

Program Evaluation
for
School Counseling Program, Department of Educational Psychology, Neag School of
Education at the University of Connecticut
2014-2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	02
Introduction.....	03
Admissions Assessment.....	05
Admissions Recommendations.....	08
Mid-Program Assessment.....	09
Mid-Program Recommendations.....	30
Program Completion Assessment.....	31
Program Completion Recommendations.....	39
Post Graduation Assessment.....	41
Post Graduation Recommendations.....	46
Discussion.....	47
Summary and Overall Recommendations.....	49

Introduction

The vision embraced by the School Counseling Program philosophy of *continuous improvement is captured by the quote below:*

The vision of the Neag School of Education is to have our assessment/evaluation systems serve as a national model for excellence, embracing and promoting an assessment culture characterized by evidence-based decisions, with the intended purpose of providing a more challenging, learner-centered academic community that advances knowledge and improves vitality in all aspects of the School.

More specifically, the Neag School of Education Assessment Plan collects and analyzes data for the purpose of improving teaching and student learning. The plan encourages an assessment of all departments and units of **in**-the Neag School of Education that includes the School Counseling program in the Department of Educational Psychology. The Neag School of Education Assessment Plan incorporates four sequential components of assessment: admissions, mid-program, program completion, and post graduation, and are shown in table 4.

Table 4: Major Assessments by Key Components

Key Components	Types of Assessments	Source of Information
Admissions	Demographics GPA Personal Statement Interviews, Fit with Mission Recommendations Entrance Survey	Applications Transcripts Application-Faculty, Students Applications-Program Faculty Applications-Program Faculty Assessment Office
Mid-Program	Coursework Projects, Tests, etc. Course Grades Student Evaluations Mid-Cycle Evaluations Practicum Surveys Comprehensive Exam	Plan of Study Faculty/Syllabi Faculty Institutional Research Faculty Assessment Office CPCE – Comp. Exam Results
Program Completion	Portfolio/Projects Internship Surveys Exit Surveys Certification	Intern/Practicum Coordinator Assessment Office Assessment Office Office of Certification

Post Graduations	Surveys of Graduates Surveys of Employers	Office of Assessments Office of Assessments
------------------	--	--

The four key components provide the basic guideline for how the Program Evaluation is structured and presented in this document. Each of the four Program faculty members had responsibility for conducting the analyses of data in their designated key component. Each key component's data will be presented along with discussion, strengths and limitations and suggested recommendations for continuous Program improvement. Additionally, where relevant, previous areas for improvement will be identified and updated.

Admissions Assessment 2014-2015

The Counseling Program Admissions process is focused on admitting students who demonstrate upon entering the program they will effectively engage the program's curricula and experiences. The Counseling Program's mission is to train future professional school counselors to develop, implement and evaluate equity based, comprehensive, developmental school counseling programs.

Beginning in the academic year 2014-2015, the Counseling Program changed its application deadline from February 15 to December 1. The Neag School of Education Dean required this change in an effort for all of the School of Education programs to become more competitive nationally. This change has allowed time for the Counseling Program to conduct in-person interviews and secure admissions from applicants from across the United States. For invited applicants who could not attend interview day, we used video conferencing as the alternative. Prior to this 2014-2015 academic year, applicants were interviewed via phone. As a result of the change, the data shows that having an interview day is more effective in getting higher numbers of students.

All four core faculty members participate in an extensive evaluation of program applicants. Program faculty members assess all applicants using the [Counseling Program Student Admissions Evaluation Form](#). We review applications in late December before the proceeding academic start year (e.g., December 2014 for Fall 2015). Second, faculty members meet as a group and review all applicants. The purpose of this review is to determine which applicants are invited to the interview day based on individual faculty assessments. Faculty members generate a consensus on which applicants are accepted or rejected and then the program coordinator extends invitations to accepted applicants to attend the interview day. This year we piloted the [UConn Individual Interview Rating Form](#) to evaluate invited applicants. Due to the time constraints of the interview day, the form was inconsistently used and didn't produce consistent data to use for constructive, evaluative information to make a decision about applicants. As a result, we relied on the Counseling Program Student Admission Evaluation Form to make final decisions about admittance.

Table 5 (below) displays data based on faculty evaluations of applicants who applied to the Counseling Program. The evaluation is based on a rating system with 1 being poor/low and 5 being outstanding/high. Faculty evaluated applicants based on the quality and strengths of their personal statement, recommendations, applicant fit within the program, and a overall impression of applicant. The data is the average of all four Counseling Program Faculty members. The data show Counseling Program applicants were rated close to outstanding for both Fall 2013 and 2014. In other words, faculty perceived that most Counseling Program applicants had a strong application packet and were more than likely a good fit with the Counseling Program's mission and purpose. Last, we evaluated students based on Grade Point Average. Per the University of Connecticut graduate school requirement, applicants must have at least a 3.0 G.P.A. for

admittance to the Counseling Program. Our applicant average is well above the minimum (see Table 5) indicating that the-Counseling Program is attracting academically competitive students. The master’s program does not require GRE scores; thus, we evaluate students on other indicators for potential academic success as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Applicant Evaluation Criteria for Fall 2013-2014

	Fall 2013	Fall 2014
Grade Point Average	3.4	3.5
Personal Statements	4.2	3.8
Recommendations	4.2	4
Fit with Program	4.2	3.9
Overall Impression	4.2	3.9

*Masters

Table 6 indicates the number of applicants, acceptances, and enrollees in our CACREP approved Master’s Program in school counseling for Fall 2013, Fall 2014, and Fall 2015 school years. To clarify, we designate the term Fall 2013 to signify the first year that students start the Counseling Program. Each academic year starts in late August and ends between late April and early May. We have experienced an increase number of students applying to our program and being admitted and we are pleased with this pattern. Our FTE student to faculty ratio for the 2014-2015 academic year is approximately 12 to 1. Our FTE student to faculty ratio from Fall 2013 to Fall 2015 is 13 to 1.

Table 6: Number of Applicants, Accepted, and Enrolled in School Counseling for 2013-2015

Year	Degree	Applicants	Accept	Enrolled
Fall 2013	Masters	28	17	9
Fall 2014	Masters	32	19	12
Fall 2015	Masters	36	24	17

Tables 7 and 8 show the number of students who enrolled by race and gender. Diversity has increased over the last three years, particularly around males and enrollment of African American students. Our efforts to recruit a more diverse student population centers around outreach efforts to programs such as the Institute for Recruitment of Teachers, which specializes in placing student of color and other diverse students in graduate programs of education. In addition, the mission of our program as well as our diverse faculty attracts students from various racial, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds.

Table 7 Applicant Enrollment by Race

Year	White	Black/African American	American Indian/Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific	Hispanic/Latino

					Islander	
Fall 2013	6	2		1		
Fall 2014	10		1			1
Fall 2015	11	4		1		1

*Masters

Table 8: Applicant Enrollment By Gender

Year	Male	Female
2013-2014	1	8
2014-2015	1	11
2015-2016	6	11

*Masters

Entrance Survey:

Table 9 shows results of the entrance survey of incoming students for 2013.

Table 9: Mean percentages for Outcome Categories on the UCONN Entrance Survey for 2014

	Counseling	Consultation	Special Education	Coordinating	Curriculum Management	Individual Planning	Managing	Professionalism	Cross-Cultural Experiences
2014									
Means	2.3	1.8	1.7	2.2	1.8	2.3	2.3	2.1	3.0

Column headings represent assessment categories and each category contains several items. Thus, the scores in the cells are mean averages of mean scores for items in each category. Students are asked to indicate how much competency they have for each item that are based on a 4-point Likert scale as follows:

- None = 1
- A Little = 2
- Some = 3

A Lot = 4

The mean scores in table 9 show that incoming students in 2013 rated their level of counseling competencies overall on the low end of the scale. This rating level is consistent with other surveys of entering students and is to be expected. It can provide a baseline for which faculty can begin to develop plans for ensuring optimal learning and experience for students.

Recommendations

After reviewing data for the Counseling Program's Admissions process, several recommendations are suggested. First, we will revise our admissions interview day to increase our time to provide consistent, evaluative feedback using the UConn Individual Interview Rating Form for each applicant during the individual interviews. Second, we will continue to search for effective ways to streamline our interview process as to be effective in identifying the best candidates for our program. For example, we will continue to review both evaluations forms to improve our candidate selection. Last, we will make greater efforts to increase diversity in our program by consulting with the NEAG School of Education academic advisors to identify potential applicants as well as working with the Institute for Recruitment of Teachers.

Mid-Program Assessment 2014-2015

The Mid-Program section of the Program Evaluation assesses whether the Program curriculum is effective in imparting student learning as defined by Program mission and objectives, and CACREP (2009) accreditation Core Content Standards and Student Outcome Standards.

