



Annual Program Evaluation Report

Ph.D. in Counselor Education and Supervision

Counselor Education and Counseling Department

DCES Annual Program Evaluation Report

Review Year: 2017-18

Date: October 31, 2018

Participants: Drs. Fred Hanna, Suzie Dukic & Tsui-ye Chow

The DCES program has completed its third year of implementations in 2017-18. There are three groups of active students in the program. The first group are the students who entered in fall 2015 when the program first started. They are either finished or still in the dissertation stage and in any case have all passed their comps and are not taking any core courses. The second group of students who entered in fall of 2016 and completed their second year of courses and comprehensive examinations. The third group is made up of the first-year students who just completed their first 4 semesters and will be taking comps in June of 2019. This annual report details the academic as well as student professional disposition ratings by their professors as well as demographic data and admissions data for the 2017 cohort.

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Table 1: Demographic Data for Fall 2017 Applicants/New Students

Gender	Applicants	Admitted	Matriculated
F	24	14	5
M	8	3	2
Undeclared	0	n/a	n/a
Grand Total	32	17	7
Race / Ethnicity	Applicants	Admitted	Matriculated
White / Caucasian	9	5	3
African American / Black	6	4	3
Hispanic / Latino	1	1	0
Asian American / Pacific Islander	2	0	0
Native American / Alaskan Native	0	n/a	n/a

Multi-racial	1	1	0
Other	0	n/a	n/a
Undeclared	13	6	1
Grand Total	32	17	7
Age Range	Applicants	Admitted	Matriculated
20 - 24	1	3	0
25 - 29	5	5	2
30 - 39	13	7	4
40 - 49	5	2	1
50 - 59	1	0	0
60 & Over	0	n/a	n/a
Undeclared	7	0	0
Grand Total	32	17	7

Discussion: The 2017 cohort was quite diverse in its original composition with regard to race and ethnicity. With 3 students identifying as African American or Black and with 3 identifying as White, a 6th student was undeclared. With a racial divide of 50-50 and one undeclared, it is easy to state that was a diverse group of students. However, it is important to note that in the first semester, one student of color left the program, leaving 6 students in the cohort. With regard to gender, 5 of the 7 students who originally matriculated were identified as female, while the remaining 2 identified as male. This is an obviously greater number of females over men, but typical in terms of other cohorts. It should be noted that during this first year of the 2017 cohort, the director of the program engaged in providing direct information sessions for students in the Clinical Mental Health Counseling program regarding the DCES program and its courses.

Table 2: Program Student Demographic Data

Gender	Cohort 15	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Total
F Identified	6	7	5	18
M Identified	2	1	2	5
Undeclared	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	8	8	7	23
Race / Ethnicity	Cohort 15	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Total
White / Caucasian	5	1	3	9
African American / Black	2	3	3	8

Hispanic / Latino	1	1	0	2
Asian American / Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0
Native American / Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0
Multi-racial	0	1	0	1
Other	0	0	0	0
Undeclared	0	2	1	3
Grand Total	8	8	7	23
Age Range	Cohort 15	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Total
20 - 24	0	0	0	0
25 - 29	1	1	2	3
30 - 39	7	5	4	16
40 - 49	0	1	1	2
50 - 59	0	1	0	1
60 & Over	0	0	0	0
Undeclared	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	8	8	7	23

Discussion: Overall, it is fair to say that the 3 cohorts of the DCES program to this point can be called diverse. Of a total of 23 students, there were more students of color than White students, with an additional 3 students being undeclared. Both Cohort 2017 and 2016 were quite diverse, although Cohort 2015 is clearly within a more conventional range. It is also important to note that of the 3 cohorts approximately 70% of the students were in their 30's during this period. It is interesting that only one student was in the 50 year-old range. Why the program did not and does not attract older students is unknown at this time.

Table 3: Persistence Data Based on Fall 2017 Day Ten Report

By Programs, Chicago	Fall 2016	Persisted into Fall 2017 ^a		Withdrew by Fall 2017 ^b	
	<i>Counts</i>	<i>Counts</i>	<i>Rates</i>	<i>Counts</i>	<i>Rates</i>
PhD in Counselor Educ. & Supervision (DCES)	16	16	100.	0	0.0

Discussion: As can be readily observed in the persistence table above, all of the students of Cohorts 2015 and 2016 persisted into the fall of 2017. This shows a steady and remarkable consistency in terms of the student determination and persistence to complete the program. This is likely attributable to the amount of advising, encouragement, and overall support provided to students by faculty. It is accurate to state that even though there was a small number of core faculty throughout this period, every effort was made by the then Director of Training, Program Director and the Chair of the CEC department, to assure that students were in good communication and engagement with the core faculty and faculty associates. They were made to feel supported, and knew that they could contact faculty who made themselves readily available to students in the effort to be of assistance and help.

