

2025-26 Continuous Improvement Report

Counseling and Development, MEd

Academic Year 2025-26. Report generated 16 September 2026.

About this version

This is a text-equivalent version of the Continuous Improvement Report. Every chart in the original has been replaced by a written narrative and a data table carrying the same values, so no result depends on seeing a graphic or on interacting with one. Status labels are written as words rather than signalled by color alone, and each linked evidence file is described in text.

Contents

Mission

The mission of the Counseling and Development Program is to provide a rigorous, engaging, and transformational experience for skilled and adept counselors-in-training. Faculty work tenaciously to build culturally responsive and supportive relationships with students to implement a developmental, integrative, experiential and strengths-based curriculum. The program's goal is to develop ethical professional counselors who are leaders, consultants, advocates, collaborators, and change agents.

Student Learning Outcome 1 — Partially met

Students will develop a professional counseling identity.

Assessment Method 1: Professional Fitness Review — Partially met

Measure

The program coordinator will administer the Professional Fitness Review (PFR) to all students in the CSDV program each semester. The PFR was developed by program faculty to assess students' adherence to aspects of ethical counseling practice as well as the development of professional counselor identity. This data will be collected at the midpoint of each semester. Method type: direct, other.

Target

Students will score at least 3 out of 4 in all Professional Fitness Review areas. Students must score 3 or better in professional dispositions to continue to move into Practicum and Internship.

Evidence

- PFR cover sheet and rubric (csdv-pfr-cover-24m).
- Aggregated activity assessment results, PFR I, 2024 Fall Cohort, RisePoint.
- Aggregated activity assessment results, PFR I, 2024 Summer Cohort, ground.
- Aggregated activity assessment results, PFR II, 2024 Summer Cohort, ground.

Results

Results for this method were reported narratively rather than as a percentage distribution. Two rubric areas fell below the program mean and are reported here as means on the 4-point scale.

Table 1. Lowest-rated Professional Fitness Review areas by rubric level, on a 4-point scale where 3 is the minimum acceptable rating

Rubric level	Competence area rated lowest	Mean
PFR I	Basic cognitive skills and appropriate affect with clients	2.92
PFR II	Interpersonal skills necessary for effective client interaction	2.92

Analysis

Across all three cohorts and both PFR levels, students broadly met program expectations in professional dispositions. Professional Responsibility and Integrity were areas of consistent strength, with near-perfect ratings across all groups, indicating that students enter and progress through the program with solid ethical grounding and professional conduct. Attitude toward work, self-control, and honesty and fairness were similarly strong, suggesting effective socialization into professional norms.

The one area that surfaced as a recurring developmental need across multiple cohorts and both rubric levels was Competence, specifically demonstrating basic cognitive skills and appropriate affect with clients at PFR I, and interpersonal skills necessary for effective client interaction at PFR II. Both recorded a mean of 2.92. The ability to receive and integrate feedback also showed isolated but consistent lower ratings across cohorts, as did awareness of personal belief systems and their potential impact on professional work. No student received a Level 1 or Significant Improvement Required rating, and the overwhelming majority met expectations across all domains, reflecting a healthy overall program performance.

Action

Implement new program or services. Status: not started. In the next cycle, faculty should embed structured skill-building activities focused on affective attunement and in-session responsiveness into

PFR I coursework, with scaffolded reinforcement in PFR II through peer observation and supervision seminars.

Conclusion

As only one assessment method was utilized to measure SLO 1 in this cycle, the outcome analysis is drawn entirely from the results of the Professional Fitness Reviews.

Student Learning Outcome 2 — Met

Students will apply the Multicultural Counseling Competencies when working with clients.

Assessment Method 1: CSDV 605 Diversity Engagement Project — Met

Measure

Students will complete a CSDV 605 (Diversity Issues in Counseling) Diversity Engagement Project. Data will be collected by the course instructor following grading of the assignment using the attached rubric at the end of the course. Method type: direct, assignment.

Target

Students will score at least 80 percent on the assessment, equivalent to 280 points. Graduate students must complete key assessments with a B or better.

Evidence

- Diversity Engagement Project, Parts 1 to 5, rubric detail for CSDV 605.

Results

Every student assessed exceeded the target. All 100 percent of students enrolled in CSDV 605 scored at or above the 280-point threshold. No student fell into the Met, Approached, or Not Met categories, so the combined Met total was 100 percent and the Not Met total was zero.

Table 2. Distribution of student performance on the CSDV 605 Diversity Engagement Project

Performance category	Percentage of students
Exceeded	100%
Met	0%
Approached	0%
Not met	0%
Met or exceeded	100%

Analysis

The target for Assessment Method 1 was set at 80 percent, or 280 points, requiring graduate students to complete the Diversity Engagement Project with a B or better. This target was exceeded, demonstrating full attainment of Student Learning Outcome 2. This outcome reflects the effectiveness of intentional course scaffolding, explicit instruction on the Multicultural Counseling Competencies, and the experiential nature of the project in preparing students to apply culturally responsive counseling practices. Key strengths included students' ability to critically examine their own cultural assumptions and connect those reflections to clinical application.

Historically, this level of cohort-wide attainment has served as a strong benchmark for the program. While all students met the target, areas for continued growth include deepening critical analysis beyond descriptive observation, strengthening integration of systemic and structural factors in student reflections, and ensuring greater diversity in community engagement settings to maximize multicultural exposure.

Action

Revise curriculum. Status: not started. Based on the full attainment rate on the Diversity Engagement Project, faculty will implement targeted enhancements in the subsequent cycle to sustain and deepen student learning beyond threshold performance. Specifically, the assignment prompt will be revised to include structured criteria for selecting community engagement sites that represent cultures meaningfully different from the student's own background, addressing the identified gap in diversity of exposure across the cohort.