This section's assessment will utilize 2014-2015 academic year data from the areas of (1) Program Course Work/Plan of Study, (2) course objectives, requirements, and other course related material, (3) course grades, (4) student course evaluations, (5) mid-program evaluations, (6), practicum surveys, and (7) comprehensive exam scores. Data from 2011-2013 will also be incorporated as a means of documenting whether course/program improvements have resulted in desired changes. Below are specific program and curricula areas identified in [past assessments](#) where improvement was needed:

- a. Integrated Equity-based counseling content and experiences throughout all program courses.
- b. A one-credit course in College Counseling (EPSY 5195) was developed in 2012 as one way to prepare students to provide equity-based counseling programs. Ongoing assessment of the status of this course for meeting the aforementioned program need will be collected and evaluated.
- c. Faculty teaching courses specific to CACREP core content in the area of *Career Development* need to be reviewed and revised to add additional course content.
- d. Faculty teaching courses specific to CACREP core content area *Assessment* need to review and as deemed necessary, revise course content and provide additional relevant content and experiences.
- e. Faculty teaching courses specific to CACREP core content area *Helping Relationships* need to review and as deemed necessary, revise course content and provide additional relevant content and experiences.
- f. EPSY 5304 Foundations and Content course needs to improve upon content and experiences for how to develop, implement and evaluate school counseling programs.

Each assessment area will be evaluated first, independently and second, in consideration of the other Mid-Program assessment areas; Plan of Study, Course Projects, Tests, ~~etc.~~, Course Grades, Student Evaluation, Mid-Program Evaluation, Practicum Surveys, and Comprehensive Exam.

Course Work/Plan of Study Assessment:

As part of the University of Connecticut's Masters' degree requirements, and a graduate school requirement as stated in the [Graduate School website](#), all masters students must complete and submit a Plan of Study by the beginning of their final semester. The School Counseling Program adheres to this requirement as shown by two [samples of completed Plan of Study](#) by program students. The Plan of Study indicates what courses students will take in order to complete their degree program, and is used by officials from the Graduate School as a check to ensure accuracy of courses before conferring the degree. If students take different courses other than what is indicated in their Program of Study, they can make note of those changes by completing a [Request for Changes in Plan of Study](#) form. All students who were scheduled to graduate 2015, all had plan of study on file with the Graduate Office and graduated on time.

Course Projects, Requirements and Tests Assessment:

Faculty/instructors develop course content, experiences and requirements that coincide with the Program Mission and Objectives and [CACREP Program Outcome Standards](#) and [CACREP Common Core Content Areas Standards](#). Each course has a syllabus stating all criteria for students to successfully complete the course. Student success on course exams, projects and other course requirements are a major means for assessing whether and the degree to which students are gaining program knowledge and skills for school counselor practice.

Tables 10, 11, and 12, present school counseling program courses along with relevant links to syllabi, major course requirements, weekly course assignments/ schedule. Based on these course materials, all courses provide content and experiences related to Program Mission, Objectives and CACREP Core Content Standards and CACREP School Counseling Program Outcomes. For instance, each table (10, 11 and 12) show that all courses provide learning experiences pertaining to knowledge, skills and practice and can be accessed by clicking on course requirements below each columns' heading. For example in Table 10 EPSY 5308 Counseling Theory and Practice, the requirement Counseling Recordings is shown in both knowledge and skills and applied focused columns.

Table 10: School Counseling Program Course Descriptions, Requirements and Related Information for 5307, 5308, 5316 & 5318

Course Code	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	Knowledge & Skills Focused Requirements	Application Focused Requirements	Weekly Assignments & Schedule
EPSY 5307 Prof. Orient. In School	Course Description, Objectives &	-School Counselor Interview/Shadow -Course	-Classroom Guidance Activity	Weekly Assignments & Schedule

Couns.	Evaluation	Examination -Professional Reflection -Classroom Guidance Activity		
EPSY 5308 Couns. Theory & Practice	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	-Laboratory Practice -Counseling Recordings -Mid-Term -Final-Exam	-Laboratory Practice -Counseling Recordings	Weekly Assignments & Schedule
EPSY 5316 Cross Cultural C.	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	--Readings & Class Activities --Mid-term Exam --Racial Identity Development Paper --Weekly Reflections --Study of a Cultural Group	--Readings & Class Activities --Racial Identity Development Paper --Weekly Reflections --Study of a Cultural Group	Weekly Assignments & Schedule
EPSY 5318 Human Growth & Development	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	--Quizzes --Mid-Term Exam --Final Exam --On Line Course Assignments		Weekly Assignments & Schedule

The example given above is associated with one **OF** the areas noted for improvement. Upon review of the 2011 and 2012 CPCE scores in the Helping relationships CACREP Core Content area, and student evaluation (instructor never received an overall rating of above 8 on a 10 point scale). Changes made to improve EPSY 5308, according to the instructor were as follows:

Changed textbook, to one that covered material consistent with CACREP standards: more fully integrated state of the art Recording studio for counseling skills and practice. Am able to help students conceptualize the entire counseling stages of counseling, how each functions, and how each relate to all others --- prior to this text, wasn't able to get students to learn and experience the entire counseling process, develop skills, facilitative conditions, and incorporate all into different theories --- students have the

opportunity to practice all within the context of two required recordings and many class and lab experiential exercises.

Both student evaluations and CPCE scores (see table 21 below) in the Helping Relationships component have significantly improved since the instructor made the above mentioned changes to the Counseling Theory and Practice course.

Table 11 provides course related information for four additional program courses (EPSY 5304, EPSY 5301, EPSY 315, and EPSY 5306). Principles of Career Development EPSY 5306, was another course primarily responsible for content of the CACREP Common Core Career Development as noted above.

Table 11: School Counseling Program Course Descriptions, Requirements and Related Information for 5304, 5301, 5315 & 5306

Course Code	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	Knowledge & Skills Focused Requirements	Application Focused Requirements	Weekly Assignments & Schedule
EPSY 5304 School Couns. Program Dev & Eval	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	--Program Assessment of a School Counseling Program --Classroom Guidance Unit -Comprehensive School Counseling Program Website --Data-Driven Advocacy Project	--Classroom Guidance Unit -Comprehensive School Counseling Program Website --Data-Driven Advocacy Project	Weekly Assignments & Schedule
EPSY 5301 Group Processes	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	--Class Participation --DVD Reaction Papers --Scenario Reflections --Group Leadership and Participation	--Group Counseling Unit (GCU) Binder --Group Leadership and Participation	Weekly Assignments & Schedule
EPSY 5315 Couns. Advanced Practice	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	--Exam --Article Share & Discussion --Modality	--Modality Strategies --Real World Practice	Weekly Assignments & Schedule

		Strategies	--Counseling Case Presentation	
EPSY 5306 Princ. of Career Dev	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	--Self Quizzes --OnLine Discussions --Assignments --Midterm and Final Exams		Weekly Assignments & Schedule

Changes made to improve EPSY 5306 Principles of Career Development, according to the instructor were as follows:

Had a guest lecture present on career development in schools: Techniques and approaches to career advising and counseling. The guest lecturer was Mark Danaher who is an expert on career development in schools. The goal was to have students hear from a professional who does career development in schools everyday.

The instructor's statement of changes made to the Career course shows that he addressed concerns students had expressed regarding needing classroom experiences directly tied to real world experiences in the public schools.

Table 12 shows program course information for the remaining courses associated with the mid-program evaluation (EPSY 5320, EPSY 5314, EPSY 5317 and EPSY 5195). Appraisals Procedures in Counseling was also identified as a content area in need of improvement. The Appraisals course received major revisions to better meet the needs of our students by former program coordinator Dr. Orv Karan and doctoral student Jennifer Parzych (former school counselor and now counselor educator). Adjunct faculty routinely teaches this course and as shown on student ratings improved from 2.0 in spring 2014 to a 3.0 in spring 2015. The assessment content area CPCE scores have steadily improved since 2012, with UCONN scores exceeding the national means in this content area (see table 21). Even with the good CPCE scores the Program needs to work to improve the course experience of students in EPSY 5314 Appraisal Procedures in Counseling.

Table 12: School Counseling Program Course Descriptions, Requirements and Related Information for 5320, 5314, 5317 & 5195

Course Code	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	Knowledge & Skills Focused Requirements	Application Focused Requirements	Weekly Assignments & Schedule
EPSY 5320 Critical	Course Description,	--Class participation	--Final project class	Weekly Assignments &

Issues	Objectives & Evaluation	--Ethics case study discussion --School counselor interview --Critical incident discussion --Final project class presentations	presentations	Schedule
EPSY 5314 Appraisal	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	--Class Participation --Collaboration & Peer Review --Quiz --Practice Interpretations:	--Collaboration & Peer Review --Research Article Critique: --Practice Interpretations:	Weekly Assignments & Schedule
EPSY 5317 Practicum	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	--Theoretical Approach Paper --Practicum Workbook --Portfolio Project --Advocacy Project	--Supervision --Conduct two audio or recordings --Practicum Workbook --Portfolio Project --Advocacy Project	Weekly Assignments & Schedule
EPSY 5195 College Admissions	Course Description, Objectives & Evaluation	--College Fair --College Visit --Book Report --College Readiness Portfolio --REFLECTION PAPERS	--College Readiness Counseling --College Readiness Portfolio	Weekly Assignments & Schedule

Table 12 also shows that the Counseling Admissions course EPSY 5195 has excellent face validity for the intent of the course. There is an array of assignments that provide students with opportunity to gain knowledge and experience of both the k-12 setting and the college and university setting as well. This allows the instructor to help students understand the importance of helping high school students prepare to enter institutions of higher education.