Table 4: Program Student Load Data (Based on Fall 2017 Day Ten Report)

Student Loads by Program – Fall 2017	Highest Program †	Full-time	Half-time	Less than Half-time
	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>		
Chicago Campus Programs				
PhD in Counselor Education & Supervision	23	100.0	0.0	0.0

Discussion: It is important to note that there were no part time students through nearly the first 2 years of the DCES program. In the 2015 cohort, one student decided to switch to part time due to work demands. That particular student moved to part time just before the comprehensive examination, which marks the end of the first 2 years. However, strictly speaking he was within the range of full time in terms of his courses completed up until the time of his comps. In the case of Cohort 2016, all of the students who originally matriculated remain full time at the time of this writing. Once again, their persistence has been remarkable.

Table 5: 2017-2018 Graduate Demographic Data

Gender	2018	Total
F Identified	4	4
M Identified	0	0
Undeclared	0	0
Grand Total	4	4
Race / Ethnicity	2018	Total
White / Caucasian	4	4
African American / Black	0	0
Hispanic / Latino	0	0
Asian American / Pacific Islander	0	0

Native American / Alaskan Native	0	0
Multi-racial	0	1
Other	0	0
Undeclared	0	3
Grand Total	8	23
Age Range	Cohort 15	Total
25 - 29	0	0
30 - 39	4	4
40 - 49	0	0
Grand Total	4	4

Discussion:

In the DCES program, 4 of the 8 students in the original 2015 cohort have graduated. The remaining 4 members of the cohort are still working on their dissertations including one successful defense and in the process of final edits. Some of the factors that account for the delay are: change over to part-time status, gainful employment, and need of self-care. It is important to note that these remaining students, having started in fall of 2015 still have until 2022 to complete their degree requirements. This is due to the fact that the DCES doctoral program allows for 7 years to completion. Thus, it should be mentioned that all of these students still have ample time to complete their programs.

SECTION II: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

A. Student Learning Outcome – Knowledge

Table 4: Cohort 2017 Student Group Performance based on the First-year Classes

Student Group Performance Based on Course Rubric & Course Learning Objectives			
Each standard is rated on a scale of 1 (Below Expectations), 2 (Meet Expectations) and 3 (Exceed Expectations) as described in the Criteria	Number of Students in the Cohort 2017, First Year	Success Criteria: Receives a “2” or higher on each course-based rubric domain	Success Criteria of the course: 90% of Students attained an average of 2 or above in each course rubric

DCES-700: Professional Orientation & Academic Endeavors I	6	2	100%
DCES-701: Professional Orientation & Academic Endeavors II	6	3	100%
DCES-702: Professional Orientation & Academic Endeavors III	6	2.6	100%
DCES-703: Advanced Individual Counseling & Career Theory	6	2	100%
DCES-704: Advanced Multicultural Counseling, Advocacy, & Leadership	6	1.8	67%
DCES-705: Teaching & Learning in Higher Education	6	2.4	100%
DCES-706: Clinical Supervision and Consultation	6	2.7	100%
DCES-707: Advanced Assessment, Diagnosis, & Treatment Planning	6	2.1	100%
DCES 803: Crisis Intervention, Disaster, & Trauma Management	6	2.4	100%
DCES-821: Qualitative Research Methods in Counseling	6	2.8	100%
DCES-822: Quantitative Research Methods in Counseling	6	2.9	100%
DCES-850: Advanced Clinical Counseling Practicum & Seminar	6	2.1	100%

Discussion: In each of the courses above, the success criteria were met except for DCES 704 in which two students of the cohort of 6, struggled with that and also other courses. However, from the faculty's rating of the students in DCES 704, and course evaluations from the students, it was decided that there would be a need to change some parts of the content of the course in order to improve the quality of the course itself. In order to strengthen students' awareness of both multicultural and leadership competencies, students henceforth are required to initiate and to conduct both diversity discussion and facilitation in the course. It was determined that this would bring about an enhanced level of understanding and participation and thus, a greater level of

understanding of these vital issues within the course framework. It is important to note, however, that one student in the 2017 cohort left the program before the end of the first semester and this explains why the number in that cohort went from 7 to 6.

Table 5: Cohort 2016 Student Group Performance based on the Second – year courses

Student Group Performance Based on Course Rubric & Course Learning Objectives			
Each standard is rated on a scale of 1 (Below Expectations), 2 (Meet Expectations) and 3 (Exceed Expectations) as described in the Criteria	Number of Students in the Cohort 2016, Second Year	Success Criteria: Receives a “2” or higher on each course-based rubric domain	Success Criteria of the course: 90% of Students attained an average of 2 or above in each course rubric
DCES-804: Group Counseling and Supervision	8	2.6	100%
DCES-805: Advanced Techniques in Counseling & Psychotherapy	8	2.6	100%
DCES-822: Quantitative Research Methods in Counseling	8	2.5	100%
DCES-823: Applied Statistics and Analysis in Research	8	2.5	100%

Discussion: The course-based rubric scores that the students of Cohort 2016 earned were of generally high quality, that is, no lower than an average 2.5, which occurred in two courses, DCES 822 and DCES 823. However, the success criteria were reached in all of the relevant courses in the above chart. No modifications of these courses are needed.

