvement 1 – Unacceptable.</p>	<p>Spring 2018 & Spring 2019</p>	<p>100% of MHC 707 projects were rated Competent or above. Moreover, 67% or projects were rated either Exceeds Expectations or Outstanding</p>	<p>We set the following goals for our students: (1) Overall ratings of 3.5 and above, (2) no students falling below Competent, and (3) 75% of students falling above Competent. For this learning outcome, the mean rating was at or above our goal and the percentage of students at or above competent exceeded our goal.</p>	<p>Given the success of MHC 707 resulting in student competence for this outcome, we now need to move this course from the second to the first year of the program. That, way qualitative methodological ideas can be adequately incorporated in the two second year dissertation seminars, MHC 831 and MHC 832.</p> <p>Generally, we need to expand the focus of our assessment initiatives to encompass more comprehensively CACREP doctoral program standards. So, in addition to our current focus on Standard 4: <i>Research and Scholarship</i>, we need to include specific assessment processes for the remaining five Standards: 1 – <i>Counseling</i>, 2 – <i>Supervision</i>, 3 – <i>Teaching</i>, and 5 – <i>Leadership and Advocacy</i>.</p>

--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 1

Means and SDs for learning outcomes by assessment year for Comprehensive Exam

Assessment_Year		Learning Outcome_1	Learning Outcome_2	Learning Outcome_3	Learning Outcome_4
2016	Mean	3.25	3.33	3.12	3.17
	N	24	24	24	24
	Std. Deviation	.74	.76	1.12	.96
2017	Mean	2.93	3.14	3.17	3.08
	N	14	14	6	12
	Std. Deviation	.83	1.03	.98	.90
2018	Mean	3.69		3.38	3.54
	N	13		13	13
	Std. Deviation	.63		.87	.52
2019	Mean	3.56	3.79	3.53	3.44
	N	18	18	18	18
	Std. Deviation	.92	.62	1.04	.78
Total	Mean	3.35	3.43	3.30	3.30
	N	69	56	61	67
	Std. Deviation	.82	.83	1.02	.84

Table 2

Means and SDs for learning outcomes 1,2, 4, and 5 by assessment year for pre-dissertation proposals

Assessment_Year		Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5
2017	Mean	2.87	2.88	2.69	2.38
	N	16	16	16	8
	Std. Deviation	1.09	.72	.87	.74
2018	Mean	3.70	3.50	3.30	3.60
	N	10	10	10	10
	Std. Deviation	1.06	.71	.67	1.17
2019	Mean	3.17	3.75	3.42	3.67
	N	12	12	12	12
	Std. Deviation	1.03	1.06	1.16	.98
Total	Mean	3.18	3.32	3.08	3.30
	N	38	38	38	38
	Std. Deviation	1.09	.90	.97	1.12

Table 3

Assessment of 2018 Comprehensive Exam

Demonstrate the ability to choose data analytic strategies appropriate to the evaluation of stated research hypotheses.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Needs Improvement	2	5.6	11.1	11.1
	Competent	7	19.4	38.9	50.0
	Exceeds Expectations	6	16.7	33.3	83.3
	Outstanding	3	8.3	16.7	100.0
	Total	18	50.0	100.0	
Missing	System	18	50.0		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 4

Assessment of 2018 Comprehensive Exam

Demonstrate an understanding and ability to critique empirical articles with respect to measurement strategies, sampling, statistical analysis, and research design

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Competent	5	13.9	27.8	27.8
	Exceeds Expectations	11	30.6	61.1	88.9
	Outstanding	2	5.6	11.1	100.0
	Total	18	50.0	100.0	
Missing	System	18	50.0		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 5

Assessment of 2018 Comprehensive Exam

Demonstrate the ability to evaluate statistical analyses and graphical representations of data via IBM-SPSS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Needs Improvement	3	8.3	16.7	16.7
	Competent	7	19.4	38.9	55.6
	Exceeds Expectations	4	11.1	22.2	77.8
	Outstanding	4	11.1	22.2	100.0
	Total	18	50.0	100.0	
Missing	System	18	50.0		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 6

Assessment of 2018 Comprehensive Exam

Demonstrate the application of statistical procedures and research designs tailored to the needs of quasi-experimental and correlational research

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Needs Improvement	1	2.8	5.6	5.6
	Competent	10	27.8	55.6	61.1
	Exceeds Expectations	5	13.9	27.8	88.9
	Outstanding	2	5.6	11.1	100.0
	Total	18	50.0	100.0	
Missing	System	18	50.0		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 7

Assessment of 2019 Pre-dissertation Proposals

Demonstrate the ability to choose data analytic strategies appropriate to the evaluation of stated research hypotheses.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unacceptable	1	2.8	8.3	8.3
	Needs Improvement	2	5.6	16.7	25.0
	Competent	3	8.3	25.0	50.0
	Exceeds Expectations	6	16.7	50.0	100.0
	Total	12	33.3	100.0	
Missing	System	24	66.7		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 8

Assessment of 2019 Pre-dissertation Proposals

Demonstrate an understanding and ability to critique empirical articles with respect to measurement strategies, sampling, statistical analysis, and research design

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Needs Improvement	2	5.6	16.7	16.7
	Competent	2	5.6	16.7	33.3
	Exceeds Expectations	5	13.9	41.7	75.0
	Outstanding	3	8.3	25.0	100.0
	Total	12	33.3	100.0	
Missing	System	24	66.7		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 9

Assessment of 2019 Pre-dissertation Proposals

Demonstrate the application of statistical procedures and research designs tailored to the needs of quasi-experimental and correlational research

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unacceptable	1	2.8	8.3	8.3
	Needs Improvement	1	2.8	8.3	16.7
	Competent	4	11.1	33.3	50.0
	Exceeds Expectations	4	11.1	33.3	83.3
	Outstanding	2	5.6	16.7	100.0
	Total	12	33.3	100.0	
Missing	System	24	66.7		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 10

Assessment of 2019 Pre-dissertation Proposals

Demonstrate the ability to write literature reviews appropriate to the doctoral level, including summarizing rather than listing research findings, choosing appropriate sources, and integrating conflicting findings.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Needs Improvement	2	5.6	16.7	16.7
	Competent	2	5.6	16.7	33.3
	Exceeds Expectations	6	16.7	50.0	83.3
	Outstanding	2	5.6	16.7	100.0
	Total	12	33.3	100.0	
Missing	System	24	66.7		
Total		36	100.0		

Table 11

Assessment of 2019 MHC 707 Projects

Demonstrate the ability to critically read qualitative research.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Competent	6	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 12

Assessment of 2019 MHC 707 Projects

Demonstrate an understanding of the philosophical assumptions that guide qualitative research

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Competent	6	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 13

Assessment of 2019 MHC 707 Projects

Demonstrate the ability to design and conduct a qualitative research study

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Competent	3	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Exceeds Expectations	3	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

Table 14

Assessment of 2019 MHC 707 Projects

Demonstrate an understanding of the major approaches to qualitative research and how they may be applied to the counseling field.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Competent	5	83.3	83.3	83.3
	Exceeds Expectations	1	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

Table 15

Assessment of 2019 MHC 707 Projects

Demonstrate an understanding of conducting qualitative research considering issues related to diversity and multiculturalism

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Competent	2	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Exceeds Expectations	2	33.3	33.3	66.7
	Outstanding	2	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	6	100.0	100.0	

Table 16

Assessment of 2019 MHC 707 Projects

Demonstrate an understanding of ethical issues in qualitative research, including steps needed to protect participants

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Exceeds Expectations	6	100.0	100.0	100.0