



AAQEP Annual Report for 2021

Provider/Program Name: Utah State University School Counselor Education Program

End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or "n/a" if not yet accredited): June 30, 2026

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

This overview describes the mission and context of the educator preparation provider and the programs encompassed in its AAQEP review.

Utah State University is Utah's land-grant and space-grant institution, with a main campus in Logan, Utah, and several regional campuses. Its Carnegie classification is RU/H, a research university with high research activity. In 1927, Utah State University started a school of education.

The Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services offers preparation programs for prospective teachers, school counselors, and administrators and supervisors in education. It also provides preparation for professionals in human services areas and corporate settings. The Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services is the largest college at Utah State University with 5,590 students (2021). The College is comprised of seven departments: Communicative Disorders and Deaf Education, Human Development and Family Studies, Kinesiology and Health Science, Instructional Technology and Learning Sciences, Psychology, the School of Teacher Education and Leadership, and Special Education and Rehabilitation. The Professional School Counselor Education Program is housed in USU's Department of Psychology. The department graduates

about 130 bachelor's-level and an additional 50 – 60 graduate students across their MEd, EDS, and PhD programs each year. The Psychology Department offers nine graduate programs: MEd: Professional School Counselor Education, EDS: School Psychology, and PhDs in the following areas: Behavior Analysis, Brain and Cognition, Combined Clinical/Counseling/School, Combined Clinical/Counseling, Neuroscience, Quantitative Psychology, and Socio-behavioral Epidemiology.

USU's master's degree program in Professional School Counselor Education was offered exclusively as an on-campus program until 1997. At that time, the Utah State Board of Education recognized the critical shortage of school counselors in rural areas in Utah. USU's Psychology department faculty adjusted the on-campus School Counseling program to facilitate a part-time, evening design offered using two formats in alternating years. The two formats work this way: 1) In odd-numbered years the program utilizes the Utah Educational Network (UEN), featuring a live, two-way, interactive video broadcast to 12 – 16 sites (selection of sites varies from year to year based upon students' locations) across the state of Utah; 2) In even-numbered years the program is offered in Kaysville, Utah, utilizing face-to-face instructorship. Instructors and curriculum are the same for the two formats.

Through the cooperative efforts of USU's Departments of Psychology and Regional Campus and Distance Education (RCDE), the program has been offered each year since that time to students in both urban and rural areas across the State. Graduates of the program are working as school counselors in public and private schools in at least two-thirds of Utah school districts. USU's Professional School Counselor Education Program has achieved the vision of having professional school counselors available to serve the needs of Utah's children and youth located across the state of Utah. Students across the state are able to apply to the program through the Interactive Video Broadcast (IVC) or in-person face-to-face cohort that is out of the Kaysville extension center. Students who live near the Logan and Cache county area are able to be a part of the program as RCDE students who attend classes utilizing a face-to-face format with most of the instructors throughout their program.

Covid has required us to work with a hybrid format where broadcast cohort students were allowed to utilize the Zoom platform during the Fall 2020, and Spring, Summer, and Fall 2021 semesters. USU is asking that all courses return to instruction as usual starting in the Spring of 2022.

Public Posting URL

Part I of this report is posted at the following web address (accredited members of AAQEP must post at least Part I):

<https://cehs.usu.edu/about/annual-report-school-counseling>

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows enrollment and completion data from the most recently completed academic year for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2020-2021

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution/organization	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates currently enrolled	Number of Completers in 2020-21
Master of Education	Utah Associate Educator License Utah Professional Educator License	177	39
	TOTALS:	177	39

Added or Discontinued Programs

Any programs within the AAQEP review that have been added or discontinued within the past year are listed below. (This list is required only from providers with accredited programs.)

N/A

3. Program Performance Indicators

The program performance information in Table 2 applies to the academic year indicated in Table 1.