B. Student Learning Outcomes: – Skills Assessment

The DCES program assesses students’ skills through their practicum and internship. The following table is based on the site supervisor evaluation of students’ practicum. At the time of this program evaluation, students of cohort 2017 had only completed their practicum.

Table 6: 2017 Cohort on Skills Assessments

DCES-850: Advanced Clinical Counseling Practicum & Seminar	Number of Students in the Cohort 2017, First Year	Success Criteria: Receives a “2” or higher on each evaluation criterion	Success Criteria 100% of students attained 2 or above in site supervisors’ ratings.
Evaluation Criteria:			
Present a broad theoretical understanding and counseling orientation that is based on knowledge of therapeutic change and a critical review of existing counseling theories.	6	2.2	100%
Understand and apply multiple effective counseling theories.	6	2.2	100%
Demonstrate an understanding of case conceptualization and effective interventions across diverse populations and settings.	6	2.2	100%
Exhibit a practice of evaluating self-performance through effective assessments of the client, the counselor (you), and counselor-client dynamics.	6	2.3	100%
Increased familiarity with clinical assessment and diagnosis using the DSM-V	6	2	100%
Self-awareness of person of the therapist issues	6	2.3	100%
Provide treatment recommendations grounded in research and evidence-based practice	6	2	100%
Develop a systems approach to mental health by gaining knowledge of the influence of community and agency dynamics on client demography and service utilization.	6	2.2	100%
Demonstrate an understanding of Adlerian Theory and case conceptualization and treatment planning	6	2	100%

Discussion: It should be noted at the outset of this discussion, once again, that the 2017 Cohort began with 7 students matriculating but lost one who did not finish the first semester. This explains why only 6 students reached the point of practicum. For the sake of this analysis, the ratings of students’ performance skills are being considered in the context of their practicum experience. The ratings were completed by practicum supervisors on a scale of 1 to 3 with 2 being acceptable and 3 exceeding expectations. As can be seen, 100% of the students attained success criteria in their evaluations by their site supervisors.

Students of Cohort 2017 entered their second year and started to take part in various internships. Data collected to evaluate their skills are based on the three required internship experiences: Teaching, Supervision and Research. Students are also evaluated when they participated in other types of approved internships including Leadership, Advocacy, and Program Development. It should also be noted, once again, that students who did not take the Social Justice Practicum in their master’s program at Adler are required to take Social Justice Internships in the DCES program. The DCES program assess students’ skills through their practicum and internship. At the time of this program evaluation, students only had completed their practicum.

C. Student Professional Dispositional Assessment Data

Students’ professional Dispositions were assessed through 7 areas: Self-Awareness, Openness, Interpersonal Effectiveness, Professional Integrity, Respect and Commitment to Diversity & Social Justice, Ethical Practice, and Clinical and Professional Readiness. Instructors were asked to rate students in these areas after each course. At the end of each semester, faculty meet and discuss students’ disposition scores. See Tables 7 & 8 below for a display of the 7 professional dispositions in the contexts of the performance of the 2016 and 2017 cohorts

The scale used for this assessment of professional dispositions is:

- 1 = Deficient
- 2 = Developing
- 3 = Demonstrated

In the following tables, the dispositions of two cohorts—2016 and 2017 are presented with ratings as to student performance.

Table 7: Student Professional Disposition Assessment Table - 2017 Cohort First Year Performance

SEMESTER	SELF-AWARE	OPENNES	INTERPERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS	PROFESSIONAL INTEGRITY	DIVERSITY SOCIAL JUSTICE	ETHICAL PRACTICE	PROFESSIONAL READINESS
----------	------------	---------	-----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	------------------	------------------------

Fall 2017	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.7	2.3
Spr 2018	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.5
Sum 2018	2.8	2.9	3	2.9	3	3	3
Year Composite	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.6

Discussion: Students in the 2017 cohort scored in a range that showed no areas of major concern. It should be noted that scores were particularly high in the Summer of 2018.

Table 8: Professional Disposition Assessment Data Year 2016 Cohort, 2nd Year

SEMESTER	SELF-AWARE	OPENNESS	INTERPERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS	PROFESSIONAL INTEGRITY	DIVERSITY SOCIAL JUSTICE	ETHICAL PRACTICE	PROFESSIONAL READINESS
Fall 2017	2.5	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8
Spr 2018	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sum 2018	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.8	3	3	2.9
Year Composite	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.9	3	3	2.9

Discussion: The 2016 cohort scored remarkably high in professional dispositions over the 2017/2018 period. There were no areas of concern displayed and overall the cohort performed very well indeed. Spring of 2018 produced scores of 3.0 across the chart in a highly impressive display of professional dispositions.