Assessment Method 2: CSDV 618 Intersectionality Paper — Met

Measure

Students will complete an Intersectionality Paper in CSDV 618, the Addictions Counseling course. Data will be collected by the course instructor following grading of the assignment using the attached rubric at the end of the course. The measure addresses Section 3, Foundational Counseling Curriculum, under the Social and Cultural Identities and Experiences standards, covering how poverty, income gaps, and limited access to healthcare impact marginalized identities. Method type: direct, assignment.

Target

Students are expected to score 80 percent or higher based on the grading rubric. Graduate students are expected to receive a B or better on their key assessments.

Evidence

- CSDV 618 research paper assignment and complete rubric.

Results

Every student assessed exceeded the target. All 100 percent of students met all four rubric criteria at or near full marks, with no students in the Met, Approached, or Not Met categories. The four criteria — Adherence to Assignment Guidelines, Health Disparities, Marginalized Identities, and Poverty and Addiction — were each weighted equally at 25 percent of the total grade.

Table 3. Distribution of student performance on the CSDV 618 Intersectionality Paper

Performance category	Percentage of students
Exceeded	100%
Met	0%
Approached	0%
Not met	0%
Met or exceeded	100%

Analysis

Students enrolled in CSDV 618 demonstrated strong performance on the Intersectionality Paper. Across all four criteria, students consistently met expectations, reflecting a solid grasp of the intersectional factors influencing addiction among marginalized populations. Given the high rate of proficiency across all criteria, no immediate curricular interventions are warranted at this time. To sustain and build upon these outcomes, faculty should continue to reinforce the connections between poverty, identity, and health disparities through current research and case-based learning. Incorporating more nuanced discussion prompts or advanced extension opportunities may help challenge high-performing students and deepen critical thinking beyond the baseline criteria.

Action

Revise measurement and assessment. Status: not started. Recommended due date 11 August 2026. Faculty will annually review rubric criteria to ensure alignment with current research and social justice frameworks. The program will also explore moving beyond a binary Met or Not Met scale toward differentiated proficiency levels to better capture depth of student learning. Peer review components or community-based research opportunities will be considered to further challenge students in applying course concepts to real-world contexts.

Conclusion

The desired results for SLO 2 were attained across both assessment methods. The Diversity Engagement Project in CSDV 605 and the Intersectionality Paper in CSDV 618 both met the 80 percent minimum threshold, collectively demonstrating that students are successfully applying the Multicultural Counseling Competencies when working with clients. A consistent strength across both measures is students' ability to engage with diversity and intersectionality frameworks across different course contexts, suggesting that multicultural competency is being effectively reinforced throughout the program curriculum.

Student Learning Outcome 3 — Partially met

Students apply human growth and development theories to the counseling process.

Assessment Method 1: CSDV 614 Final Exam — Partially met

Measure

Students will take a multiple-choice final exam in CSDV 614 (Lifespan Developmental Counseling, first semester) assigned by the course instructor to test knowledge of human growth and development theories as applied to the counseling process. Data will be collected by the course instructor following grading of the exam at the end of the course. Method type: direct, course-based exam.

Target

Students are expected to score 80 percent or higher. Graduate students are expected to receive a B or better on their key assessments.

Results

Student performance distributed across three categories. Three quarters of students, 75 percent, exceeded the target; 20 percent met it; and 5 percent approached it without reaching it. No students fell into the Not Met category as a separate rating. Taking the first two categories together, 95 percent of students met or exceeded the benchmark and 5 percent did not.

Table 4. Distribution of student performance on the CSDV 614 multiple-choice final exam

Performance category	Percentage of students
Exceeded	75%
Met	20%
Approached	5%
Met or exceeded	95%
Did not meet	5%

Analysis

The target for this assessment method was met. These results confirm that the program's expected outcome, that students apply human growth and development theories to the counseling process, is being realized at a high level. A notable strength reflected in the data is the consistently high rate of students exceeding the benchmark, suggesting that course instruction, content alignment, and exam design are effectively preparing students to demonstrate knowledge of developmental theories as they relate to counseling practice.

Action

Additional training. Status: not started. Recommended due date 11 August 2026. The course instructor will implement a mid-semester check-in assessment, such as a brief formative quiz or case reflection, to identify students who may be at risk of not meeting the benchmark before the final exam. This will allow for earlier intervention rather than remediation after the fact.

Assessment Method 2: CSDV 601 Theory of Change Paper — Met

Measure

In CSDV 601 (Counseling Theories) students will complete a Theory of Change paper assigned by the course instructor. Students will reflect on and articulate their theoretical perspective as a counselor. Data will be collected by the course instructor following grading of the assignment using the attached rubric at the end of the course. Method type: direct, assignment.

Target

Students must score 80 percent or higher on the Theory of Change paper. Graduate students must score a B or better on all key assessments.

Evidence

- CSDV 601 Theoretical Orientation Paper assignment and rubric.
- Combined score table for RisePoint and ground sections.

Results

Student performance was reported against five rubric criteria on a binary Met or Not Met scale. Students met the criterion at a rate of 100 percent on every one of the five: APA Format, Application of Theory, Knowledge of Theory, Spelling and Grammar, and Use of References. No student was rated Not Met on any criterion.

Table 5. Proficiency of student scores by rubric criterion on the CSDV 601 Theory of Change paper

Rubric criterion	Met	Not met
APA format	100%	0%
Application of theory	100%	0%
Knowledge of theory	100%	0%
Spelling and grammar	100%	0%
Use of references	100%	0%

Analysis

For the 2025-26 assessment cycle, students enrolled in CSDV 601 demonstrated strong performance on the Theory of Change paper, with every student meeting all rubric criteria. This assignment required students to reflect on and articulate their theoretical perspective as a counselor, and results indicate that students are successfully developing a foundational professional identity aligned with course expectations.