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

1. Total enrollment in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.				
Number of Students by Cohort				
Entry Year	2015	2016	2017	
Completion Year	2018	2019	2020	
Location/Format	Statewide/Broadcast	Kaysville/Face-to-Face	Statewide/Broadcast	
Number of Students	58	36	60***	
*In 2018, a member from the 2015 cohort took a Leave of Absence. The student returned to the program and graduated in 2020. The student is included here.				
**At the request of the Utah State Office of Education, during the 2019-2020 academic year USU allowed two transfer students from Argosy University to complete their training at USU. Their data is included on this table.				
2. Total number of unique completers (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.				
Graduation Rate Information				
2018 Completion Year Graduation Rate				
Initial Enrollment	Students Graduated	Student Taking Leave of Absence	Students Withdrawn	Graduation Rate
64	58	3*	3	90.63%
*In 2018, a member from the 2015 cohort took a Leave of Absence. The student returned to the program and graduated in 2020. The student is included here.				
2019 Completion Year Graduation Rate				
Initial Enrollment	Students Graduated	Student Taking Leave of Absence	Students Withdrawn	Graduation Rate
37	36	1	0	97.30%

2020 Completion Year Graduation Rate				
Initial Enrollment	Students Graduated	Student Taking Leave of Absence	Students Withdrawn	Graduation Rate
62	60***	1	4	96.77%***
*In 2018, a member from the 2015 cohort took a Leave of Absence. The student returned to the program and graduated in 2020. The student is included here. **At the request of the Utah State Office of Education, during the 2019-2020 academic year USU allowed two transfer students from Argosy University to complete their training at USU. Their data is included on this table.				
3. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.				
Entry Year Completion Year	2015 2018	2016 2019	2017 2020	
Location/Format	Statewide/Broadcast	Face-to-Face/Kaysville	Statewide/Broadcast	
Number of Completers	58	36	60	
4. Cohort completion rates for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program's expected timeframe and in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.				
Completion Year	Number of students graduated in fall term (2.5 years)	Number of students graduated in spring term (3 years)	Number of students graduated in summer term (3.25 years)	Number of students graduated in fall term (3.5 years)
2018	44	13	0	1
2019	29	7	0	0
2020	44	15***	1	0
*In 2018, a member from the 2015 cohort took a Leave of Absence. The student returned to the program and graduated in 2020. The student is included here. **At the request of the Utah State Office of Education, during the 2019-2020 academic year USU allowed two transfer students from Argosy University to complete their training at USU. Their data is included on this table.				
5. Summary of state license examination results , including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.				
The Praxis School Counselor II Exam is a graduation requirement for all students. Students must take and pass the exam at or above the Utah cutoff score which is 164. Taking and passing the Praxis is also required for students to earn their Utah Professional Educator License upon graduation. All students send a copy of their official score report and it is saved in each				

student file. Subtest and overall scores are recorded. Data analysis on the Praxis results is done each year. One hundred percent of the completers in this data cycle passed the Praxis School Counselor II Exam.

Professional School Counselor Praxis II Scores

Entry Year Completion Year	2015 2018	2016 2019	2017 2020	Combined
	Mean = 173.95 Range: 164 - 187 SD = 5.511 N = 58	Mean = 177.47 Range: 166 - 190 SD = 6.566 N = 36	Mean = 175.80 Range: 164 - 192 SD = 6.10 N = 60	Mean = 175.49 Range: 164 - 192 SD = 5.99 N = 154
Qualifying Score Rate	100%	100%	100%	100%

6. Narrative explanation of **evidence available from program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

The Completer (Graduate) Survey is distributed to program completers every year to gather feedback and assess how well graduates feel the program prepared them for employment. The survey, consisting of demographic and quantitative items, as well as open-ended questions was distributed to 419 past graduates. Two reminder emails were sent to potential respondents to encourage their participation. A total of 190 completers responded to the survey (45.34% response rate). The response rate almost doubled from our 23.24% response rate in 2019. Completers were asked to complete a variety of rating items using a 5-point scale where 1 = *Poor* and 5 = *Excellent*. The means for all items exceeded 3.97.