SECTION III: PROGRAM DATA AND EVALUATION

Assessment of program objectives were based on data collected through course rubrics and course objectives which were formulated based on the program objectives.

The data displayed in the chart below is based on course rubrics. The course objectives are derived from program objectives and CACREP standards. The rating scale itself is based on a one to three range, with one being below expectations, 2 meets expectations and 3 exceeds expectations.

A. Aggregated Data on Program Objectives

Table 9: Program Objectives, Cohort 2017 First Year Courses

Program Objectives These are composite scores from course rubrics related to each of the program learning outcomes/objectives. The course rubrics are set on a scale of 1-3, 1 (Below Expectations), 2 (Meet Expectations) and 3 (Exceed Expectations) as described in the Criteria.	Average Ratings on Students Individual Performance	Average Ratings on Course Objectives Across Different Courses
1. Demonstrate an in-depth understanding and identification of the various roles of counselor educators in the training and supervision of counselors, teaching, advancing the standards, knowledge and skills based on the profession of counseling, research and scholarly work, advocating the welfare of those whom they serve, and advocating for and leadership within the profession.	2.4 All students exceeded expectation level	2.8
2. Demonstrate a conceptual understanding of and ability to apply various theories and models in the supervision of counselors with reference to the characteristics of the counselor supervisees, clinical settings, and relevant therapeutic issues.	2.7 All students exceeded expectation level	2.7
3. Demonstrate the ability to apply, evaluate, and integrate theories from both individual and systems perspectives in the provision of interventions in different practice areas in counseling and in serving diverse populations.	2.1 All students exceeded expectation level	2.3
4. Demonstrate competencies in applying teaching strategies, instructional theories, and evaluative measures in the development of curriculum and teaching modules pertaining to counselor education and the training of counselors.	2.2 All students exceeded expectation level	2.2
5. Demonstrate an in-depth understanding and ability in designing and implementing research from both quantitative and qualitative paradigms, and awareness and realization of the importance of research and scholarly contribution to the profession.	2.8 All students exceeded expectation level	2.9
6. Demonstrate an advanced understanding of social change theories, and a keen awareness of social justice issues and their respective causes from social, cultural, and systemic perspectives.	2.5 All students exceeded expectation level	2.4
7. Demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the role of counselor educators in social changes and advancement of the counseling profession; and ability to utilize leadership and advocacy models in order to initiate changes with reference to topical and political conditions.	2.4 All students exceeded expectation level	2.5

8. Demonstrate a high level of awareness and aptitude in assessment and evaluation as well as evidence-informed practices in areas of counseling, teaching, supervision, advocacy, and program development.	2.4 All students exceeded expectation level	2.4
9. Integrate Adlerian principles and counseling approach in areas of counseling, teaching, supervision, and advocacy.	2.7	2.7
10. Demonstrate a commitment to socially responsible practice and adherence to ethical standards established by the profession, and to regulations set up by local, regional, and national authorities.	3 All students exceeded expectation level	3
11. Demonstrate multicultural competencies in all aspects of practice as a counselor educator, with advanced understanding of the impact and management of diverse factors in the preparation of counselors, provision of treatment and intervention for clients, promotion of client welfare, development of programs and services, observation of ethical and legal standards, and initiation of social change through political venues and strategies.	2.5 All students exceeded expectation level	2.6
12. Forms an identity and function of that of a scholar capable of actively contributing to the knowledge base of the profession, as well as to the knowledge base of the mental health professions in general, through scholarly publications. This can be done conceptually through scholarly writing in the form of analysis of the literature, designing research-based models, or constructively writing articles analyzing the profession itself with the intention of improving it. This also involves not only the ability to conduct quantitative and qualitative research, but also the ability to logically conceive and put in writing both the results and the implications of those results in the venue of scholarly, peer-reviewed journal articles and books.	2.4 All students exceeded expectation level	2.4

Discussion: Student performance appears to be quite acceptable with the lowest rating of program objectives (PO) being at 2.1 at the level of individual performance, and 2.3 with regard to ratings on course objectives across courses. In terms of the highest ratings at the level of individual performance, PO #5 and PO #10 received the highest ratings at 2.8 and 3.0 respectively, in the areas of research and socially responsible practice, the latter being closely aligned with the mission of Adler University. The highest ratings on course objectives across different courses were also with regard to PO #5 and PO #10. Overall, it appears that the DCES

program is a high quality program that has so far been successful in achieving objectives. It also appears to be safe to say that students are benefitting from the curriculum offered, and the courses taken.

