

**2023-2024 PhD in Counselor Education and Supervision Evaluation Report**

**Program Mission**

The PhD in Counselor Education and Supervision trains professionals to integrate Christian faith into their multifaceted roles as a counselor educators. We develop skilled professionals, who in their awareness and development of self, are compassionate, competent, and take responsibility for engaging those whom they serve in culturally relevant and responsive ways. Students acquire knowledge and skills to contribute and influence the professional domains of clinical counseling, counselor education, supervision, research, leadership, advocacy, and the integration of faith in professional practice.

**Vital Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Students** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Gender  | Age  | Residency  |
| YEAR  | M  | F  | 21-30  | 31-40  | 40+  | CO Res.  | Out of St.  |
| FA21  | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| FA22  | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| FA23  | 5 | 10 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 12 |
| FA24  | 3 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YEAR  | White  | Black or African-Am  | Hispanic  | Asian  | Native-Am  | Multiracial  | Other |
| FA21  | 6 |   |   |   |   |   | 1 |
| FA22  | 5 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |
| FA23  | 7 | 5 | 1 |   |   |   | 1 |
| FA24  | 8 | 2 | 1 |   |   |   |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Faculty** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Gender  | Age  | Residency  |
| YEAR  | M  | F  | 21-30  | 31-40  | 40+  | CO Res.  | Out of St.  |
| FA21  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| FA22  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| FA23  | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| FA24  | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YEAR  | White  | Black or African-Am  | Hispanic  | Asian  | Native-Am  | Multiracial  | Other |
| FA21  | 1 |  2 |   |   |   |   |  |
| FA22  | 1 | 3 |   |   |   |   |   |
| FA23  | 1 | 2 |  |   |   |   |  |
| FA24  | 1 | 2 |  |   |   |   |  |

**Major Program Activities**

This report reflects program activities and evaluation in AY 2023-2024. During this academic year, the department was in time of significant revision.

* We shifted from the CACREP 2016 to the CACREP 2024 standards beginning Fall of 2023 (thus our data reporting window).
* We completed the initial CACREP self-study and submitted it for review.
* We updated program mission, vision, and objectives to better reflect the current workforce landscape and our philosophical commitments. This included curricular and assignment emphases and inclusion of a robust DEI statement embedded in our Ph.D. program manual and each course syllabus.
* We finished implementing updates to curricula, program evaluation, and student assessment procedures to comply with CACREP 2024 standards.
* We launched new alumni, site supervisor, and employer surveys aligned to program updates above.
* We implemented the first year of our new graduate assistantship program in which 15 PhD students participated in teaching, supervision, or research experiences with core faculty members.
* We adjusted comprehensive exam dates to aid in matriculation. We also implemented an additional dissertation course to support students and chairs at the start of the dissertation process.
* Our department chair left, and we successfully transitioned an existing faculty member to the department chair position. We hired one part-time faculty member and began a faculty search committee launch for an additional full-time PhD CES faculty member who is set to begin in May of 2025.
* Notably, within the data reporting period, five students left the program and this was due to personal stressors. As such, we had an annual retention rate of 84%.

**Sources of Data**

The following sources of data were utilized in developing this report

1. Denver Seminary reports regarding admissions and enrollment data for the AY23-24 cycle
2. Aggregate data on all key performance indicators (KPIs) assessed during this year.
3. Student performance on final internship evaluations from instructors and site supervisors.
4. Formative and summative disposition assessments using the *Assessment of Professional Counseling Dispositions* evaluation completed by core faculty members.

**PhD CES Academic Quality Indicators**

**PhD Aggregate Assessment of Student Success**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **KPI** | **Time** | **M** | **% Met Threshold** |
| 6.B.1.c. - conceptualization of clients from multiple theoretical perspectives | **Time 1****Time 2** | **100%****96%** | Time 1: 100% of grades were a “B” or higher.Time 2: 100% of grades were a “B” or higher. |
| 6.B.2.b. - theoretical frameworks and models of clinical supervision | **Time 1****Time 2** | **91%****100%** | Time 1: 100% of grades were a “B” or higher.Time 2: 100% of grades were a “B” or higher. |
| 6.B.3.b. - pedagogy and teaching methods relevant to counselor education | **Time 1****Time 2****Time 3** | **97%****100%****100%** | Time 1: 100% of grades were a “B” or higher.Time 2: 100% of grades were a “B” or higher.Time 3: 100% of grades were a “B” or higher. |
| 6.B.4.a. research designs appropriate to quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, and action research questions or hypotheses  | **Time 1****Time 2****Time 3** | **94%****92%****94%** | Time 1: 100% of grades were a “B” or higher.Time 2: 100% of grades were a “B” or higher.Time 3: 100% of grades were a “B” or higher. |
| 6.B.5.h. - current sociopolitical and social justice issues and how those issues affect the counseling profession | **Time 1****Time 2** | **95%****96%** | Time 1: 100% of grades were a “B” or higher.Time 2: 100% of grades were a “B” or higher. |
| Demonstrate professional counseling dispositions | **Time 1****Time 2** | **2.79 (out of 3)****3.25 (out of 4)** | Time 1: 100% of students scored above the cut-off.Time 2: 100% of students scored above the cut-off. |