Based on the findings from our Self Study and from our 2020 Annual Report, the accreditation writing committee included new items on our Completer Survey that was launched in spring 2021. We included questions to address completers engaging in local school and community cultural endeavors and events, professional development opportunities, effectiveness of program training to collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning, and how well the program supports completers after graduation. Findings indicate completers are doing well in these areas and feel comfortable with the support they continue to receive post-graduation. We found that 75.26% of our completers are engaging in local school and community cultural endeavors and events. The mean for the question “How well did the program prepare you to collaborate with other colleagues to support professional learning” is a 4.18. We found that 95.26% of completers continue to engage in professional development opportunities. Completers are participating in district level trainings, state-level trainings and conferences, ASCA sponsored webinars and trainings, and the ASCA Annual Conference. We found that 97.81% of completers feel they have support from the program now that they have graduated. An open-ended question was included to inquire what ways the program can support the completers post-graduation. We will be analyzing the feedback and finding ways to implement additional support.

A committee is organized and has been meeting during the fall 2021 semester to analyze the completer survey results and to continue improving program instruction and support.

Please visit the link below to find a complete analysis of the survey results and a copy of the Graduate Survey.

[Graduate Survey Results](#)

7. Narrative explanation of **evidence available from employers of program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

The Employer Survey is distributed to employers every year to assess how well they feel the program prepared their employee in all areas of school counseling. Spring 2021 was the second year the survey was sent directly to employers. The survey was sent to 281 employers. We received 69 responses for a response rate of 24.56%. They were informed that the purpose of the survey was to collect feedback from the employer on the completer's performance and the USU Professional School Counselor Education program. Employers were asked to complete a variety of rating items using a 5-point scale where 1 = *Poor* and 5 = *Excellent*. The question "overall performance as a school counselor while under your supervision" had a mean of 4.57.

The accreditation writing committee added two new questions to the Employer Survey to address findings from our Self Study and 2020 Annual Report. The questions that were added surveyed the employer regarding the completers capacity to collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning and the completer engaging in local school and community cultural endeavors and events. Findings from these two new questions show that completers are performing well in these areas. The mean for the question "Demonstrates capacity to collaborate with colleagues to support ongoing professional learning" is a 4.47. The mean for the question "Engages in local school and community cultural endeavors and events" is a 4.43.

A committee is organized and has been meeting during the fall 2021 semester to analyze the employer survey results and to continue improving program instruction and support.

Please visit the link below to find a complete analysis of the survey results and a copy of the Employer Survey.

[Employer Survey Results](#)

8. Narrative explanation of how the program investigates **employment rates for program completers**, with a characterization of findings. This section may also indicate rates of completers' ongoing education, e.g., graduate study.

The USU Professional School Counselor Education program tracks the employment rate one-year post-graduation. We do this by surveying the completers, utilizing the Licensing Coordinator in the USU College of Education, and tracking current assignments for completers in the Utah State Board of Education Teacher Verification website. The tables below show where our completers were hired one-year post-graduation. Eighty four percent of our 2018 completers were hired in elementary, secondary, or K-12

school counselor positions. Ninety four percent of our 2019 completers were hired in elementary and secondary school counselor positions. Eighty eight percent of our 2020 completers were hired in secondary and elementary school counselor positions. 3% of the 2020 completers are unknown and do not have a current licensed position according to the Utah State Board of Education Teacher Verification website. Emails to these students have not been returned. We will continue to evaluate the most effective approach to tracking employment rates of our completers.

2018 Completion Year – Hire Information 1 Year Post Graduation								
Secondary Counselor	Elementary Counselor	Further Education	Combined Counselor	Post-Secondary Advisement	Other Licensed Educator	Non-Education Setting	Unemployed by Choice	Total
63%	12%	2%	9%	3%	3%	3%	5%	100%

2019 Completion Year – Hire Information 1 Year Post Graduation			
Secondary Counselor	Elementary Counselor	Other Licensed Educator	Total
66%	28%	3%	100%

2020 Completion Year – Hire Information 1 Year Post Graduation						
Secondary Counselor	Elementary Counselor	Post-Secondary	Other Licensed Educator	Unemployed by Choice	Unknown	Total
73%	15%	5%	2%	2%	3%	100%

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for successful performance and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

Table 3. Expectations and Performance on Standard 1: Candidate and Completer Performance