Table 10: Program Objectives, Cohort 2016 Second Year Courses

Program Objectives These are composites scores from course rubrics related to each of the program learning outcomes/objectives. The course rubrics are set on a scale of 1-3, 1 (Below Expectations), 2 (Meet Expectations) and 3 (Exceed Expectations) as described in the Criteria.	Average Ratings on Students Individual Performance	Average Ratings on Course Objectives Across Different Courses
1. Demonstrate an in-depth understanding and identification of the various roles of counselor educators in the training and supervision of counselors, teaching, advancing the standards, knowledge and skills based on the profession of counseling, research and scholarly work, advocating the welfare of those whom they serve, and advocating for and leadership within the profession.	N/A	
2. Demonstrate a conceptual understanding of and ability to apply various theories and models in the supervision of counselors with reference to the characteristics of the counselor supervisees, clinical settings, and relevant therapeutic issues.	N/A	
3. Demonstrate the ability to apply, evaluate, and integrate theories from both individual and systems perspectives in the provision of interventions in different practice areas in counseling and in serving diverse populations.	2.6 All students exceeded expectation level	2.6
4. Demonstrate competencies in applying teaching strategies, instructional theories, and evaluative measures in the development of curriculum and teaching modules pertaining to counselor education and the training of counselors.	N/A	
5. Demonstrate an in-depth understanding and ability in designing and implementing research from both quantitative and qualitative paradigms, and awareness and realization of the importance of research and scholarly contribution to the profession.	2.9 All students exceeded expectation level	2.9
6. Demonstrate an advanced understanding of social change theories, and a keen awareness of social	N/A	

justice issues and their respective causes from social, cultural, and systemic perspectives.		
7. Demonstrate an in-depth understanding of the role of counselor educators in social changes and advancement of the counseling profession; and ability to utilize leadership and advocacy models in order to initiate changes with reference to topical and political conditions.	3 All students exceeded expectation level	3
8. Demonstrate a high level of awareness and aptitude in assessment and evaluation as well as evidence-informed practices in areas of counseling, teaching, supervision, advocacy, and program development.	2.8 All students exceeded expectation level	2.8
9. Integrate Adlerian principles and counseling approach in areas of counseling, teaching, supervision, and advocacy.	N/A	
10. Demonstrate a commitment to socially responsible practice and adherence to ethical standards established by the profession, and to regulations set up by local, regional, and national authorities.	3 All students exceeded expectation level	3
11. Demonstrate multicultural competencies in all aspects of practice as a counselor educator, with advanced understanding of the impact and management of diverse factors in the preparation of counselors, provision of treatment and intervention for clients, promotion of client welfare, development of programs and services, observation of ethical and legal standards, and initiation of social change through political venues and strategies.	2.5 All students exceeded expectation level	2.5
12. Forms an identity and function of that of a scholar capable of actively contributing to the knowledge base of the profession, as well as to the knowledge base of the mental health professions in general, through scholarly publications. This can be done conceptually through scholarly writing in the form of analysis of the literature, designing research-based models, or constructively writing articles analyzing the profession itself with the intention of improving it. This also involves not only the ability to conduct quantitative and qualitative research, but also the ability to logically conceive and put in writing both the results and the implications of those results in the venue of scholarly, peer-reviewed journal articles and books.	N/A	N/A

Discussion: Some program objectives (POs) are marked with the notation of N/A due to the fact that courses were not taken in the second year that were directly relevant to those POs so marked. Six of the POs were marked N/A. Having said that, it is important to comment on how the program appears overall. Simply stated, the program appears to be highly efficient in achieving program objectives. In fact, the ratings here are quite high, giving further evidence that the DCES program is successful in terms of the curriculum design, courses offered, and courses taken. Indirectly, it could be inferred that the teaching quality of instructors in the program has also been of good quality.

B. DATA AND EVALUATION ON CACREP DOCTORAL CORE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Table 11 Aggregated Data on CACREP Doctoral Core Areas – 2017 First year Courses

<i>CACREP Doctoral Core Area</i>	<i>Average Ratings on Students Individual Performance</i>	<i>Average Ratings on Course Objectives Across Different Courses</i>
1. Counseling	2.4	2.1
2. Supervision	2.7	2.7
3. Teaching	2.2	2.2
4. Research and Scholarship	2.5	2.8
5. Leadership and Advocacy	2.4	2.4

Discussion: The data show that the average ratings on CACREP core areas are quite acceptable with regard to the range of first-year courses taken by the 2017 Cohort. Special attention should be paid to the average ratings on course objectives regarding Supervision (2.7) and Research & Scholarship (2.8). Individual performance of students at the individual level are also well within the range above 2.0 and therefore considered to be successful. This data appears to be evidence that the DCES program is successful on many fronts, including individual performance in courses and general performance across courses.