Course Grades:

As one indicator that program students have participated in the program curriculum, each course provides letter grades at the end of each semester. Distribution of School Counseling Program course grades is shown in the table 13 below. Table 13 shows that the all program students earn at least a B and that 56% earned an A, with 55% earning A+; these are averages for the years with reported grades. Alone it would be difficult to state these grades mean that students have actually gained the knowledge, skills and foundation for practice, however with additional related data, it is reasonable to say these grades indicate student learning. For example, looking at the CPCE scores with UCONN students consistently scoring above the national mean lends support to the notion that these course grades are associated with the desired student learning, in particular, the CACREP Common Content Standards. Also, looking at the practicum ratings for 2014 below, 100 % of the site supervisors report that students have the ability to translate their course knowledge into practice as dictated by CACREP School Counseling Program Student Outcome Standards.

Table 13: School Counseling Program Course Grades

Course Code	Course Term	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	I
EPSY 5307 Prof. Orient. In School Couns.	Fall 2011							
	Fall 2012	70%	30%					
	Fall 2013	21%	18%					
	Fall 2014	46%	54%					
EPSY 5308 Couns. Theory & Practice	Fall 2011	8%	61%	8%		23%		
	Fall 2012	30%	45%	15%	10%			
	Fall 2013	23%	54%	23%				
	Fall 2014		64%	12%	12%	12%		
EPSY 5316 Cross Cultural C.	Fall 2011	19%	64%	18%	9%			
	Fall 2012	38%	59%	29%				
	Fall 2013	62%	55%					9%
	Fall 2014	33%						
EPSY 5318 Human Growth & Development	Fall 2011		76%	5%	5%	5%	9%	
	Fall 2012		67%	25%	4%		4%	
	Fall 2013		78%		22%			
	Fall 2014		77%	9%		5%	9%	
EPSY 5304 School Couns. Program Dev & Eval	Spr. 2012	9%	64%	18%	9%			
	Spr. 2013	12%	59%	29%				
	Spr. 2014	36%	55%					9%
	Spr. 2015	100%						
EPSY 5301 Group Processes	Spr. 2012							
	Spr. 2013	91%	9%					

	Spr. 2014 Spr. 2015	95% 100%		5%				
EPSY 5315 Couns. Advanced Practice	Spr. 2012 Spr. 2013 Spr. 2014 Spr. 2015	17% 58% 42% 31%	58% 95% 58% 69%	25% 5%				
EPSY 5306 Princ. of Career Dev	Spr. 2012 Spr. 2013 Spr. 2014 Spr. 2015		58% 92% 100%	30% 8%	4%		8%	
EPSY 5320 Critical Issues	Fall 2011 Fall 2012 Fall 2013 Fall 2014							
EPSY 5314 Appraisal	Spr. 2012 Spr. 2013 Spr. 2014 Spr. 2015	100%						
EPSY 5317 Practicum	Fall 2011 Fall 2012 Fall 2013 Fall 2014 Spr. 2015	100% 100% 75%	25%					
EPSY 5195 College Admissions	Fall 2011 Fall 2012 Fall 2013 Fall 2014 Spr. 2015	75% 100%	25%					
Overall Average Percentages		55%	56%	17%	9%	11%	8%	9%

Even though students in the Counseling Program show evidence of gaining the desired knowledge and skills associated with Program Mission, Objectives and both CACREP Standards, it is still important to pay closer attention to grades. Specifically, data from students on past exit surveys and alumni surveys indicate that some students believe that program courses are not rigorous enough. Attention needs to be placed on what is occurring in classrooms to prepare students for school counseling practice. As will be shown below in this section, greater emphasis is now being placed on the various elements of the instructor and the course in each program course.

Student Evaluations:

Student evaluation is important to the learning mission of the University and the School Counseling Program. The University has established an easy online access university-wide-evaluation system. While the university informs students of the evaluation process and procedures -- course instructors are also encouraged to remind students to complete

the course evaluations near end of semester. Faculty are unable to access student evaluations until after course grades have been submitted; thus allowing students greater freedom in completing course evaluations. Below in table 14 student course evaluations are shown for program courses since the CACREP Mid-Cycle report. Student evaluations were rated on 1-10 Likert scale (with 10 being excellent) until spring 2013 when the scale was changed to a 1-5 format with 5 being excellent.

Table 14: UCONN Overall Rating of School Counseling Program on Student Evaluations

Course Code	Fall 2011	Spring 2012	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015
EPSY 5307 Prof. Orient. In School Couns.			9.3				4.0	
EPSY 5308 Couns. Theory & Practice	9.7		9.2		5.0		5.0	
EPSY 5316 Cross Cultural C.	9.1		9.0		4.5		4.5	
EPSY 5318 Human Growth & Development	9.6		9.2		3.0		3.0	
EPSY 5304 School Couns. Program Dev & Eval		7.8		4.0		4.0		4.0
EPSY 5301 Group Processes		9.0		4.5		4.0		4.0
EPSY 5315 Couns. Advanced Practice				5.0		5.0		5.0
EPSY 5306 Princ. of Career Dev		9.6				4.0		4.0
EPSY 5320 Critical Issues			9.8				5.0	
EPSY 5314 Appraisal		6.6				2.0		3.0
EPSY 5317 Practicum Fall Section 1 Fall Section 2 Spring Sec 1 Spring Sec 2							3.5 4.0	
EPSY 5195 College Admissions							No Evals	No Evals

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

Although, course evaluations have been included in the Program Mid-program evaluation, they have not been formally used in a data for continuous improvements. Thus, this year’s program evaluation utilizes course evaluations as one of the targets for identifying curricula areas in need of improvement.

Reviewing the overall ratings for courses in table 14 show that the Program courses are rated overall being in good standings with most courses (when the scale was 1-10) were rated mostly in the 9s with a few expectations. In 2012 EPSY 5304 School Counseling Program Development was rated low at 7.8. Courses rated below an 8 at that time were considered below department teaching standard. The instructor of the course was experimenting with different means of teaching students how to utilize data in program development. The method used the previous semester was very successful, however, the instructor made changes that didn’t work well. The methods that had been used were used again in 2013 with a solid rating on the new scale (1-5) where the overall rating for the course 4 on a 5-point scale.

Also, in spring 2012 EPSY 5314 Appraisal in Counseling was rated 6.6 on 10-point scale, which is well below the expectable minimal 8-point standard. It is uncertain whether the adjunct that taught the course at the time was spoken to, however, since the same adjunct was hired again to teach the course spring 2014 and again received a low course rating of 2 on a 5-point scale it doesn’t appear corrective measures were taken. For the spring 2015 running of this course, the department head did inform the current Program Coordinator that the evaluations were too low for the aforementioned adjunct, thus a different adjunct was hired. As shown in table 12 the new adjunct, a recent former school counselor and director of guidance, and recent doctoral graduate from the UCONN Counselor Education Program, improved the course and did receive a higher rating of 3.

In addition to the above overall rating of the course, data specific to the instructor (13 questions) and the course (7 questions) have been included in this evaluation. Table 15 shows questions 1-6 for student ratings pertaining to questions about the instructor. Faculty agreed that for questions where student ratings fall below 80% that the instructor would review that course and decide whether and how to make improvements. Those courses needing review are in bold with an asterisk.

Table 15:
Student Evaluations: Questions 1-6 About the Instructor for courses 5307,
5308, 5316, 5318, 5304 and 5301

Course Code	Presented Material Clearly	Prepared for Class	Responded to Questions Adequately	Stimulated Interest in Students	Showed Interest in Helping Students	Gave Clear Assignments
	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree
EPSY 5307 Prof. Orient. In School Couns.	*66%	84%	*33%	83%	84%	83%
EPSY 5308 Couns. Theory & Practice	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
EPSY 5316 Cross Cultural C.	100%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%
EPSY 5318 Human Growth & Development	93%	93%	*72%	65%	86%	100%
EPSY 5304 School Couns. Program Dev & Eval	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%
EPSY 5301						

Group Processes	96%	86%	100%	100%	100%	86%
-----------------	-----	-----	------	------	------	-----

There were only 2 courses in table 13 where student ratings were below 80%.

Table 16 shows student ratings for questions 7-13 pertaining to the instructor. Five courses have student ratings that fall below 80%.

Table 16:
Student Evaluations: Questions 7-13 About the Instructor for courses 5307, 5308, 5316, 5318, 5304 and 5301

Course Code	Instructor Accessible to Students	Gave Useful Feedback on	Returned Graded Work in Reasonable Amount of Time	Used Class Time Effectively	Treated Students with Respect	Graded Fairly	Methods Promoted Student Learning
	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree
EPSY 5307 Prof. Orient. In School Couns.	*67%	*33%	83%	83%	83%	*50%	*50%
EPSY 5308 Couns. Theory & Practice	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
EPSY 5316 Cross Cultural C.	100%	100%	*38%	100%	88%	100%	*75%
EPSY 5318 Human Growth &	93%	*78%	100%	*50%	100%	100%	*50%

Development							
EPSY 5304 School Couns. Program Dev & Eval	83%	100%	*66%	83%	100%	100%	100%
EPSY 5301 Group Processes	100%	100%	100%	*71%	100%	100%	100%

Table 17 shows student ratings for questions 1-6 pertaining to the instructor. Three courses have student ratings below 80% and one course (EPSY 5195- College Admissions) there were no evaluations.