Action

Revise measurement and assessment. Status: not started. Recommended due date 13 April 2026. To sustain and strengthen these outcomes, faculty will annually review rubric criteria to ensure alignment with

current counseling theory and best practices. The program will also explore moving beyond a binary Met or Not Met scale toward differentiated proficiency levels to better capture the depth and sophistication of student reflection. Faculty will consider scaffolding the assignment with earlier low-stakes reflection activities to further support students in developing a well-articulated theoretical perspective throughout the course.

Conclusion

Taken together, the results reflect a program that is generally succeeding in helping students develop and apply knowledge of human growth and development theories. The consistent strength on the reflective, writing-based measure compared to the exam-based measure points to a potential area worth examining, namely whether the current balance of assessment methods captures the full range of student competency for this outcome. Historical performance across both measures has been relatively stable, which reinforces the reliability of the instructional approaches in place while also underscoring that the small gap in exam performance has not yet been meaningfully closed. The primary area for improvement is addressing the subset of students who struggle to demonstrate competency on the exam-based measure, as well as exploring whether the two existing measures together provide a sufficiently comprehensive picture of students' ability to apply developmental theory within actual counseling contexts.

Student Learning Outcome 4 — Partially met

Students will differentiate among career assessments to inform client needs and growth.

Assessment Method 2: CSDV 603 Comparative Analysis Paper — Partially met

Measure

In CSDV 603 (Career and Lifestyle Development), students will complete a comparative analysis paper assigned by the course instructor to deepen their understanding of how cultural, racial, and gender identities influence individuals' career experiences and aspirations. Data will be collected by the course instructor following grading of the assignment using the attached rubric at the end of the course.

Method type: direct, assignment.

Target

Students will score a minimum of 80 percent on the comparative paper. Graduate students need a B or better on key assessments.

Evidence

- Comparative analysis paper assignment and rubric.

Results

Of the 23 students enrolled in CSDV 603 who completed this assignment, 20 students, or 87 percent, exceeded the 80 percent threshold; 1 student, or 4 percent, met it; and 2 students, or 9 percent, did not meet it. The combined Met total was 91 percent and the Not Met total was 9 percent.

Table 6. Distribution of student performance on the CSDV 603 Comparative Analysis Paper

Performance category	Students	Percentage
Exceeded	20	87%
Met	1	4%
Not met	2	9%
Met or exceeded	21	91%

Analysis

The target for this assessment method was largely met. These results indicate that the majority of students demonstrated competency in analyzing how cultural, racial, and gender identities influence career experiences and aspirations. A key strength is the high number of students exceeding the minimum, suggesting that the comparative analysis paper is an effective tool for assessing students' ability to differentiate among career assessments through a multicultural lens. The two students who did not meet the target represent a small but notable concern, as the intersectional nature of the assignment may present additional complexity that some students are underprepared to navigate.

Data note

The instructor for CSDV 603-600 did not require this assignment. No data is available for that group.

Action

Implement new program or services. Status: not started. Send reminder emails to students to complete the assignment.

Assessment Method 3: CSDV 603 Career Highlight Film Paper — Partially met

Measure

Students will complete a Career Highlight Film Paper assigned by the course instructor in CSDV 603 (Career Development). Data will be collected by the course instructor following grading of the assignment using the attached rubric at the end of the course. Method type: direct, project.

Target

Students will score a minimum of 80 percent on the CSDV 603 Career Highlight Project. Graduate students must score B or better on all key assessments.

Evidence

- Career film paper rubric.

Results

All students enrolled in CSDV 603 but one scored at or above the 80 percent minimum threshold. Ninety-eight percent of students exceeded the target and 2 percent, representing one student, did not meet it. No students fell into the Met or Approached categories.

Table 7. Distribution of student performance on the CSDV 603 Career Highlight Film Paper

Performance category	Percentage of students
Exceeded	98%
Met	0%
Not met	2%
Met or exceeded	98%

Figure to reconcile before submission

The narrative analysis for this measure in the source report describes a 96 percent pass rate, while the results distribution reports 98 percent. These two figures should be reconciled and the correct value used in both places.

Analysis

The target for this assessment method was largely met, reflecting strong overall student ability to differentiate among career assessments and apply that knowledge to a real-world media analysis. A key strength is the high number of students exceeding the minimum benchmark, suggesting that the Career Highlight Film Paper is an effective and engaging assignment for demonstrating mastery of SLO 4. The one student who did not meet the target indicates an isolated gap rather than a systemic instructional concern.

Action

Implement new program or services. Status: not started. Send reminder emails to students to complete the assignment.

Conclusion

The desired results for SLO 4 were attained across both assessment methods. The Career Highlight Film Paper and the Comparative Analysis Paper both produced pass rates above 90 percent, collectively demonstrating that students are successfully differentiating among career assessments to inform client needs and growth. A consistent strength across both measures is students' ability to apply career development concepts in varied assignment formats, suggesting effective course instruction in CSDV 603. The slightly lower pass rate on the Comparative Analysis Paper indicates that assignments requiring integration of multicultural and identity frameworks present a greater challenge, pointing to a targeted area for improvement. Actions already identified, revising the curriculum and refining the assessment measure, directly address these gaps and are expected to strengthen both instructional delivery and measurement clarity in the next assessment cycle.

Student Learning Outcome 5 — Partially met

Students will apply foundational counseling skills that are informed by theory.

Assessment Method 1: CSDV 610B Practicum II Final Evaluation — Partially met

Measure

In CSDV 610B (Counseling Practicum II), students receive a final evaluation from their course instructor and field site supervisor upon completion of their first external field experience. During this experience, students implement foundational helping skills. Data will be collected by the course instructor using the attached rubric at the end of the course. Method type: direct, field assessment.

Target

A foundational helping skills rating of 3 (good), 4 (very good), or 5 (superior) in key areas.

Evidence

- CSDV 610B, 611, and 612 Counseling Fieldwork rubric.
- Summary overview and identified individual student final evaluations for Practicum II, as reported from the Supervision Assist platform.

Results

Most students received a progress outcome of Satisfactory from their site and faculty supervisors, at 98.9 percent. Two students, representing 1.1 percent, received a progress outcome of Requires Review.