Table 12: Aggregated Data on CACREP Doctoral Core Areas – 2016 Cohort Courses

<i>CACREP Doctoral Core Area</i>	<i>Average Ratings on Students Individual Performance</i>	<i>Average Ratings on Course Objectives Across Different Courses</i>
1. Counseling	2.6	2.6

2. Supervision	3	3
3. Teaching	2.7	2.7
4. Research and Scholarship	2.7	2.8
5. Leadership and Advocacy	3	3

Discussion: This chart refers to the performance of the students in Cohort 2016 in their second year the DCES program. The data show that the average ratings on course objectives with regard to the range of second-year courses taken were quite high overall and especially in the areas of Supervision, Leadership/Advocacy, and Research/Scholarship. Taken as a whole, this set of data also appears to be evidence of high quality in the DCES doctoral program, specifically with regard to students' individual performance in courses and their general performance across courses.

SECTION IV: REVIEW OF MISSION STATEMENT & PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

External Advisory Board Input:

The external advisory board gave approval to the DCES mission statement, with particular regard to the overall mission of the program in the framework of freedom and liberation, having been familiar with the program director's articles on this topic published in the journal, *Counselor Education and Supervision*. The board members commented that this approach to Counselor Education was on the leading edge of where the field is headed. They also were strongly in favor of the social justice being a key aspect of the mission statement. The external advisory board also recognized that the DCES program objectives were both relevant to Counselor Education and complete in their coverage of, and how they address, the vitally important areas of study necessary for a Counselor Education program that would be seeking CACREP accreditation. In addition, several courses in the program were praised including Advanced Theories, although the Pedagogy in Counselor Education course was singled out in particular. Overall, the external advisory board agreed that the DCES program was forward in its conception and in step with current trends. The minutes of this meeting are in the appendix.

Internal Advisory Board Input:

The mission statement and program objectives were also evaluated by the internal advisory board composed of the faculty associates in the DCES program. All of the objectives were found to be appropriate and acceptable, and that the objectives covered the intentions and purposes of the program well within the parameters that should be found in a Counselor Education and Supervision doctoral program that would be seeking eventual CACREP accreditation. The program mission was also presented and found to be acceptable with little discussion. The minutes of this meeting are in the appendix.

Student Feedback and Input:

With regard to student feedback, students reported that all the courses they have taken are consistent with program objectives. Students also reported that there should be more current events discussions in more, if not all, classes. Specifically, students reported that this applies to world topics, current community topics, discussions regarding what is currently happening in the profession and legislation, and current university concerns and ways to address concerns with students. This has been addressed and added into more classes. In addition, students reported that more action should be taken by the university with regard to social justice. Students also report that the program has enhanced their professional opportunities, allow them to publish in the field, increase confidence and value in self-worth, and enhances personal and professional development. Additionally, it has clarified career goals and potential areas for research, program development, and evaluation. The minutes of this meeting are in the appendix.

An Additional Program Objective

With regard to DCES program objectives, it should be noted that originally, there were 11 program objectives in DCES. However, in the fall of 2017, a 12th objective was added that is believed to be highly important and central to the purpose and mission of the program. Program objectives were called at the time, a program learning outcome, as this was more in line with earlier standards. However, this changed with the 2016 standards, of course. Thus, this 12th program objective can be seen below and is mentioned here as an example of how the program faculty have been striving to improve the quality of the program overall.

Program Objective 12: Forms an identity and function of that of a scholar capable of actively contributing to the knowledge base of the profession, as well as to the knowledge base of the mental health professions in general, through scholarly publications. This can be done conceptually through scholarly writing in the form of analysis of the literature, designing research-based models, or constructively writing articles analyzing the profession itself with the intention of improving it. This also involves not only the ability to conduct quantitative and qualitative research, but also the ability to logically conceive and put in writing both the results and the implications of those results in the venue of scholarly, peer-reviewed journal articles and books.

SECTION V: GRADUATE DATA, ALUMNI SURVEY, SITE SUPERVISOR, AND EMPLOYERS

A. Alumni Employer Survey and Input

This section provides information on the program in the context of assessments by alumni, employers, and site supervisors.

Table 13: DCES Alumni Employer Survey

Data averages for employer survey of DCES alumni in 4 areas, on a scale of 1 to 4, where 4 is highest. Three employers responded out of a possible 4.

	Individual Average	Group Average
Competency		
Teaching	4	4
Training	4	4
Research	3	3
Leadership/Advocacy	4	4
Program Dev	4	4
Supervision	4	4
Consultation	4	4
Social Justice - Cultural Awareness		
Demonstrates Cultural Awareness	4	4
Promoting social justice; works to eliminate biases prejudice and oppression	4	4
Shows appreciation of individual and cultural differences	4	4
Understands the impact of social, political, economic, & cultural factors on well-being	4	4
Research		
Demonstrating awareness and use of evidence based and culturally relevant research	4	4
Knowledge of outcome assessment, or qualitative research, or prevention activities	n/a	n/a
Utilizes the ability to use program effectiveness measures and suggest improvements	4	4
Consultation & Supervision		
Applying knowledge of administrative factors to professional practice	4	4
Providing effective supervision or consultation for clinical services provided by others	4	4