Table 17:
Student Evaluations: Questions 1-6 About the Instructor for courses 5315, 5306, 5320, 5314, 5317 and 5195

Course Code	Presented Material Clearly	Prepared for Class	Responded to Questions Adequately	Stimulated Interest in Students	Showed Interest in Helping Students	Gave Clear Assignments
	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree
EPSY 5315 Couns. Advanced Practice	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
EPSY 5306 Princ. of Career Dev	80%	100%	90%	*70%	100%	100%
EPSY 5320 Critical	100%	100%	100%	86%	100%	100%

Issues						
EPSY 5314 Appraisal	*50%	*60%	*50%	*55%	*60%	*50%
EPSY 5317 Practicum						
Fall	*66%	84%	*33%	83%	84%	83%
Spring	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%
EPSY 5195 College Admissions	No ratings	No ratings	No ratings	No ratings	No ratings	No ratings

Table 18 shows student ratings for questions 1-7 pertaining to the course. Four courses have student ratings that fall below the 80% threshold and one course (EPSY 5195 College Admissions) did not have any evaluations.

Table 18:
Student Evaluations: Questions 7-13 About the Instructor for Courses 5315, 5306, 5320, 5314, 5317 and 5195

Course Code	Instructor Accessible to Students	Gave Useful Feedback on	Returned Graded Work in Reasonable Amount	Used Class Time Effectively	Treated Students with Respect	Graded Fairly	Methods Promoted Student Learning
	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree
EPSY 5315							

Couns. Advanced Practice	*60%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
EPSY 5306 Princ. of Career Dev	100%	*70%	100%	*50%	100%	100%	*70%
EPSY 5320 Critical Issues	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
EPSY 5314 Appraisal	*40%	*60%	90%	*50%	90%	*70%	*40%
EPSY 5317 Practicum							
Fall	*67%	*33%	83%	83%	83%	*50%	*50%
Spring	83%	100%	*66%	83%	100%	100%	100%
EPSY 5195 College Admission s	No ratings	No ratings	No ratings	No rating s	No rating s	No ratings	No ratings

Table 19 shows student ratings for questions 1-7 pertaining to the course content and process. Two courses have student ratings that fall below 80% cut off.

**Table 19:
Student Evaluations: Questions 1-7 About the Course for courses 5307, 5308,
5316, 5318, 5304 and 5301**

Course Code	Methods for Evaluating Student Learning Seemed Appropriate	Course Content Well Organized	Course Objectives were Clear	Course Objectives were Met	Textbook made valuable	Other Course Material Made a Valuable Contribution	Appropriate Course Pace
	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree
EPSY 5307 Prof. Orient. In School Couns.	*50%	83%	100%	83%	*50%	100%	83%
EPSY 5308 Couns. Theory & Practice	85%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
EPSY 5316 Cross Cultural C.	100%	88%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%
EPSY 5318 Human Growth & Development	100%	86%	93%	86%	*71%	*79%	93%
EPSY 5304 School Couns. Program Dev & Eval	100%	100%	100%	100%	88%	100%	100%
EPSY 5301 Group Processes	100%	86%	86%	100%	100%	100%	86%

Table 20 shows student ratings for questions 1-7 for the remaining courses. Three courses have student ratings that fall below 80% and the EPSY 5195 (College Admissions) had no evaluations.

Table 20:
Student Evaluations: Questions 1-7 About the Course for courses 5315, 5306, 5320, 5314, 5317 and 5195

Course Code	Appropriate Course Pace	Other Course Material Made a Valuable Contribution	Textbook made a valuable contribution	Course Objectives were Met	Course Objectives were Clear	Course Content Well Organized	Methods for Evaluating Student Learning Seemed Appropriate
	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree	Agree to Strongly Agree
EPSY 5315 Couns. Advanced Practice	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
EPSY 5306 Princ. of Career Dev	100%	80%	100%	90%	80%	*60%	80%
EPSY 5320 Critical Issues	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
EPSY 5314 Appraisal	*70%	*50%	*70%	*70%	*70%	*70%	*60%
EPSY 5317 Practicum							

Fall	*50%	83%	100%	83%	*50%	100%	83%
Spring	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	100%	100%
EPSY 5195 College Admission s	No ratings	No ratings	No ratings	No rating s	No rating s	No ratings	No ratings

Mid-Cycle Evaluations:

Upon enrollment in the School Counseling Program, students undergo process screening leading to retention (i.e., candidacy), or non-retention. Process screening occurs during the first and second semesters of full-time study, or in the case of part-time study, during enrollment in at least six (6) semester hours of coursework up to a maximum of twelve (12) semester hours of course work. Criteria for retention in the program include: satisfactory academic performance, satisfactory progress as a counselor in training, and supportive recommendations of the faculty. Implied in these criteria is the notion that some individuals may not possess the attributes or characteristics necessary for successful functioning as a school counselor. Below is the statement in the School Counseling Program Policy handbook:

Students are evaluated throughout the program using a variety of both formal and informal methods. A faculty review of each student's progress with respect to the student's professional knowledge, skills, and disposition in both course assignments and clinical/school settings is conducted annually and recommendations pertinent to that student's continuation are placed in the student's file. Criteria for retention in the program are delineated below. Implied in these criteria is the notion that some individuals may not possess the attributes or characteristics necessary for successful functioning as a professional school counselor. Continuation in the School Counseling Program is based on on-going acceptable performance in meeting all the following criteria:

1. Earn grades of B or better in counseling courses and seminars: maintain a GPA of 3:00 or higher in their counseling and related program coursework;
2. Maintain a cumulative GPA of 3 :00 or higher;
3. Complete all work with regard to grades of Incomplete prior to start of the subsequent

semester, and prior to the grade being converted to a failing grade (F);

4. Follow the University of Connecticut Student Code of Conduct;
5. Adhere to ACA ethical guidelines;
6. Demonstrate ability to work successfully with k-12 students in field placement settings throughout the program. Site supervisors evaluate students by using a program designed evaluation instrument aligned with program standards. Students must receive consistently positive evaluations from site supervisors to continue in the program.

For the purpose of evaluating each student for retention faculty complete a [Faculty Evaluation of Students Form](#) for each student. These forms are shared with students and maintained in students' records' file in the Department's locked cabinet. [One completed form](#) has been provided as samples to view with student names erased. There has not been a case where corrective action was needed in order for a student to remain in good standing since 2007, and before that only one case. In that case the student adhered to the recommendations for program retention and thus graduated on time. During Admission's interviews/New Student Orientation, students are apprised of this policy. This retention policy and process appears to be effective for maintaining students in good standing as evidenced the extremely low number of students that have gone through corrective action. Faculty evaluated all first year-year cohort students for 2014-2015 during the program meeting on May 1, 2015, and all were deemed in good standing.

Practicum Surveys:

Students in the School Counseling program participated in their practicum placements during the each semester of the 2014-2015 academic year. This was only the second year that practicum students have been formally evaluated and second consecutive year that a survey of practicum students was conducted. Both surveys are considered pilots surveys, and results of both will be used as part of a pilot study for the initial development of an evaluation system for School Counseling practicum students. Aspects of both surveys will be modified for future use based on the data received.

The areas listed served as a general guide for the activities typically engaged in during counselor training. The students were rated on the following scale:

1. Area of strength

2. Adequate
3. Area needing improvement
4. No opportunity to observe

Average Ratings for 6 Students

1. Personal and Professional Competencies	1.03
2. Use of Supervision	1.25
3. Use of Resources	1.70
4. Self-Organization Skills	1.03
5. Relationship Skills	1.44
6. Communication Skills	1.50

Overall Average Rating 1.33

Comprehensive Exam:

The Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE) is an exit requirement of the School Counseling Program and is administered each spring. Students who have completed all or nearly all of their program course work sit for the CPCE. The CPCE covers the eight CACREP common core curricular areas; Professional Orientation and Ethical Practices, Social and Cultural Diversity, Human Growth and Development, Career Development, Helping Relationships, Group Work, Assessment and Research and Program Evaluation.

Table 21 below gives a comparison of the UCONN School Counseling CPCE scores with the National CPCE exam scores for years 2013, 2014, and 2015. An asterisk next to the mean score indicates that UCONN's scores were higher than national scores. For test year 2013 the national means of all 8 combined CACREP content areas were slightly higher than UCONN's scores (83.87 and 82.93 respectively). However, for the next two testing years the UCONN combined mean scores were somewhat higher than the national scores. In 2014 the scores were 92.88 for UCONN and 85.61 for the national means. In 2015 the mean scores for UCONN were 90.45 and 87.13 for the national means.