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Grades in coursework in courses pertaining to content and professional knowledge, developmental theories and applications, data literacy and the creation of inclusive school environments	Grades of B (3.0) or better	There were seven instances of a student earning a grade of less than B (3.0) during the period covered by this annual report (cohorts beginning in 2015, 2016, 2017). Five of those grades were earned by three students in the 2015 cohort, and two were earned by two students in the 2017 cohort. Of all students, 98.01% of students attained this goal. Of grades issued to students in these courses across the cohorts, over 99% of them met the criteria.
Praxis Scores	Passing score of 164 or greater	100% attainment X = 175.49, SD = 5.99, n = 154
Practicum Classroom Supervisor Evaluation Ratings pertaining to dispositions and behavior required for successful professional practice and content and professional knowledge	Score of 3 "Average" or better, using a 5-point Likert-type scale	In the 2015 cohort, two students earned a single rating of 2 (one student for level of understanding of school's comprehensive guidance program; the other for organization and succinctness of case conceptualizations/presentations); no students in the 2016 or 2017 earned scores of less than 3.

Practicum Evaluation Ratings	Score of 5 “Average” or better using a 9-point Likert-type scale across all domains for the 2015 cohort. For the 2016 and 2017 cohorts the Behaviorally Anchored Rating scale was used and included a 5-point Likert-type scale and thus scores of 3 “Average” or better were expected.	100% attainment
Internship Evaluation Ratings	Score of 3 “Average” or better using a 5-point Likert-type scale across all domains.	One student received two domain scores of less than 3. Thus, 99.4% of students reached this marker.

Table 4. Expectations and Performance on Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation
Practicum Classroom Supervisor Evaluation Ratings	Score of 3 “Average” or better using a 5-point Likert-type scale	100% attainment
Practicum Evaluation Ratings pertaining to working in a variety of contexts and growing as a professional, engaging with diverse communities, and creating an effective and responsive learning environment	Score of 5 “Average” or better using a 9-point Likert-type scale across all domains for the 2015 cohort. For the 2016 and 2017 cohorts the Behaviorally Anchored Rating scale was used and included a 5-point Likert-type scale and thus scores of 3 “Average” or better were expected.	100% attainment
Internship Evaluation Ratings pertaining to working in a variety of contexts and growing as a professional, engaging with diverse communities, and creating and effective and responsive learning environment	Score of 3 “Average” or better using a 5-point Likert-type scale across all domains	One student from the 2017 cohorts received two domain scores of less than 3, still more than 99% of students attained this goal.

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes recent program accomplishments, efforts to address challenges, current priorities, and innovations that are in plan or process.

Progress

Response to New Utah Legislation: Recognizing the steep increase in anxiety and depression in children and youth, the legislature of the State of Utah in 2018 and 2019 put into law legislation designed to hire mental health professionals, including school counselors, in elementary schools. This move by the legislature fulfilled an overarching goal that school counselors and aligned professionals in the state have had for decades, to provide school counseling services to students in Utah's elementary schools, in addition to secondary schools.

Challenge

While the legislation described above was extraordinarily positive for our profession and Utah's children, implementation created a challenge for our program, albeit a welcome one. Listed below are challenges associated with approval of the legislation.

1. The major challenge is for the three approved training programs in the state is to train enough school counselors to fill the open spots, in a state where a school counselor shortage already existed.
2. Elementary-level content and curriculum in our program had to be improved from a cursory overview employed in the past, to a level commensurate with the goal of preparing school counselors to be highly effective at the elementary school level.

USU's Professional School Counselor Education Program response included the following:

Challenge 1: We admitted additional qualified students to our program beginning with fall 2019. Cohort sizes are up 50 percent over what we have had in past years.

Challenge 2: Each instructor was required to integrate curriculum for serving elementary-age students via the Utah and national model into all classes.

Additional Progress: Please see Part II, Section 6, Table 5 Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

1. A leadership and advocacy committee was established to support the need to advocate for our students and address current events within program curriculum and courses to help guide our faculty with responding to these events across the state and country. This committee meets monthly.
2. The USU Professional School Counselor Education program sponsored Caitlin Ryan, from the Family Acceptance Project (San Francisco State University) to present to our current students, graduates, and professionals on the topic of support for Utah's LGBTQ youth. We are endeavoring to address issues of diversity and inclusion with our students, graduates, and stakeholders.