Discussion: As can be readily seen in the chart above, there are 4 areas about which the site supervisors were queried regarding their DCES alumni employees. Each of these 4 areas has subcategories. These areas are competency, social justice and cultural awareness, research, and consultation and supervision. It is clear that the three employers who responded in regard their DCES alumni employees in an extraordinarily high fashion, with all areas receiving grades of 4,

and the exception being in the area of research competency. This is misleading however, as the separate area of research itself received ratings of 4 in 2 of the 3 research subcategories, and the remaining subcategory received a rating of n/a. This appears to be a testimony to the high quality of DCES alumni in the context of these three respondents. However, there were also 2 open-ended questions that were also sent employers of alumni. Again, there were 3 employers who responded out of a possible 4 (one of the alumni is not working at this time).

Open-Ended Responses to the DCES Employers of Alumni Survey

Question 1: What do you see as the greatest strengths of our doctoral program, based upon your observations of our alumnus?

- #1. Responsibilities, care, and concern for the university, core faculty, and students. Also, a deep appreciation for course content and teaching content and effectiveness.
- #2. Very attentive to the dynamics of power, systemic inequities and its impact on individuals, groups and communities.
- #3. I greatly appreciated how she managed a conflict with a student and confronted the issue, remediated it with consultation and maintained high quality work from students.

Question 2: In what areas does our alumnus need additional training?

- #1 Cannot think of anything
- #2 Curriculum design, student evaluation, and leadership
- #3 More confidence when operating outside of her comfort zone

Discussion: It is immediately apparent that these responses are highly positive and seem to be assessments not only of alumni by employers, but also an assessment of the DCES program itself. However, the feedback that suggests that we attend more to training in curriculum design and student evaluation and leadership seems appropriate to look into for further possibilities of improvement.

B. Practicum and Internship Site Supervisor Survey and Input

Presented below is the survey questionnaire sent to DCES practicum and internship site supervisors along with a summary of their responses.

Questions:

- After a review of the DCES program objectives, do you think the curriculum in Adler's DCES program matches what is going on in the field? If so, how? If not, what is missing?
- Do you have some ideas on how we might improve the DCES program? If so, please list them. If not, what are we doing well?

- Any additional suggestions you may have would be greatly appreciated.

Summary of Site Supervisor Input

Site supervisors stated that the DCES program objectives "...appear to be very comprehensive" and one supervisor was impressed by the popular electives offered in the curriculum. All of the supervisors surveyed stated that the objectives match their current knowledge of what is going on in the field.

Supervisors did not have any suggestions for improvement at this time. One supervisor stated that "...communication and engagement... [between the DCES program and the site]was phenomenal!"

Discussion: As can be readily seen in the summary above, the site supervisors of DCES interns and practicum students regarded DCES students in a very positive light. One of the supervisors praised the program objectives and another was impressed by the elective courses available in the curriculum. Praise was also given for the apparently effective engagement and communication maintained between the DCES program and the site.

C. Alumni Surveys and Responses

In late February and again in mid-March of 2019, 2 surveys were sent to alumni of the DCES program. At that time, and at the time of this writing, there were a total of 4 graduates of the program. All 4 alumni responded to both February survey and the March survey. Both surveys were short and quite different and separate from each other. The February survey was done for the sake of completing a comprehensive program review required and ordered by the Adler Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA). The March survey was done for primarily to gather information for the sake of this CACREP accreditation application. Both surveys are described and commented on below, in reverse chronological order.

Responses to the March Alumni Survey

Employment: 3 out of 4 respondents obtained full-time faculty positions, and one works as a clinician.

Duration of Finding Employment: 3 of the respondents indicated that they were hired before the graduation, and one got the position 3 months after the graduation.

Perspectives on the Mission and Program Objectives

One of the major purposes of this survey was to acquire feedback information from alumni regarding how they perceived the success of the DCES program mission along with their personal achievement of the 12 DCES program objectives. Specifically, alumni were asked to rate the mission success in the program. They were also asked to rate the program objectives in terms of how much each alumnus perceived that they themselves had achieved each of those objectives. They were asked to rate the mission question and program objective questions, on a scale of 1 to 3. The meaning of the ratings is below:

1. = below expectations
2. = met expectations
3. = beyond expectations

In terms of the mission of the DCES program being fulfilled by the program as delivered, the average score was 2.5 and there were no ratings below 2.0. In the case of the program objectives, remarkably, there were no ratings below 2.0 on any of the 12 objectives by any of the 4 alumni. The lowest score for any of the objectives was 2.25 for program objective #1 regarding the role of the counselor educator and also #5 which is the ability to design and implement research. The highest rating given was 2.75, for program objective #12 which has to do with forming a scholarly identity. In summary, the mean score for all 12 program objectives was 2.36.