**Table 21:
Comparison of UCONN School Counseling Program CPCE Scores with the National CPCE Scores for years 2013, 2014 and 2015**

Content Area	UCONN Mean Scores 2013	National Mean Scores 2013	UCONN Mean Scores 2014	National Mean Scores 2014	UCONN Mean Scores 2015	National Mean Scores 2015

Human Growth and Development	12.71*	12.34	11.5*	9.85	11.91*	11.62
Social and Cultural Diversity	8.71*	8.56	11.56*	10.58	11.45*	10.30
Helping Relationships	9.64	10.27	10.25*	10.04	12.27*	11.94
Group Work	10.71*	10.53	13.19*	12.52	9.73	10.84
Career Development	9.86	10.49	11.44*	10.54	10.18*	9.38
Assessment	10.64*	10.06	11.50*	10.62	12.45*	10.63
Research and Program Evaluation	10.14*	9.60	11.88*	10.81	11.36*	11.04
Professional Orientation & Ethical Practices	10.50	12.03	11.56*	10.65	11.09	11.38
Totals -- Means	82.93	83.87	92.88*	85.61	90.45*	87.13
S.D.	14.37	14.74	13.74	15.21	13.32	16.79

Looking at the above mentioned trends in these CPCE mean scores, it appears that UCONN curricula is providing students with content and experiences for obtaining the knowledge associated with these 8 core standards. These UCONN mean scores combined with other data presented show that program faculty have and are continuing to make improvements in providing adequate course learning and experiences for students to gain knowledge of the CACREP 8 common core areas. Specifically, EPSY 5316 – Principle of Career Development, EPSY 5308 Counseling; Theory and Practice, and EPSY 5314 Appraisals/Assessment Procedures in Counseling all showed mean scores higher than the national means. This is important because in 2013, these three areas were identified as needing improvement in order to better comply with CACREP standards.

Recommendations based on mid-program assessment:

1. Routinely use material from this section of the Program Evaluation to review program courses for continued infusion of equity-based school counseling and ways to ensure there is a well coordinated sequence of learning and experiences regarding equity-based school counseling.
2. Explore those areas of student evaluations that were rated below 80% as mentioned in order to pinpoint how those ratings translate into deficits and development and implement course strategies to address such curricula needs.
3. Ensure that EPSY 5195 obtains student evaluations in futures offerings of the course.
4. Assess the rigor of courses to determine if and how rigor might be increased.
5. Coordinate with Assessment Coordinator to determine best way to assess practicum students.

Program Completion Assessment 2014-2015

The Program Completion section of the Program Evaluation assesses the degree to which interns are prepared to successfully execute school counseling competencies within the internship experience. This section also surveys students as they are exiting the Program or at program completion/graduation. Both areas of assessment are another means to determine the degree to which Program curriculum is effective for imparting student learning as defined by the Program’s mission and objectives as well as the CACREP (2009) accreditation Core Content Standards and Student Outcome Standards. Assessments in this section provide direction for making improvements in areas previously identified and identify new areas for continuous improvements. Additionally these assessments can identify areas of the Program beyond curriculum, i.e. advising, communication and such, that that might warrant faculty attention for improvement.

Internship Surveys Assessment:

Supervisors of Program interns complete surveys administered by the Neag School of Education Office of Assessment. Supervisor ratings provide additional information for purposes of accessing the degree to which the Program is meeting its goals. Table 22 shows supervisor rating for interns for the years 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015.

Table 22: Supervisor Ratings of Functions Adequately to Extremely Well of Interns for 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015

	Counseling	Consultation	Coordinating	Curriculum Management	Individual Planning	Managing	Professionalism	Extremely Good Top 1-19 th percentile
2012	98%	100%	100%	98%	100%	91%	100%	79%
2013	95%	94%	100%	94%	100%	81%	97%	92%

2014								
Means	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.86	2.86	2.9	2.9	100%
2015								
Means	*2.43	2.48	2.58	2.56	2.52	2.68	2.68	92.3%

In order to interpret the data in table 22 four notes are necessary; (1) each column heading represents a category for assessment, (2) each percentage represents a mean or average of all percentages in a category, i.e. for the category Counseling, there were 5 items, (3) one exception to note #2—the last column heading on far right is the average of supervisors’ rating, (4) an asterisk indicates that for at least one item in a category the Functions Adequately percentage was larger than the Functions Extremely Well rating scale level. The data in table 21 show that for two consecutive years (2012 and 2013) supervisors overwhelmingly report that interns function adequately to extremely regarding various competencies demonstrated by interns in the role of professional school counselors, as evidenced all percentages higher than 80% except one (79%), with the majority in the 90%-100% range. Ratings for 2014 and 2015 are shown as average mean scores on a 3-point rating scale:

- 1: Requires close supervision in this area
- 2: Functions adequately and/or requires occasional supervision
- 3: Functions extremely well and/or independently
- NA: Not applicable to this training experience.

Supervisor ratings for 2014 were similar to ratings for 2012 and 2013, with mean scores 2.8-2.9, which approximates high 90% levels. Also, for 2015 supervisor ratings were not as high as previous years with mean ratings between 2.43 to 2.68. While these ratings are good, they need to be further considered within the context of additional data regarding the 2015 student group, which will be further discussed below in the results of exit survey data. The one category for 2015 that resulted in one item where the Functions Adequately was higher than the Functions Extremely Well rating, which was, *Counseling-Demonstrates the ability to interpret tests, student data, and other appraisal results appropriately in the counseling environment*. Again, these results will be discussed below in the exit survey section.

Exit Surveys Assessment:

The Office of Assessment also conducts assessment of Neag School of Education near the time of their graduation. Assessment of “newly” graduated students is conducted by the administering of the Exit Survey. Exit survey results for the years 2012, 2013 and 2015 are shown in table 23.

Table 23: Percentages Moderate to Total Comfort with Standard on Exit Surveys for 2012, 2013 and 2015

	Counseling	Consultation	Special Education	Coordinating	Curriculum Management	Individual Planning	Managing	Professionalism	Cross-Cultural Experiences
2012	*100%	*90%	*97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	*100%	100%
2013	98%	*92%	*96%	100%	100%	100%	*100%	100%	100%
2015	*99%	*94%	*94%	100%	95%	100%	83%	100%	100%

Similar to table 22 above to interpret the data in table 23 three notes are provided; (1) each column heading represents a category for assessment, (2) each percentage represents a mean or average of all percentages in a category, i.e. for the category Counseling, there were 5 items, (3) an asterisk indicates that for at least one item in a category the moderate percentage was larger than the total comfort. The data in table 23 show that for three years program graduates overwhelmingly report a moderate to total comfort level with the various competencies they will need to demonstrate as professional school counselors, as evidenced all percentages higher than 80%, with the majority in the 90%-100% range.

There were five of the nine categorical areas that had at least one item where the moderate comfort percentage was larger than the total comfort. Faculty agree that for any such category there should be a review of those specific items in order to eliminate the possibility of a “false positive” or thinking that because a category received a high percentage average that all is well within that particular category. Thus, for these data, the categories with an asterisk were, counseling, consultation, special education, managing and professionalism. The counseling item with a moderate rating higher than the total comfort level occurred in the 2012 and the 2015 administering of the survey

was, *Demonstrate the ability to interpret tests, student data and other appraisal results appropriately in the counseling environment*. The 2012 and 2015 student percentage ratings for this item were 80% (moderate), 20% (total), 75% (moderate), 25% (total) respectively. The appraisals course received extremely low student evaluation scores as shown above in the Mid-Program evaluation section table 13 with a 6.6 in 2012 on a 10 point rating scale and a 2.0 on a 5 point rating scale spring 2014. A different instructor was hired for this course for 2015 and student evaluation improved to 3.0 on a 5-point rating scale. While this improvement is encouraging and suggests that the appraisals course has been improved, still the percentages found here and the student evaluation ratings provide good direction for program faculty to continue improving this area for students. Further, in table 22 above that shows supervisor ratings of interns, 2015 ratings were significantly lower than the compared years of 2012 and 2013 on across all categories except the rating comparing our students to previous supervised students.

Moderate percentage comfort ratings higher than total comfort for all three assessed years in table 23 had at least one consultation item. For 2012, consultation items were, *Demonstrate knowledge of a wide variety of appraisal instruments and techniques to enhance decision-making and planning*, and *Demonstrate knowledge of the theory and practice of school-based consultation*. Percentage levels for 2012 for the above-mentioned two items were, 60% (moderate), 30% (total), 50% (moderate) and 40% (total) respectively. In 2013 the consultation item was, *Demonstrate knowledge of a wide variety of appraisal instruments and techniques to enhance decision-making and planning*, with ratings of 63% (moderate) and 25% (total).

The 2015 consultation items with larger moderate percentages than total comfort were, *Demonstrate the ability to consult and collaborate with teachers, staff, administrators and community-based organizations in understanding and meeting the needs of all students*, *Make appropriate referrals to school and community support personnel*, and *Demonstrate knowledge of a wide variety of appraisal instruments and techniques to enhance decision-making and planning* – where the difference in percentage between moderate and total were, 50% (Moderate), 33%total, 50% (moderate), 41% total, 50% (moderate) and 33% (total) respectively. Involvement in the community on two levels is indicated in these the first two consultation items.

The newly revised course in School Counseling Program Development (EPSY 5304) contains substantial content regarding school counselor role in the student community. Additionally, other course such as Counseling Theory and Practice (EPSY 5308) could increase content pertaining to community. Also, the instructor who teaches consultation for the program hold appointment in another program and it will be important to collaborate with her to determine the best means for integrating content and experiences for counseling students related to these consultation areas. The item regarding appraisal instrumentation remained an area in need of improvement for all three years including the 2015. It's important to keep in mind the aforementioned regarding the changes in instructor of the appraisal's course and improved student evaluations and that the 2015 students took the appraisal's course in 2014. Further, both consultation and appraisals are the responsibility of the Counseling Program faculty and as strategies are undertaken to improve these areas it is crucial to receive timely feedback

in order to make any needed changes for student benefit. If evidence of significant improvements is not shown in a timely manner, faculty will need to consider speaking to administration about faculty positions to better cover program courses.