**Fieldwork Placement Rates**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SPA** | **Experience**  | **Placement Rate** | **Trend** |
| **CES** | PracticumInternship | 100%100% | StableStable |

**Summary of Disposition Findings**

We assessed student professional dispositions using the *Assessment of Professional Counseling Dispositions* evaluation. Formatively, students are evaluated using the APCD in each course except for dissertation. For reporting purposes, we averaged all APCD forms from the fall semester. The data points were averaged for an overall disposition assessment of each student. 100% of students met or exceeded expectations (2 or above on a 3-point scale) Cohort 1 averaged 2.78, Cohort 2 averaged 2.77, and Cohort 3 averaged 2.82. Students showed the most strengths in cooperativeness with others, ability to accept personal responsibility, and attention to ethical and legal considerations. Students showed the most opportunity for improvement in initiative and motivation, orientation to multiculturalism and social justice advocacy, and professional wellness and self-care.

PhD core faculty completed a summative evaluation prior to Residency. The data points were averaged for an overall disposition assessment of each student. 100% of students met or exceeded expectations (3 or above on a 4-point scale). Cohort 1 averaged 3.57, Cohort 2 averaged 3.13, and Cohort 3 averaged 3.14. Students demonstrated similar areas of growth and improvement, though some increase in orientation to multiculturalism and social justice advocacy.

**PhD CES Program Evaluation Findings**

**Objective 1: Equip students with advanced knowledge and skills in counseling theories and counseling practice to serve a culturally diverse society.**

* KPI-100% of students met expectations on their time 1 and time 2 in knowledge and skills in theoretical conceptualization as assessed through a lesson plan and case study paper. Results indicated strengths in treatment planning and diagnosis. There was the most opportunity for growth in ethical and multicultural application as well as faith integration.
* Comprehensive Exams: 100% of students passed comprehensive exams with an 80% or higher. Areas of strength were in conceptualization of the client from multiple theoretical perspectives and faith integration. There were no clear trends in areas for growth.
* Feedback Partner Surveys: The partner surveys indicated that our site supervisors strongly believe that our training equips students to address this program objective (average of 5 out of Likert scale of 1-5, with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree).

**Objective 2: Prepare students to articulate and demonstrate their preferred model of clinical supervision that is culturally relevant and responsive.**

* KPI-100% of students met expectations on their time 1 and time 2 of demonstration of their supervision theory/model as assessed through their personal philosophy of supervision and supervision case study paper. Results indicated strength in supervisory interventions and techniques as well as conceptualization of their supervision model. There was the most opportunity for growth in articulating supervisee development.
* Comprehensive Exams: 100% of students passed comprehensive exams with an 80% or higher. There were no clear trends in areas for growth. Students consistently demonstrated growth in conceptualization and application of their chosen supervision model.
* Feedback Partner Surveys: The partner surveys indicated that our site supervisors strongly believe that our training equips students to address this program objective (average of 4.8 out of Likert scale of 1-5, with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree).

**Objective 3: Train students in evidence-based models of adult learning for work with diverse clients, students, and organizations.**

* KPI-100% of students met expectations on their time 1 and time 2 in their teaching skills as assessed through teaching demonstrations and lesson plan development. Results indicate strengths in articulation of theories and models of adult learning, theological integration, and approach to teaching those from diverse backgrounds. The greatest areas for growth were in instructional design and classroom engagement.
* Comprehensive Exams: 100% of students passed comprehensive exams with an 80% or higher. Results indicated strength in models and theories of adult learning as well as use of the person of the educator (e.g., personality and as a cultural being). Students consistently demonstrated opportunities for growth in instructional design and one student with integration of diversity, equity, and inclusion into teaching strategies.
* The partner surveys indicated that our site supervisors strongly believe that our training equips students to address this program objective (average of 5 out of Likert scale of 1-5, with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree).

**Objective 4: Equip students to critically evaluate and select, design, and execute quantitative and qualitative research relevant to counseling and counselor education.**

* KPI-100% of students met expectations on their time 1, time 2, and time 3 in research design and execution as assessed through research proposals. Results indicate strengths in research design and use of literature. The greatest opportunities for growth were in data collection and analysis.
* Comprehensive Exams: 100% of students passed comprehensive exams with an 80% or higher. Results indicated strength in models and theories of adult learning as well as use of the person of the educator (e.g., personality and as a cultural being). Students consistently demonstrated opportunities for growth in sampling and data collection as well as faith integration (approximately half of the sample for the latter).
* The partner surveys indicated that our site supervisors strongly believe that our training equips students to address this program objective (average of 5 out of Likert scale of 1-5, with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree).