Table 8. Practicum II final evaluation outcomes

Progress outcome	Percentage of students
Satisfactory	98.9%
Requires review	1.1%

Analysis

The pass rate target was substantially met. The most consistently strong area across both Clinical Mental Health and School Counseling students was Attitude toward Work, particularly promptness, dependability, cooperativeness, and the ability to carry out suggestions, where many students received ratings of 4 and 5. Supervisor comments frequently highlighted qualities such as eagerness to learn, professionalism, openness to feedback, and strong rapport-building with clients and students.

The two students rated Requires Review shared some overlapping challenges: difficulty taking initiative, inconsistent promptness and dependability, underdeveloped clinical skills relative to peers, and supervisors expressing concern about readiness for independent functioning.

Action

Implement new program or services. Status: in progress. Recommended due date 12 October 2026. Early intervention. For the two students who received Requires Review outcomes, a review of the site supervisor feedback indicates that concerns about initiative, timeliness, and readiness were present early in the placement but may not have triggered formal remediation until the final evaluation. The

action for the next cycle is to implement a mid-placement check-in protocol for any student receiving supervisor concern flags.

Assessment Method 2: CSDV 612 Internship II Final Evaluation — Met

Measure

In CSDV 612 (Counseling Internship II), students receive a final evaluation from their course instructor at the conclusion of their final field experience. During this experience, students implement foundational helping skills. Data will be collected by the course instructor using the attached rubric at the end of the course. Method type: direct, field assessment.

Target

Students must demonstrate implementation of foundational helping skills. This area is assessed through the completion of final evaluations conducted by the site supervisor. Data is collected during the student's practicum, internship I, and internship II experiences. A rating of 3 (good), 4 (very good), or 5 (superior) in key areas will indicate a fundamental development of helping skills.

Evidence

- CSDV 610B, 611, and 612 Counseling Fieldwork rubric.
- Summary overview and de-identified individual student final evaluations for Internship II, as reported from the Supervision Assist platform.

Results and analysis

The pass rate target was met. All students received a Satisfactory rating, consistent with the summary overview provided in the documentation. As previously noted, in the earlier Practicum II assessment method all but two students passed, indicating the program's primary outcome of successful completion of practicum with satisfactory performance. Both of those students subsequently passed Internship II with a Satisfactory rating.

Action

Community partnership. Status: not started. Continue open communication with site supervisors to ensure all students pass with satisfactory ratings.

Assessment Measure 3: CSDV 610B Practicum II Midterm Evaluation — Partially met

Measure

In CSDV 610B, students receive a midterm evaluation from their course instructor upon completion of their first external field experience, Practicum II. During this experience, students implement foundational helping skills. Data will be collected by the course instructor using the attached rubric at the end of the course. Method type: direct, field assessment.

Target

Students will receive a minimum rating of 3.

Evidence

- Table of student midterm evaluation scores.

Results

The midterm evaluation data covered 452 student records. The overall mean rating was 4.14 out of 5, with 79 percent of all competency ratings falling at the Very Good or Superior level. Domain means are given below. Notably, 451 of 452 students, or 99.8 percent, were recommended for continuation, and only one student received a poor or fair rating.

Table 9. Practicum II midterm evaluation means by competency domain, on a 5-point scale, across 452 student records

Competency domain	Mean rating	Rated 4 or higher
Attitude toward work	4.53	93.5%
Foundations	4.19	Not reported
Research and evaluation	4.01	Not reported
All domains combined	4.14	79%

Analysis

The midterm evaluation data reflects strong overall performance across the Clinical Mental Health Counseling program. The highest-performing domain was Attitude toward Work, indicating that students consistently demonstrate professionalism, dependability, and cooperativeness at their sites. Foundations and Research and Evaluation also reflect solid competency. The near-universal recommendation for continuation confirms broad program-level success. Areas of relative strength include cooperativeness, ability to carry out suggestions, and daily preparation skills, which supervisors consistently rate at or near Superior.

Action

Revise curriculum. Status: not started. Given that the lowest-rated competencies center on diagnostic tools, suicide risk, and co-occurring disorder screening, all critical clinical safety skills, the program should integrate structured skill-building activities into the practicum and internship curriculum during the next cycle. Specifically, faculty should develop targeted case vignettes or simulations focused on DSM application and differential diagnosis for use in supervision seminars, ensuring students have repeated practice beyond what individual sites may provide. For suicide risk assessment, a standardized protocol review, for example using the Columbia Protocol, should be embedded as a required module at the start of each placement to establish a consistent baseline before site hours begin.

Conclusion

The program's expected outcome was partially achieved. In the first measure, results were partially met, with two students not passing, indicating some gaps in student performance. However, the second measure showed strong success, with all students passing, demonstrating that the outcome can be fully achieved under certain conditions. Strengths are reflected in the strategies used in the second measure,

which should be maintained and applied more broadly. The lower performance in the first measure suggests a need to review assessment alignment and difficulty, and to provide additional support for struggling students. Overall, improving consistency across measures is a key area for improvement.

Student Learning Outcome 6 — Met

Students will assess the implementation of group counseling procedures.

Assessment Method 1: CSDV 606 Literature Review — Met

Measure

Students will complete a literature review in CSDV 606 (Group Counseling) assigned by their course instructor. Data will be collected by the course instructor following grading of the assignment using the attached rubric at the end of the course. Method type: direct, assignment.

Target

Students must score a minimum of 80 percent on key assessments. The Graduate School requires a B or higher.

Evidence

- CSDV 606 group literature review assignment and complete rubric.
- Spreadsheet of student grades for the group counseling literature review.

Results

All students scored at or above the 80 percent minimum threshold, with scores ranging from 85 to 100 out of 100 points. The class average was approximately 96 percent.