Table 24: Satisfaction with program experiences as moderately to very satisfied

	2012	2013	2015	% Diff 2012 to 2013	% Diff 2013 to 2015
Overall quality of instruction	88.9%	87.5%	50%	N.D.	-
Range of courses	88.9%	87.5%	50%	N.D.	-
Course content	77.8%	87.5%	58.4%	+	-
Up-to-date courses	88.9%	100%	66.7%	+	-
Quality of teaching	100%	62.5%	58.3%	-	-
Accessibility of faculty	88.9%	50.0%	25%	-	-
Quality of advising	100%	62.5%	33.4%	-	-
Courses challenging you to meet your fullest academic potential	88.9%	100%	58.3%	+	-
Program challenged you to meet your fullest academic potential	88.9%	100%	58.3%	+	-
Faculty involvement with students	88.9%	87.5%	33.4%	N.D.	-
Faculty experience as practitioners	44.44	62.5%	50%	+	-
Up-to-date equipment	77.8%	100%	50%	+	-
Sense of community with other students	100%	100%	75%	N.D.	-
Clinic/Practicum/Internship experiences	88.9%	100%	100%	+	N.D.
Job readiness	88.9%	75%	83%	-	+

Table 24 shows graduates ratings of their level of satisfaction with different areas of experiences in the program not covered by those in table 23. Specifically table 23 provides the average percentage rating of moderately to very satisfied with a particular program experience. The data in table 24 provide a good way to see whether there was improvement from one year to the next in these program areas. The column labeled percentage (%) differences from 2012 to 2013 shows no differences on 4 items, as indicated by N.D., 7 items showed increases in student satisfaction and 4 items showed decreases in satisfaction on those program experiences. The student satisfaction rating differences from 2013 to 2015 showed 1 item with no difference

(N.D.), 1 item with increased satisfaction, and 13 items with decreases in satisfaction with those areas of program experiences.

Student ratings for 2012 to 2013 that showed no differences were: *Overall quality of instruction, Range of courses, Faculty involvement with students and Sense of community with other students*. Beginning in 2011, faculty began implementing changes to courses as mentioned in the Mid-Program assessment above. Specifically changes were made in the Career course, the Counseling Theory and Practice course and Appraisals course to address the low scores in those CACREP common core content areas. Additionally, other courses were modified as a regular part of program continuous improvements to better meet students needs. Such changes might have helped maintain positive students experiences. The levels of faculty involvement with students and their involvement with each other appear to have held steady for this time period.

Student ratings from 2012 to 2013 with increases in satisfaction were: *Course content, Up-to-date courses, Courses challenging you to meet your fullest academic potential, Program challenged you to meet your fullest academic potential, Faculty experience as practitioners, Up-to-date equipment, and Clinic/Practicum/Internship experiences*. The changes made in course content and experience for students as mentioned above and in the Mid-Program assessment above would have had more time for gains to be made and thus might have influenced these student ratings. During the program New Student Orientation faculty take the opportunity to share their excitement for the profession and to provide students with the challenge of gaining the most by getting involved in professional organizations, student organizations, and faculty research.

Ratings from 2012 to 2013 with decreases in student satisfaction were: *Quality of teaching, Accessibility of faculty, Quality of advising, Job readiness*. The first two areas have to do with faculty in areas other than teaching. The program is currently in the process of developing better ways to improve these two areas as will be discussed below in the recommendation section.

One item for the 2013 to 2015 ratings showed no difference, *Clinic/Practicum/Internship experiences*, and one item that showed an increase was, *Job readiness*. The remaining 13 items for 2013 to 2015 showed decreases in student satisfaction. In order to gain helpful information we will delineate the 2013 to 2015 alongside the 2012 to 2013 differences. For those 13 items with decreases, 4 showed no differences for the 2012 to 2013 ratings, 6 showed increase for the 2012 to 2013 ratings and 3 revealed decreases for the 2012 to 2013 assessments. Given the inconsistencies in these data where no clear pattern of improvement nor dissatisfaction can be found across the three years, it will be important for program faculty to assess all areas on this part of the exit survey to determine what might be the cause(s) for the inconsistencies so that any areas that need to be addressed are done so in an effective and timely manner.

Pilot Survey of Program Standards:

New for the 2014-2015 academic year was a pilot administering of a survey to first year and third year cohorts. The survey contained the 2009 CACREP Program Outcome Standards. Table 25 below shows the results of the pilot survey:

Table 25: Program Student Outcome Standards Mean Scores for 2015 First and Third Year Cohorts

School Counseling Program Outcome Standards	First Year Cohort Mean Scores	Third Year Cohort Mean Scores
<u>Foundation</u>		
Knowledge	3.09	4.46
Skills	3.20	4.73
<u>Counseling/Prevention/Intervention</u>		
Knowledge	2.50	4.20
Skills	3.24	4.40
<u>Diversity and Advocacy</u>		
Knowledge	3.50	4.50
Skills	3.85	4.56
<u>Assessment</u>		
Knowledge	2.90	4.41
Skills	3.12	4.53
<u>Research and Evaluation</u>		
Knowledge	2.68	4.70
Skills	3.00	4.74
<u>Academic Development</u>		
Knowledge	3.47	4.78
Skills	2.90	4.71
<u>Collaboration and Coordination</u>		
Knowledge	2.94	4.20
Skills	3.76	4.52
<u>Leadership</u>		
Knowledge	3.24	4.63
Skills	3.10	4.69

Mean scores in table 25 are based on a 5 point rating scale and are as follows:

Inadequate competencies = 1

Minimal competencies = 2

Developing professional competencies = 3

Adequate initial professional competencies = 4

Professional competencies = 5

Results of the pilot assessment of first and third year cohort students reveal patterns that will be helpful in determining whether the program is meeting its program outcomes standard goals. The first point of note is that on all knowledge and skills outcomes standards the third year group reported higher levels of competencies than the first year group. This is to be expected given that third year students have had significantly more course work and field based experiences than the first year group. Second, a couple more patterns show more precise differences between the two student groups. Table 25 shows greater within group differences on knowledge and skills means for the first year group than in the third year group. The relatively no difference between knowledge and skills mean scores for the third year group seems fitting in that these students have taken all course work and are engaged in the internship experience. The variance between knowledge and skills for the first year group could point to student's ability to absorb the course content and experiences aimed at skills development. These data are rich in information for program faculty to evaluate their program course content and experiences for ongoing improvements.

Based on the results of the exit surveys from the class of 2015 it was difficult to determine degree of success on program standards. However, the pilot assessment of the 2009 program standards that was administered to the class of 2015 showed that based on their perceptions, did gain knowledge and skills consistent with the Program Outcome standards. These results in conjunction with those of the exit surveys will need to be further reviewed by program faculty members to determine the means for assessing program outcome standards.

Portfolio/Projects:

The portfolio/project's assessment is in transition. Currently these projects have taken place during the practicum course EPST 5317. However, due to new leadership in practicum and the portfolio and projects used for assessments in the program evaluation will be developed in the internship EPSY 5319. According to Practicum and Internship coordinator Dr. Rachelle Perusse, "Students will produce a portfolio containing all the essential elements of a comprehensive developmental school counseling program." This element is moving to an online format beginning in 2015-2016.

Certification Assessment:

The state of Connecticut endorses the UCONN School Counseling Program and as such certifies program graduates. By completing all program requirements, course work and a 10-month internship in a public school program students have met the criteria for certification in Connecticut. The Neag School of Education’s Certification Office is responsible for submitting Connecticut certification applications for all School programs. Table 26 below is a list of graduates that the Certification Office forwarded applications and that were awarded state certification:

Table 26: Graduates that submitted application for Connecticut State Certification through Neag School of Education Certification Office

July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013	July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014	July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015
Cynthia Harakaly	Amanda Ahlcrona	Jennifer Malerba
Olafemi Hunter	Lauren Bucci	Donald Long
Denise Batista	Michael Feinberg	Mary Jane Bazares
	Jennifer Ferreira	Jennifer Puskarz
	Erinda Kalaja	Wen Zeng
	Colleen Murphy	Kiersten Tupper
	Melane Thomas	Kristen Negron
	James Grabowski	Amanda Kanehl
	Kyle Wood	Michelle Godaire
	Yolanda Feliciano- Bedard	Kaitlin Gillard
	Jessica Slater	Samantha Eisenberg
	Christopher Delucia	Curtis Darragh IV
	Tina Worboys	Ashley Caceres
	Melanie Gillis	Samuel Lane
	Jennifer Devlin	Sara Schreiber
	Stephanie Murana	Heather Casale
	Christine San Souci	
	Kayla Williams	

Based on data from the program completion component for years 2012 through 2015, the following recommendations are being suggested for continuous improvement to the school counseling program:

1. **Improve communication to students regarding policy changes.** During the 2015-2016 school year, the internship coordinator will be responsible for ensuring that all students are aware of the newer policies for grades and certification during the first week of internship class,

2. **Conduct a needs assessment.** It is recommended that the department review student comments in the exit surveys to determine what might need to be changed to make the course “more meaningful” to students.
3. **Increase core faculty.** Seek support from Administration to support the increase in enrollment in the University of Connecticut School Counseling Program as well as the increase in minimum credit hours required as indicated in the 2016 CACREP Standards it is recommended that the core faculty in this program be increased by one full time member. Beginning July 1, 2020, all entry-level counseling degree programs require a minimum of 60 semester credit hours or 90-quarter credit hours for all students.
4. **Improve data collection and use of available data.** Coordinate with the Neag Assessment Committee and Director the Counseling Program needs for a more centralized data and related information for access.