**Objective 5: Prepare students to engage as leaders and advocates regarding current sociopolitical and social justice issues within the counseling profession on a programmatic, institutional, state, regional, and national level.**

* KPI-100% of students met expectations on their time 1 and time 2 in their leadership and advocacy as assessed through a current issue paper and theological integration and current issues in the dissertation. Results indicate strengths in integration of faith and articulation of current sociopolitical or social justice issues and their plans for advocacy both within the profession and within their dissertation research. There were no trend areas for growth.
* Comprehensive Exams: 100% of students passed comprehensive exams with an 80% or higher. Results indicated strength in articulation of approach and application of leadership models to the people and context in which they will work. A little less than half of the students demonstrated an opportunity for growth in the integration of diversity, equity, and inclusion principles into their approach to leadership.
* The partner surveys indicated that our site supervisors strongly believe that our training equips students to address this program objective (average of 4.8 out of Likert scale of 1-5, with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree).

**Objective 6: Train students to ethically integrate spirituality into their work as counselor educators.**

* No KPIs tied to integration of spirituality.
* Comprehensive Exams: 100% of students passed comprehensive exams with an 80% or higher. Faith integration was embedded within questions in each of the 5 professional domains. Students demonstrated strengths in faith integration across 4 of the 5 professional domains. At the time of comprehensive exams, research was the only area in which there was consistent evidence of an opportunity for growth for about half of the sample.
* The partner surveys indicated that our site supervisors strongly believe that our training equips students to address this program objective (average of 5 out of Likert scale of 1-5, with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree).

**PhD CES Program Changes, Improvements, and Response**

1. Contextualize of the above information:
	1. The data collection and reporting process for dispositions during this reporting period has proved inefficient and cumbersome for faculty members (data was collected in each class period, with faculty meeting with all students once or twice during the semester). Given the importance of monitoring dispositions, especially within an online program, we wanted to make sure our assessment and reporting was robust. Moving forward, faculty members will continue to collect disposition data in each course (excluding dissertations courses), but will only meet with those who score a 1 on any item in the Assessment of Professional Counseling Dispositions (APCD). The faculty will then meet at the end of the Fall semester to provide formative feedback for each student that mimics the summative assessment process during our annual residency (see assessment plan document). This allows for immediate support and remediation within courses and provides a formative summary. The faculty will also continue to discuss disposition issues/trends once a month, which supports consensus in supporting students early through disposition concerns.
	2. We have adjusted our data collection procedures for KPIs to request specific articulation of trends (growth and strengths) in our end of semester forms as observed by instructors of record. This will allow for greater efficiency and precision in reporting.
	3. Additionally, given that Moodle is our outcome repository for KPI assignment rubrics and reporting, instructors will be required to change the assignment types to allow for uploading of files for feedback (i.e., papers with tracked changes and assignment rubrics) or work with our educational technology department to develop rubrics within TurnItIn.
2. Celebrate any improved trends (or continued high performance)
	1. Although our reporting period is from Fall 23-Summer 24, our students are excellent both academically and dispositionally. We have excellent students!
	2. Students improved in outcomes for faith integration from the beginning of the program to the end in all but one area.
3. Note plan for addressing any unmet thresholds or negative trends
	1. Diversity, equity and inclusion and multicultural competencies
		1. The switch to the 2024 standards came with a greater focus on DEI. Although the program had a great deal of curricular and instructional strategies for multicultural competency integration throughout the program, the specific attention to and integration of DEI began in fall of 2023. This means that some of the students in our reporting period received less training in DEI specifically. As such, our faculty meetings moving into this next reporting period will focus on brainstorming both curricular (e.g., readings and assignments) and instructional strategies for supporting students in this area.
	2. Faith integration in research
		1. In recognition of the need for more focus on ethical integration of faith within research, the program faculty re-designed our final course for integration (CO 3312 Seminary in Integration of Faith in Counselor Education) to support students specifically in this area.
	3. Instructional design
		1. It is unclear as to why students have not clearly connected curriculum to instructional strategies. To address this, soliciting specific feedback from students as well as spending more class time on this process.
	4. Supervisee development
		1. In using student course evaluations, this opportunity for growth related to this area had more to do lack of clarity in the assignment description both in class and comprehensive exams. The assignments will be modified in spring of 2025 for greater clarity and operationalization of what is meant by supervisee development.
4. Bulleted list of actions taken based on data reported above.
	1. DEI
		1. Brainstorming in monthly Ph.D. meetings regarding implementation of curricular and instructional strategies for integration of DEI.
	2. Integration of Faith and Research
		1. Development of CO 3312 for supporting faith integration with research
	3. Instructional design
		1. Student feedback and reviewing/redesigning curriculum and instruction to address deficiency
	4. Supervisee development
		1. Re-design of CO 1204