Table 10. Score range on the CSDV 606 group counseling literature review

Statistic	Value out of 100
Lowest score	85
Highest score	100
Class average	96
Minimum threshold	80

Analysis

The target for this assessment method was met, reflecting strong student mastery of group counseling literature and demonstrating that students are successfully meeting SLO 6. A notable strength is the high concentration of perfect and near-perfect scores, suggesting that the literature review assignment and accompanying rubric are well-aligned with course instruction.

Action

Revise measurement and assessment. Status: not started. Based on the strong performance data, the program will refine the literature review rubric to include a more explicit evaluation criterion focused on the application of group counseling theory to real-world practice, ensuring students move beyond summarization toward deeper critical analysis.

Conclusion

As only one assessment method was utilized to measure SLO 6 in this cycle, the outcome analysis is drawn entirely from the literature review results in CSDV 606. Based on that single measure, the desired outcome was fully realized. All students met or exceeded the 80 percent threshold, indicating strong collective mastery of group counseling procedures. The alignment between course instruction and the assessment rubric appears to be an effective strategy, as reflected in the consistently high scores. Future efforts could include more assessments.

Student Learning Outcome 7 — Partially met

Students will integrate basic concepts of qualitative and quantitative assessment into practice.

Assessment Method 1: CSDV 607 Progressive Case Study — Met

Measure

In CSDV 607 (Appraisal of the Individual, also titled Assessment and Testing) students will complete a Progressive Case Study Assessment assigned by their course instructor at the end of the semester. Students are required to complete case study analyses in which they apply the assessment tools, techniques, and concepts learned throughout the course. Data will be collected by the course instructor following grading of the assignment using the attached rubric at the end of the course. Method type: direct, assignment.

Target

Students are expected to score a minimum of 80 percent in all areas of the assignment rubric. Graduate students are expected to score B or better on all key assessments.

Evidence

- CSDV 607 case study reflection rubric.

Results

Every student assessed exceeded the target. All 100 percent of students exceeded the benchmark on the Progressive Case Study Assessment. No students fell into the Met, Approached, or Not Met categories.

Table 11. Distribution of student performance on the CSDV 607 Progressive Case Study Assessment

Performance category	Percentage of students
Exceeded	100%
Met	0%
Approached	0%
Not met	0%
Met or exceeded	100%

Analysis

The program outcome was fully achieved and exceeded expectations, demonstrating strong mastery of assessment tools, techniques, and concepts. This reflects effective instructional strategies, clear alignment between course content and assessment, and successful student application of knowledge. To sustain this strength, these strategies should be maintained and considered for replication in other courses. Continued monitoring will ensure consistent high performance over time.

Data note

Students in CSDV 607-700 have not yet taken the course and are expected to do so in summer 2026.

Action

Revise benchmark and target. Status: not started. Given that all students exceeded the benchmark, it is appropriate to increase the benchmark to promote continued rigor and student growth. The benchmark can be raised to a higher performance level, for example by requiring a greater percentage of students to score in the exceeds expectations category or by increasing rubric criteria standards. Faculty will also enhance the complexity of the case study and incorporate more advanced application components to maintain challenge.

Assessment Method 3: CSDV 618 Research Methodology Assignment — Partially met**Measure**

In CSDV 618, students will design a research methodology assignment assigned by their instructor. Students will design a qualitative or quantitative research study that includes a method, purpose statement or research question, theoretical framework, literature base, data analysis, and implication discussion. Data will be collected by the course instructor following grading of the assignment using the attached rubric at the end of the course. Method type: direct, assignment.

Target

Students will receive a minimum of 85 percent on all areas of the assignment rubric. Students are expected to score 80 percent or better on all key assessments.

Evidence

- Research Methods assignment rubric.
- CSDV 618 research paper assignment.
- Table of de-identified students and their grades on the research methodology assignment.

Results and analysis

A review of the assessment data for this program outcome indicates strong overall performance, with the majority of students successfully meeting the established targets for this measure. All but two students met the requirement. The high completion and submission rates reflect students' engagement with the material and suggest that the instructional strategies employed were effective in supporting student learning. Nearly all students who submitted work achieved scores at or near the benchmark, demonstrating consistent mastery across the cohort. One area for improvement involves students who did not submit or submitted late, which warrants further follow-up to identify barriers to timely completion. Moving forward, continued emphasis on early engagement and proactive outreach to at-risk students may help sustain and strengthen these results in future terms.

Action

Modify policies and procedures. Status: not started. Recommended due date **20 October 2026**. The program will implement a mid-unit check-in email reminder for students who have not yet submitted by the halfway point of the assessment window.

Conclusion

Student Learning Outcome 7 was partially met based on two assessment measures. In CSDV 607, students met the target by scoring at or above the 80 percent benchmark on the Progressive Case Study Assessment, demonstrating strong application of assessment concepts. In CSDV 618, the outcome was partially met, as students did not consistently achieve the 85 percent benchmark across all rubric criteria in the research methodology assignment. Overall, students demonstrated solid foundational understanding of qualitative and quantitative assessment, particularly in applied case-based work. However, performance was weaker in designing and fully integrating research methodology components such as theoretical frameworks and data analysis. Instructional strategies were effective in applied contexts but may need strengthening through additional scaffolding and guided support for research design tasks. Compared to historical performance, results remain generally consistent, with stronger outcomes in applied assessments than in advanced research integration.

Student Learning Outcome 8 — Partially met

Students will design a research methodology that will be used to inform their practice.

Assessment Method 1: CSDV 623 Final Theory Paper — Partially met

Measure

In CSDV 623 (Advanced Counseling Interventions) students complete a final theory paper assigned by their course instructor. In this assignment students explore the history and training required for a

counseling theory they will use as a foundation for their practice. Data will be collected by the course instructor following grading of the assignment using the attached rubric at the end of the course.

Method type: direct, assignment.

Target

Students will receive a score of 85 percent or better on the theory paper. Graduate students are expected to score B or better on all key assessments.