Post Graduation Assessment 2014-2015

The UCONN Masters School Counseling Program's Post Graduation evaluation assesses the degree to which the Program graduates including current graduates, alumni and alumni employers are satisfied with the professional preparation provided by the Counseling Program. An exit survey is administered to our graduates within weeks after graduation using the Exit Survey. The Neag School of Education Assessment personnel beginning in 2012 have administered the Exit survey.

To assess alumni and their employers, initially, the plan was to conduct surveys on a three-year rotating basis. The first year alumni were to be surveyed, the second superintendents and the third, supervisors. However, beginning in 2012 Counseling Program alum and superintendents were surveyed. This assessment will utilize data from the superintendents' survey administered in 2012. Given that the past Program Coordinator reviewed the Alum data from 2012, this report will not present the 2012 alum data, only the findings that led to areas for program improvements. Below are areas in which the Program marked as areas to improve upon in June 2011 and June 2012:

- Survey of alumni indicated that more than one student expressed less than satisfaction with our program in the area of "up-to-date" equipment. We will continue conducting routine follow-ups on our graduates paying close attention to the most recent graduates because they have the first hand exposure and opportunity to use the new equipment.
- Alum were informing us they felt ill prepared in the area of college career counseling. A new course has been designed and initiated on college career counseling and modifications on the topic have been integrated in most of our core courses. We will continue conducting routine follow-ups on our graduates paying close attention to those that are most recent because they are the ones that had the new course and other course adjustments while in our program to see if the area of college career counseling remains as an area of their continuing concern.

Additionally, data from the 2014 (last time alumni were surveyed) alum will be used in this assessment. In 2014 alum that graduated between the years 2009 and 2013 were surveyed.

Surveys of Graduates:

Alumni reported their satisfaction and effectiveness with UCONN's school counseling program in 12 evaluative areas and by their written responses to seven open ended questions. The results are briefly summarized focusing on patterns and trends, areas of strength, and those areas needing future attention. Data on specific assessment areas are found in the questionnaire items and only overall trends are discussed here.

Almost 90% of the alumni reported they were very satisfied with the overall quality of instruction and their educational experiences at UCONN.

A majority of alumni were very satisfied in 15 of 21 areas of their training. In the six other areas, all of the respondents indicated they were either very satisfied or moderately satisfied. The greatest satisfactions were found in the clinical and practicum experiences, faculty involvement and accessibility, and the cultural awareness training. Three alumni reported areas of dissatisfaction. Two respondents were dissatisfied with the faculty's lack of experience as practitioners and one alumni reported that the program could better promote student academic potential.

Two of nine alumni reported that the program should place greater emphasis on job readiness, hiring faculty with more practical experience in schools, increasing the challenges for students to meet their full academic potential, and purchasing more up to date equipment.

Alumni rated their satisfaction with being prepared to demonstrate 11 counseling skills in their work. All but one of skills was rated by the respondents as being very satisfied with their preparation. One respondent indicated they were moderately unsatisfied with being prepared to effectively use technology.

The alumni evaluated the Neag School of Education across 10 educational characteristics. Between 66% and 99% rated the school as good or excellent in these educational areas. One respondent indicated that the sense of community could be improved and another alumnus reported the program needed more experienced practitioners. Two respondents indicated that improvement was needed in how the Neag School of Education cooperated with other UCONN schools. Two other indices evaluated the educational processes school wide. Eighty percent of the alumni would recommend the Neag School of Education to someone else, 55% evaluated the school with an A grade, and the rest of the respondents gave Neag a B grade.

One hundred percent of the graduates indicated that skills developed at UCONN helped them get jobs and the same percentage was reported on being prepared well or very well with their current positions. For the 30 areas of educational preparation in the school counseling program, over 75% of the alumni were satisfied or very satisfied with their educational training experiences. The only preparation areas not reaching the 75% threshold were skills using technology and written communications. In both these area 63% of the alumni reported being satisfied or strongly satisfied.

Finally, 100% of the alumni rated their overall educational experiences at UCONN in terms overall satisfaction. Twelve percent reported being satisfied and 88% indicated they were very satisfied.

Overall, the follow-up data indicates that graduates report high satisfaction and effectiveness in their UCONN counselor training in the Neag School of Education. The results indicate high quality instruction, the effective teaching of counseling skills, and

that those skills prepare students to get jobs and perform in them. The areas needing improvement and alumni written suggestions can guide further development of UCONN's counseling training program.

Based on these Alumni data, recommendations for improvement include:

1. Provide more practical examples and experiences for students in their classes,
2. Consider hiring faculty who have applied experience or knowledge about schools,
3. Specific modules should be developed to help students prepare for job interviews and seeking employment.
4. Curriculum should be developed for students to become competent with the new technologies and technical equipment should be identified or purchased that students can use before they enter the job market.

Since these alumni data were collected from those who graduated between the year 2009 and 2013, and that Program former Program Coordinator consulted with the current Internship Coordinator, Dr. Rachelle Perusse has worked to implement strategies to address the above areas for improvement. Additionally, Dr. Robert Colbert also reviewed these alumni data and developed strategies to address them in his courses and professional development. Lastly, Dr. Jim O'Neil implemented course changes to address some of the areas in needing improvement. Below are the strategies that were implemented:

1. Most adjuncts that we hire are practicing school counselors [link].
2. One faculty member, Dr. Robert Colbert took sabbatical leave spring 2009 and worked as a high school counselor in an urban school district in order to update his school counseling skills and to remain current with issues and trends in the profession.
3. In internship classes, and through the Honor Society we host a mock interview evening and have area school counselors come in to run them.
4. The faculty now sends out links of job openings to students who are in their job searches as well as place these on the program website.
5. Also, all of Dr. Perusse' doctoral students have been school counselors, and they co-teach with her.
6. Our students are heavily involved in Connecticut School Counselor

Association (CSCA) and plan the graduate CSCA conference every year. (In fact Samantha Eisenberg was Connecticut graduate student of the year!).

7. Regarding “new technologies or technical equipment” such as Naviance, Career Cruising, Kahn Academy, SAT prep, and so forth, we have guest lecturers discuss these, as well as Dr. Perusse’ expertise with College Board materials.
8. Dr. Jim O’Neil implemented changes in his EPSY 5306 Career Development course to include more school counseling and practical content and experiences.
9. Our new students will have practicum in fall and spring and be hosted on-site by school counselors in order to be immersed in the school system from the first day forward.
10. Most of our courses have fieldwork components even from the first course the students take.
11. Dr. Robert Colbert embedded a field-based component his EPSY 5315 Counseling: Advanced Practice for first year second semester students; wherein they go to Renzulli Academy in Hartford and conduct individual counseling with one students for approximately six weeks.
12. The first semester students go observe on-site in the first school counseling course EPSY 5307 Professional Orientation in School Counseling.
13. Faculty member Dr. Erik Hines was recently hired (fall 2014) in the Counseling Program and is a certified School Counselor.

Surveys of Employers:

In coordination with the Neag Assessment Committee all K-12 certification programs including School Counseling participated in an online survey of Employer Survey. A report provided by the Committee was to provide PROVIDED a quantitative analysis and qualitative reproduction of the responses of 51 superintendents of Neag School alumni, including: teachers, school counselors, school psychologists, intermediate administrators, and executive administrators. Below is a brief bulleted summary of that report:

- a. When rating satisfaction with the overall quality of the Neag School of Education, 45 superintendents “graded” the School with “B”s or better; 69.6% gave the Neag School ”A”s.
- b. As compared to other professional educators of similar experience levels,

91.5% of respondents ($n = 43$) rated Neag School graduates in the top 20% or better; 95.6% indicated that Neag graduates stand out in a positive way in the school/district.

- c. As compared to other executive leaders of similar experience levels, 92.3% of respondents ($n = 36$) rated Neag School graduates in the top 20% or better; 94.9% indicated that Neag graduates stand out in a positive way in the school/district.

In addition to the combined program data, the Committee also analyzed the Employer Surveys by specific program. The School Counseling Program data as presented by the Neag Assessment Committee is presented below:

The 2012 Employer Survey also asked superintendents to compare Neag School alumni of the school counseling program to other school counselors with a similar level of professional experience. Quantitative analysis suggests that 87.5% of respondents ($n = 14$) rated Neag School graduates in the “top 20%” or better of school counselors. Additionally, 94.4% of superintendents indicated that Neag graduates stand out in a positive way in the school/district.