Suggestions for improvement of the program:

“Have the program expectations and sequence available and prepared for students upon admission into the program.”

“I think more challenging assignments would have helped elevate the classes.”

Strengths of the Program:

“Overall the structure, content and support within the program were great!”

“Comprehensive exams and dissertation structure were fantastic!”

“Ability to work full time and take evening and weekend courses.”

“Flexible schedules”

Discussion: As can be seen, alumni very clearly rated the program and their learning information and skills within the program as meeting expectations and exceeding expectations. This appears to be an indicator of the success of the DCES program thus far. Every alumnus clearly believed that they had achieved each one of the 12 objectives. There was not a single rating below 2.0 by any of the respondents on any of the objectives. In other words, it could be safely stated that the alumni believe that they obtained the benefit of having achieved success in each one of the 12 program objectives, and also believe that the program itself had met its mission statement parameters.

With regard to suggestions for improvement and what alumni liked the most about the program, some very good points are made. Clearly there is much to be said for the program overall as a result of this survey. And good suggestions were made that should be pursued.

Responses to the February Alumni Survey

In this survey 4 generally open questions were asked of DCES alumni and no ratings were required. This survey was originally designed for an internal comprehensive program review required by Adler. But it has relevance for this document and so results are included as appropriate. The questions are listed below:

1. Please list any employment that you have received or have been offered in a counseling related area that was made possible by your doctoral degree in CES.
2. Since graduating, have you been involved in job placements that involve working with underserved populations in a socially responsible context?
3. Please report on if and how you are engaged with Adler University in any professional way.
4. Please add anything else you may want us to know.

Responses to the February Alumni Survey

Student survey responses relevant to this accreditation application revealed that 4 alumni are employed and each of those 4 believe that it was the DCES program that afforded them the opportunity to find employment at a level that would not have been available without a PhD degree. With regard to the second question, 2 of the 4 alumni are working with underserved populations.

However, the general comments in response to the open-ended question 4 are relevant to this document and are included below. Students talked about the strengths of the program which enabled them to find employment readily.

Some indicated that the program is practical, emphasizing purposeful and intentional learning that benefits their current practices while simultaneously preparing you for that which they have yet to experience. It is engaging, thoughtful, community spirited, and rigorous.

Discussion: As can be seen, alumni reported a generally positive perspective on the DCES program from their vantage points in retrospect.

SECTION VI: PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS AND ACTIONS

- Curriculum Change: Removing DCES 707: Advanced Assessment, Diagnosis, and Treatment in Counseling While Adding DCES 804 Advanced Group Counseling and Supervision

Purpose of the Change: The content of DCES707 has been covered by other courses like Advanced Techniques and Theories. The re-installing of the Advanced Group Counseling and Supervision course will provide students direct supervision experience when they lead and supervise MA group leaders in their Group Counseling course.

- Course Added

DCES 899: Special Topics

Course Description: It becomes occasionally appropriate that a student do an independent study with a faculty member on a special topic relevant to the field of Counselor Education and Supervision. This Special Topics course fills that need. This independent study could be any

topic in the field, including but not limited to, the practice of counseling and psychotherapy, counselor training, trauma, leadership, advocacy, diversity, multiculturalism, research, or other related area of study. The number of credits for this course can vary from 1 to 3.

Purpose of the Change: Student feedback indicated that the DCES program should offer an Independent Study course option so that faculty members can work with students' interests when possible. The faculty agreed and this was placed in the curriculum.

- **Elective Course Added**

DCES 898: Neuroscientific Aspects of Counseling

Course Description: This course will examine research findings from the field of neuroscience and the relationship to counseling therapies. A special focus will be on the impact of belief and behavior on brain chemistry, which impacts our moods and health in general. Students will explore the **application of neurobiological** research to clinical practice. Neurochemical shifts, neural activity, and neurostructural changes as a result of counseling will be reviewed.

Purpose of the Change: Since neuroscience is an important and popular topic in the mental health professions in general, this course was placed into the curriculum to fill that need as appropriate.

- **Change in Timeline in Program of Study:**

DCES 850: Advanced Clinical Practicum in Counseling

Change: The course had previously been offered in summer semester. However, the faculty essentially decided in spring semester that the practicum course be moved to spring semester for the year 2020 with regard to the 2019 Cohort. However, the decision itself to move the course was not formally made in the spring although it was generally agreed at that time that this change would be made for 2020.

Purpose of the Change: It was noted that has been difficult for students to find a practicum site in the summer

- **Elective Course Planned**

DCES XXX: Advanced Adlerian Counseling and Therapy

Course Description: To be announced.

Purpose of the Change: Students who did not attain their Master's degree at Adler expressed interests in taking a formal Adlerian course which will emphasize on the application of Adlerian

principles and theory in teaching, supervision, counseling and other areas of the work of a counselor educator.