Evidence

- CSDV 623 grading rubric for the final theory paper. This evidence is currently attached as an image file with no text alternative; a text or table version should replace it.
- Table of student grades.

Results and analysis

The target of 85 percent or better was largely met, with the majority of students performing at or above the expected level. Two students fell short, one receiving a failing grade and one earning 80 percent. This suggests that while the assignment is effective overall, a small subset of students may struggle with synthesizing theoretical foundations into a coherent paper. These results are consistent with typical performance expectations for a graduate-level theory assignment.

Actions

Implement new program or services. Status: not started. For the next cycle, the instructor will introduce a structured outline or scaffolding template earlier in the course to help students organize their theory paper before drafting. Additionally, a brief one-on-one check-in or peer review activity will be added mid-semester to identify struggling students before the final submission deadline.

Revise curriculum. Status: not started. The counseling department will replace its current assessment for Student Learning Outcome 8 with a more targeted and measurable instrument that better captures students' applied skills and behavioral changes. After reviewing recent assessment data and identifying gaps in how effectively SLO 8 is being measured, faculty will collaborate to design or adopt a rubric-based evaluation aligned with real counseling scenarios, such as case studies, role-play reflections, or applied decision-making tasks. This revised assessment will be piloted in the next cycle, with results compared to prior data to evaluate its effectiveness. Based on these findings, the department will refine the tool further to ensure it provides clear, actionable evidence of student learning specific to Outcome 8.

Assessment Method 2: EDUC 640 Literature Review and Final Research Proposal — Partially met

Measure

Students will write a literature review and final paper proposal in EDUC 640 (Educational Research, Design and Analysis). Data will be collected by the course instructor following grading of the assignment using the attached rubric at the end of the course. Method type: direct, assignment.

Target

Eighty percent or better on the project. Graduate students are expected to score B or better on all key assessments.

Evidence

- Literature Review and Final Research Proposal assignment for EDCI 640.

Results

Student performance distributed across four categories. Eighty percent of students exceeded the target, 7 percent met it, 11 percent approached it, and 2 percent did not meet it. Taking the first two categories together, 86 percent of students, or 38 students, met or exceeded the benchmark, while 14 percent, or 6 students, did not. The mean score across both sections was 93.13 percent.

Table 12. Distribution of student performance on the EDUC 640 Literature Review and Final Research Proposal

Performance category	Percentage of students
Exceeded	80%
Met	7%
Approached	11%
Not met	2%
Met or exceeded	86%
Did not meet	14%

Table 13. Letter grade distribution on the EDUC 640 Literature Review and Final Research Proposal, across both sections

Letter grade	Students
A	35
B	3
C	5
F	1
Total assessed	44

Analysis

The target for this measure was met. The mean score indicates strong overall performance. While the mean reflects a high-performing cohort overall, the presence of students earning a C or F warrants attention, as graduate-level expectations require a B or better on key assessments. The strength of this measure lies in the large proportion of students producing A-level work on a research-intensive assignment, suggesting that instruction in research design, literature review construction, and proposal

writing is largely effective. However, the 14 percent who did not meet the benchmark indicate that a subset of students may be entering the course without adequate preparation in academic research writing, or may need additional scaffolding throughout the assignment process.

Action

Implement new program or services. Status: in progress. Recommended due date 8 March 2027. To address the performance gap among students who did not meet the benchmark, the course instructor will introduce structured assignment scaffolding in the subsequent cycle. Rather than collecting the literature review and final research proposal solely at the end of the course, the assignment will be broken into staged submission checkpoints such as a topic proposal, annotated bibliography, and draft literature review, so that students receive formative feedback before the final submission.

Conclusion

The outcome was largely met across both measures. In CSDV 623, the majority of students met the 85 percent benchmark on the theory paper, with two exceptions. In EDUC 640, 86 percent of students met the 80 percent benchmark with a strong cohort mean of 93.13 percent. These results indicate that students are generally developing the ability to design research methodologies that inform their practice at an acceptable graduate level. A consistent strength across both measures is the high proportion of students producing quality work on research-intensive assignments, suggesting current instructional strategies are largely effective. However, both courses identified a small subset of students who did not meet expectations, pointing to a recurring gap in research writing preparedness and theory-to-practice synthesis. This pattern across two courses suggests a program-wide need for earlier and more consistent support in academic research writing, which will be a focus for the next assessment cycle.

Program Outcome 1 — Met

The Counseling and Development Program's curriculum will clearly align with the 2024 CACREP (Council for the Accreditation of Counseling Related Educational Programs) expectations and standards.

Assessment Method 1: Monthly Program Meetings — Met

Measure

Monthly program meetings to discuss key performance indicators in alignment with 2024 CACREP standards and to document assessment data. Program meetings will be documented by the program coordinator via minutes. Method type: indirect, other.

Target

The Counseling and Development Program will meet monthly to ensure data collection is in alignment with 2024 CACREP standards.

Evidence

- 2024 CACREP Standards, combined version.
- Screenshot of the CSDV OneDrive folder showing where monthly program meeting minutes are stored. Text alternative: the screenshot displays a folder listing of dated monthly meeting minutes files in the program's shared OneDrive location.

Analysis

The target for this method was fully met, as monthly program meetings were consistently conducted to review key performance indicators and ensure alignment with 2024 CACREP standards. Documentation through meeting minutes demonstrates a systematic and organized approach to data collection and program oversight. A key strength is the regular and structured communication among faculty, which supports ongoing alignment and accountability. This strategy was effective and should be maintained.

Action

Gather additional data. Status: not started. The program will implement a standardized action-tracking system within monthly meeting minutes to document decisions, assign responsibilities, and verify completion of CACREP-related updates. In addition, the program will introduce a mid-year internal audit of key performance indicator alignment to ensure that CACREP standards are being consistently reflected in course-level data collection and reporting. These changes will strengthen accountability and improve the translation of meeting discussions into measurable program improvements.