When asked to rate how often Neag School counseling graduates exhibited 12 individual characteristics, superintendents used a five-point rating scale, on which a “1” indicates that Neag School alumni never demonstrate the attribute and a “5” indicates that Neag School alumni always demonstrate the attribute. Superintendents indicated that Neag School graduates of the school counseling program most often demonstrate: *Compassion, caring, and desire to make a positive difference in the world* ($M = 4.46$) and *Use of ethical standards to make evidence-based decisions* ($M = 4.38$). Of the attributes provided, superintendents indicated that Neag School counselors least often demonstrate the *Ability to use multiple methods of technology to enhance and develop learning opportunities* ($M = 3.77$) and *Flexibility to use rich, diverse, “high-end” approaches to construct knowledge* ($M = 3.77$). However, all of the superintendents’ average ratings of Neag School alumni were generally high, with the majority of individual ratings as “Often” or “Always” (See [Superintendent Survey](#)).

Based upon results from a prior administration of the Employer Survey, from 2008 to 2012, the attribute for which superintendent ratings increased most was *Knowledge and creativity to produce new methods* (+ .08). The attribute for which average ratings decreased most was *Ability to use multiple methods of technology to enhance and develop learning opportunities* (- .48). However, there were also fairly large decreases in ratings of *Skill and knowledge to use*

varied methods of assessment to document improvement (- .42) and Flexibility to use rich, diverse, “high-end” approaches to construct knowledge (- .36).

Both superintendents and alumni-rating pertaining to ... *Ability to use multiple methods of technology to enhance and develop learning opportunities...* is an area that need of improvement by the School Counseling Program. The one other area in which superintendents rated school counselors as lacking was what was termed ... *Flexibility to use rich, diverse, “high-end” approaches to construct knowledge.* This particular issue is difficult to know how to integrate into school counselor training and practice.

Recommendations for continued improvements:

1. Program faculty in consultation with the Neag Director of Assessment, determine how best to measure each of strategies implemented above in order to link these strategies with program students and graduates outcomes.
2. Develop new assessment measures that can best address the program changes and desired student outcomes and/or effects.

Discussion

Data from all four key components of the Program Evaluation will be discussed in regards to the benchmark strived for based on the Program Mission, Program Objectives, CACREP Common 8 Core Content Standards, and the CACREP School Counseling Program Outcome Standards.

Program Mission:

The program mission is centered on student being trained provide equity-based school counseling. This means that our trainees must be culturally competent in the three domains of knowledge, skills and awareness that are promoted by the American Counseling Association. Faculty engage in a variety of program endeavors in order to ensure students obtain cultural competence during their program of study.

Entrance survey data presented in the Admission's component section show that entering UCONN students have a moderate mean score for cultural competency items. This is consistent with entrance surveys in the past and supports the goal of our application process, which is to attract applicants who want to function as professional school counselors to help eliminate the various educational disparities among students groups, particularly those pertaining to race and class. Additionally, the application process where faculty have to complete an applicant evaluation form that has educational equity questions, helps with screening to better ensure students goals and motivations are consistent with the Program Mission. This year faculty members implemented the Interview Day/New Student Orientation as another way to increase the chances that students admitted into the program will work in conjunction with the type of program of study planned.

All entering students' program of study is organized around a cohort group. For those first year first semester full-time students are required to take the following four courses: (1) Professional Orientation to School Counseling, (2) Human Growth and Development, (3) Counseling: Theories and Practice, and (4) Cross Cultural Counseling. In regards to the Program's Mission focus primarily on eliminating educational disparities, faculty members coordinate the curriculum so that cultural competence is integrated across all classes. For example, during the first semester students learn in the Human Growth and Development course to identify how race, class, sex, ethnicity, and sexual orientation shape human development over the lifespan. Further human growth and development learning includes how Privilege and Oppression operate within the context of the socialization process in the United States. The aforementioned course experience sets an excellent conceptual foundation for cultural competency development in the remaining program courses in students plan of study.

Examining the requirements for two of the program courses reveals evidence that cultural competence development has been integrated across program courses. For example, table 9 shows the requirements in the Cross Cultural course, racial identity development paper, weekly reflections and study of a cultural group all support

foundations for cultural competence development. Students gain these foundational cultural competencies during their first year and first semester. Following in the second semester of the first year students enroll in School Counseling Program Development and Evaluation that requires students to develop a data-driven advocacy project is shown above in table 10. This requirement provides students with the opportunity to apply what they learned the previous semester in the Cross Cultural course (as well as others courses). Specially, to successfully implement the data project students must be able to understand and know how to identify disparities that school data will expose. With the foundational background for this course work students are able to complete this assignment greater a better knowledge base and sensitivity than they would if they had not had such course preparation in their first semester.

Data presented through out this program evaluation shows evidence that program students have gained high level knowledge and skills to become effective culturally competent professional school counselors. For instance the intern and exit surveys show that program students and graduates have consistently been rated high on cultural competence and various areas of school counselor practice. As discussed above that while these data reveal strong evidence that program goals are being met, they also show evidence that program faulty need to implement additional strategies to maintain and enhance student development.

Program Objectives and Core Content Standards:

The program curriculum as shown in Section II of the self-study provides evidence that the program curriculum has the content and experiences for students to meet the 8 core standards and program objectives. Also, the mid-program component assessment shows that courses cover the content and experiences needed to meet the common core standards and program objectives, and are shown in tables 10, 11, and 12. Further, in the mid-program component section student evaluation shows specific aspects of instructors and courses as presented in tables 15-20. The student evaluations allows faculty members to pinpoint specific areas in the curriculum and classroom that need revisions to better meet student needs, i.e. while providing the content and experiences conducive to meeting the common core standards and program objectives. The CPCE exam is another layer of data that shows the Program is on track and is providing effective curriculum for these common core areas and many areas of the program objectives as shown in table 21. The data also so some areas in need of further improvement, i.e., appraisals.

Program Outcome Standards:

Student outcome data that reflect the Program Outcome standards are shown primarily in the internship ratings, exit survey and Alumni and Employer data. As presented above in the Program Completion assessment component, program the aforementioned reveal trends that will be helpful in faculty members remaining focused on continually striving for improvement.

Further, by piloting the survey of the 2009 program outcome standards on the first year cohort the program now has a baseline to plan continued improvements. This will allow faculty to better target course and other experiences associated with the outcome standards to match our current student baseline.

Summary and Overall Recommendations

The above four sections of the Programs' evaluation presented a substantial amount of data across the years 2011-2015 to determine how well areas that were slated for improvement in 2011 and 2012 have been met. The Program has made many revisions in its curriculum and program operations such as admissions, pre-practicum field experiences, and faculty. Additionally, faculty members have created a strong collaboration that has and will continue to create and implement improvements in the quality and experiences for students.

Each evaluation section assessed its designated areas and came up with recommendations for future Program improvements. Below are guidelines for the program to utilize the results of this Program Evaluation to continue making improvements in Program curriculum and all other matters associated with student learning and experience:

1. Transition from current improvement strategies to new ones identified in this Program Evaluation:

- a. Utilize the Mid-program evaluation discussed above, in particular, the student evaluations of courses to assess whether these strategies and the curriculum changes have produced the desired changes
- b. Review the data from the exit and alum surveys to determine exact years in which those students participated in courses where concerns remained (cognitive and social development, appraisals and updated and school counseling relevant course materials), and if so, seek to make additional changes. If exit surveyed students did not participated in revised courses, then seek to assess only those who have participated in those courses ~~sense~~ since the changes were made.
- c. Determine whether the above goals have been implemented to improve the program. Where there has been sufficient success, continue, and where success has been difficult to assess the reason why and then modify and/or create new strategies to implement.

2. Collaborate with the Greater Neag School of Education in order to maximize all pertinent areas slated for improvement, which include;

- a. Counseling Faculty member(s) serve as member of the Neag Assessment Committee. This committee is in the process of creating new goals to better meet the needs of ALL programs in the School.
- b. Determine which assessments to be administered by the School Assessment Office and ensure logistics and planning are communicated to Counseling faculty and students.

- c. Determine which areas, might be assessed by the Counseling Program only, and communicate this to all parties, i.e. students, the Neag Assessment Committee and any other relevant individuals or groups.
- d. Partner with the School's Academic Advisors to identify potential applicants in order to continue improving student quality and diversity.
- e. Partner with the Institute for Recruitment of teachers in order to continue improving student quality and diversity.

3. Revise Program Website for better and more consistent communication with students and the public. Changes should include those recommended by current students, and address communications concerns in the exit surveys noted below:

- a. Update faculty listing.
- b. List how many credits each class is worth on the Plan of Study.
- c. Create a more detailed potential Plan of Study for part-time students.
- d. Upload the Handbook for Students
 - In the Handbook, it might be helpful to have some information about class times/ course requirements (i.e. Renzulli) so students recognize that flexibility in their schedule is needed to complete the program.
- e. Create an electronic copy of the Plan of Study to be filled out with advisor and create deadlines for completion.
- f. Create a link or make a comment about the Student Counseling Honors Society.
- g. Provide more information about practicum/ internship (maybe in the student Handbook) on where to find information about previous practicum/ internship and whether UCONN has any partnerships with any school districts?
- h. Create a timetable to secure practicum/internship sites and develop forms that students need to fill out.
- i. Provide information about the timing of National/ State examinations, when to register, the cost, and the location of testing.

4. Program faculty organize to better meet Program needs:

- a. Hold faculty retreat to review this Program Evaluation and make a plan for implementing recommendations.
- b. Faculty determine how to best use program meetings to address recommendations.
- c. Develop a communication mechanism and process to identify and address student concerns on an ongoing basis.
- d. Faculty identify and implement a common advising procedure and communicate to students.