Assessment Method 2: Faculty Review of CACREP Alignment — Met

Measure

All faculty will engage in a review of 2024 CACREP standard alignment with courses and align course material with standards. The review meeting will take place during the all-staff meeting in the summer before the start of the school year.

Target

One hundred percent of the program faculty will ensure syllabi key performance indicators align with 2024 CACREP standards. Faculty will consider current practice and mechanisms to ensure continuity of course expectations.

Evidence

- 2024 CACREP Standards, combined version.
- Table indicating how CACREP standards are measured by key performance indicators, 2024-2025 student assessments.

Analysis

The target for this method was fully attained, as all faculty ensured that course syllabi and key performance indicators aligned with 2024 CACREP standards. All eight CACREP core sections are represented through designated assignments, and student performance data is being systematically collected and analyzed. A key strength is the collaborative faculty review process conducted prior to the academic year, which ensured consistency and alignment across courses. This strategy was effective in

promoting accountability and maintaining curricular coherence and should be continued. A review of student performance data will be important to ensure that alignment not only exists in course design but also translates into strong student outcomes. Future efforts can focus on refining assessment measures and using data trends to further strengthen program effectiveness.

Action

Adopt or expand technologies. Status: not started. Periodic updates to course materials will help sustain alignment and support continuous program improvement. Key performance indicator assignments will be refined as needed to ensure they remain rigorous and meaningful.

Conclusion

The desired results for this outcome were fully attained across all assessment methods, indicating that the Counseling and Development Program's curriculum is clearly aligned with the 2024 CACREP standards. All measures demonstrated successful implementation of CACREP-aligned key performance indicators and consistent faculty engagement in alignment processes. A key strength is the structured and collaborative approach to curriculum alignment, including regular faculty review, documented program meetings, and integration of CACREP standards across all eight core areas. These strategies have been effective in maintaining consistency and ensuring accountability.

Program Outcome 2 — Partially met

The CSDV program will increase program enrollment by enrolling a new cohort of 27 and an online cohort of 30.

Assessment Method 1: Admission Numbers by Cohort — Partially met

Measure

Admission numbers by cohort. Method type: direct, number of applications.

Target

The Counseling and Development Program will admit a full cohort of 25 students each summer, limited by CACREP capacity.

Evidence

- Applicant information.
- List of on-the-ground 2025 student identification numbers.
- List of RisePoint 2025 student identification numbers.

Results

Current enrollment data shows 25 RisePoint online students and 23 on-the-ground in-person students, for a total of 48 enrolled students.

Table 14. Enrollment by delivery modality against target, 2025 admission cycle

Delivery modality	Students enrolled	Target
RisePoint (online)	25	30
On the ground (in person)	23	27
Total	48	57

Analysis

The Counseling and Development (MEd) program aimed to admit a full cohort of 25 students each summer, consistent with CACREP capacity limits. While admission targets were partially met, enrollment did not fully reach the intended cohort size, indicating a shortfall relative to program expectations. Total enrollment reflects a strong overall level but a distribution that exceeds the stated cohort cap when combined across modalities. This outcome suggests that while interest in the program remains strong, clarification of cohort definitions and enrollment targets across delivery formats may be needed, along with continued attention to recruitment and yield management strategies to ensure alignment with CACREP-guided capacity expectations.

Action

Community partnership. Status: not started. Areas for improvement include enhancing recruitment efforts to meet enrollment targets more consistently and further strengthening proactive retention interventions to ensure sustained or improved completion rates.

Assessment Method 2: Retention to Graduation — Partially met**Measure**

Retain admitted cohorts to graduation at a 96 percent rate.

Target

The Counseling and Development Program will retain all admitted students from 2024-25. Students are carefully screened prior to admittance to the program, so it is expected they will persist and succeed.

Evidence

- 2025 interview rubric template and 2025 interview rating sheet showing applicant rubric ratings and acceptance decisions.
- Admission orientation presentation and admission overview for CSDV 2025.
- Lists of on-the-ground and RisePoint 2025 student identification numbers.

Results

The retention target of 96 percent applied to the admitted cohort of 23 students, requiring at least 22 students to persist through graduation. Enrollment yield fell short of the projected 27 admitted students.

Table 15. Retention target for the admitted on-the-ground cohort

Metric	Value
Cohort size	23 students
Retention target rate	96%
Students who must persist to meet target	22

Analysis

While the program is still in progress, current expectations indicate that the target is achievable due to historically strong retention patterns and the program's selective admissions process, which contributes to student preparedness and success. Key strengths include close faculty mentoring, individualized advising, and a cohort-based learning structure that supports student engagement and persistence. These strategies have historically been effective and continue to support retention; however, formal early-alert systems and more consistent tracking of at-risk students could be strengthened. Compared to prior years, retention performance remains stable and aligned with historical outcomes near the 96 percent benchmark, although enrollment yield fell short of the projection.

Action

Community partnership. Status: not started. Areas for improvement include enhancing recruitment efforts to meet enrollment targets more consistently and further strengthening proactive retention interventions to ensure sustained or improved completion rates.

Conclusion

The Counseling and Development (MEd) program partially attained its enrollment outcome across assessment measures. While the program targeted a CACREP-aligned cohort of 25 students per summer, current data show a total enrollment of 48 students, including 25 RisePoint online and 23 on-the-ground students. This reflects strong overall demand but indicates some misalignment with defined cohort targets and enrollment structure. Key strengths include sustained interest in both delivery formats and successful recruitment across multiple modalities, resulting in strong total enrollment. These strengths can be further supported by more coordinated recruitment and clearer alignment of cohort targets across online and on-ground programs. Compared to historical performance, enrollment remains strong and consistent, though planning and yield management could be improved. Areas for improvement include better alignment of enrollment targets with actual cohort composition and strengthened tracking and coordination across program modalities.

Program Outcome 3 — Partially met

The program will better disseminate outcome data, program improvements, and expectations to all stakeholders by: first, formalizing training for adjunct and non-core faculty and supervisors with clear procedures and documentation; second, providing training and professional

development opportunities for site supervisors and community partners; third, ensuring assessment data is disseminated to all stakeholders; and fourth, improving advisory committee membership and attendance to provide more opportunities for feedback for programmatic changes.

Assessment Method 1: Adjunct and Non-Core Faculty Training — Partially met

Measure

During onboarding, all adjuncts and non-core CSDV faculty will complete formalized training and sign an attestation that they have completed training.

Target

One hundred percent of adjunct and non-core faculty will be in compliance with CACREP standards and complete formalized training.

Evidence

- Adjunct Faculty Manual, Counseling and Development Program, Academic Year 2025-2026.
- Blackboard CSDV Adjunct Faculty Resources.
- Screenshot of the adjunct affirmation of training attestation form. Text alternative: the image shows the signed attestation form adjunct faculty complete to confirm they have finished required onboarding training.
- Screenshot of the email reminder sent to adjunct faculty. Text alternative: the image shows an email message reminding adjunct faculty to complete their required onboarding training.

Results

Four of seven adjunct and non-core faculty, or 57 percent, completed the required onboarding and formalized training. Three of seven, or 43 percent, had not completed it at the time of reporting. The target of 100 percent was therefore not reached.

Table 16. Adjunct and non-core faculty completion of required onboarding training

Completion status	Faculty	Share of total
Completed training	4	57%
Not yet completed	3	43%
Total adjunct and non-core faculty	7	100%

Analysis

The target was partially met. The development of the Adjunct Faculty Manual and the CSDV Adjunct Faculty Resources in Blackboard reflects a strong commitment to structured support and clear communication of program expectations. A key strength is the implementation of standardized onboarding materials and documentation, which ensures consistency and accountability across faculty.

Actions

Implement new program or services. Status: not started. Email reminders to adjunct faculty at several points through the semester to ensure full completion.

Gather additional data. Status: not started. The program will continue to survey adjuncts' opinions on the formalized training process and on the Adjunct Faculty Manual and Blackboard resources to determine effectiveness.

Assessment Method 2: Site Supervisor Training — Met

Measure

At the beginning of CSDV 610B, site supervisors will complete training and professional development and attest that they have completed it.

Target

Supervision training will be provided to all supervisors through Supervision Assist. Two new professional development opportunities will be provided.

Evidence

- Supervisor Orientation presentation.
- Table of supervisor attestation and training records.

Analysis

The target was fully met, as all site supervisors completed the required supervision training through Supervision Assist and participated in the provided professional development opportunities. This indicates successful dissemination of expectations and effective engagement with supervisors. A key strength is the structured training and attestation process, which ensured accountability and consistent preparation of site supervisors. This strategy was effective and should be continued.

Action

Additional training. Status: not started. The program will continue requiring supervision training and attestation for all site supervisors. It will also update and expand professional development opportunities to reflect best practices. Additionally, the program will gather feedback from stakeholders to improve training quality and ensure ongoing effectiveness.

Assessment Method 3: Public Posting and Email Distribution of Assessment Data — Met

Measure and target

Assessment data will be posted publicly and provided to stakeholders through email, ensuring assessment data is disseminated to all stakeholders.

Evidence

- 2024-25 Continuous Improvement Report.
- April 2025 advisory meeting agenda and minutes.

- Screenshot of the welcome email sent to advisory board members. Text alternative: the image shows an email welcoming advisory board members and introducing the committee's purpose.

Analysis

The target for this assessment method was partially met. Assessment data was successfully discussed with stakeholders during the advisory committee meeting, demonstrating that dissemination is occurring and that stakeholders are being engaged in meaningful dialogue around program outcomes. However, the intended method of distributing data via email was not carried out as planned, indicating a gap between the established procedure and its implementation. A strength of this cycle is that the conversation around assessment data did take place, suggesting that stakeholder engagement is valued and active within the program. The area for improvement is formalizing the email dissemination process to ensure that data reaches all stakeholders in a documented, consistent, and accessible manner, particularly those who may not have been present at the meeting. Going forward, the program should establish a clear protocol and timeline for distributing assessment reports electronically following each advisory committee meeting to ensure full compliance with the dissemination target in the next cycle.

Status to reconcile before submission

This method is labeled Met in the source report, while the analysis states the target was partially met. The label and the narrative should be brought into agreement.

Action

Revise benchmark and target. Status: not started. Distribute data via email or in the meeting.

Assessment Method 4: Advisory Committee Feedback — Met

Measure

During annual advisory committee membership, include discussion of opportunities for feedback for programmatic changes.

Target

As required by CACREP, advisory committee involvement will be documented for program improvements.

Evidence

- April 2025 advisory meeting agenda and minutes.

Analysis

The target for this assessment method was met. Assessment data was successfully discussed with stakeholders during the advisory committee meeting, demonstrating that dissemination is occurring and that stakeholders are being engaged in meaningful dialogue around program outcomes.

Action

Gather additional data. Status: not started. Collect a more formalized survey to gather quantitative data from stakeholders.

Conclusion

The desired results for Program Outcome 3 were largely attained across all four assessment methods, with three methods fully met and one partially met. This overall pattern reflects meaningful progress in the program's efforts to better disseminate outcome data and engage stakeholders across multiple channels and constituencies. A notable strength is the breadth of dissemination activity occurring across different stakeholder groups, suggesting that the program has established a functional infrastructure for communication and engagement. The one partially met method highlights that consistency in following established dissemination procedures, particularly formal email distribution of assessment data, remains an area for improvement. Actions already identified across the four methods, including additional training, implementing new services, gathering additional data, and revising benchmarks, collectively reflect a data-informed and multifaceted approach to strengthening Program Outcome 3. Going forward, the program should prioritize formalizing and documenting dissemination procedures to ensure all targets are fully met and that stakeholder engagement is both consistent and verifiable across future assessment cycles.