Accomplishments

Annual Report 2 – 2021

1. Appointment of a new director for the school counseling program was completed and our current director came on board in August 2021 as a tenure track faculty member. All responsibilities were transitioned to the new director during the fall 2021 semester.
2. Appointment of a program assistant was initiated and completed with the retirement of our prior program assistant in December 2021. The new appointment started part time in October 2021 and will be full time starting in January 2022.
3. The program brought on board a new statewide cohort in August 2021 with 61 students located at 16 sites across the state.
4. The program expanded recruitment endeavors for potential students. Procedures included utilizing the Zoom platform to reach candidates more broadly through a virtual open house event in the fall of 2021. Pre-event social media marketing started with Facebook and Instagram 14 days before the event. An email was then sent to superintendents and LEAs seven days before the event with an invitation to register for the open house. There was a total of 66 attendees out of 76 registrants for the open house. The event included the use of breakout rooms to allow participants to ask 1:1 questions with the graduate program coordinators following the event.

Innovation

Annual Report 2 – 2021

1. Supervisor evaluation documents of BARS have been in use for two years. These were piloted in 2018, where we now have a two-year analysis of the BARS rating in our data from the students starting in the 2016 and 2017 cohort years.
2. Continuation of trained teaching assistants has been successful and will continue to be utilized.
3. The program funded virtual participation in the annual American School Counselor Association Conference for 85 third-year students in the summer of 2021. These students began their on-site internships in schools one month later.
4. Graduate and employer surveys were revised and distributed to program graduates and employers, and the findings are being processed by a formal committee comprised of program faculty and staff. Results and suggestions will be incorporated into our 2022 annual report.

Priorities on our current agenda

1. Continue to deliver high quality curriculum to our students utilizing technology to address COVID-related adjustments. This includes continuing to support students with the IVC learning option during statewide broadcast course meeting times and supporting recording lectures and course content for those who miss instructional time.
2. Continuing to insure the safety and well-being of our students in both classroom and on-site practicum and internship assignments.

3. A peer mentoring program began in September 2021 and consists of a leadership committee that meets monthly to support feedback and growth for the peer mentoring program. A total of 26 first through third year students are in the program serving as mentees or mentors. The leadership committee will be meeting with the second and third year mentors in December to discuss outcomes, feedback, and areas of support needed moving forward for the spring semester. The committee will also work on creating a survey relating to effectiveness of the program to support change in the overall model. We will report on the findings in next year's annual report.
4. A search to support bringing on a term faculty appointment began in late November/early December 2021.
5. A survey to support feedback from supervisor evaluation documents has been in use for the past year relating to use of the new supervisor feedback form.
6. The practicum small group format and secondary supervisor recruitment process has been undergoing adjustment in the fall of 2021 and will be new for the spring 2022 practicum course. This includes the director posting an advertisement for possible facilitators and secondary supervisors through the USU career platform where the recruitment of supervisors targets those who have been in a school counseling position for at least five years and have experience supervising practicum or internship students. The groups will include 5-6 students per group which has increased from the 4 students that were previously in small groups for the practicum course. These changes are being implemented to bring the program in line with other graduate programs in the department, including hiring full-term core faculty. The new practicum model will reflect the alignment with other graduate programs in Psychology. Once we have additional full-term faculty in place, further review will take place. For now, the transition is also saving money.
7. Two diversity and equity trainings were implemented by the office of Diversity and Inclusion at USU during the fall 2021 semester due to requests from adjunct instructors within the leadership and advocacy meetings.

Part II: Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth

AAQEP does not require public posting of the information in Part II, but programs may post it at their discretion.

6. Self-Assessment and Continuous Growth and Improvement

This section charts ongoing growth and improvement processes in relation to each AAQEP standard.

Table 5. Provider Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement

Std .	Strengths, Needs, and Goals/Opportunities by Standard	Priorities to Be Addressed	Action Plan/ Steps to Be Taken	Steps Taken/ Outcomes (Reflection)
1	Strength	Beginning in 2017, the faculty reviewed places where program curriculum needed to change due to the release of four documents: The Praxis Crosswalk, the revised CACREP standards, the ASCA training standards, and the New Utah Model. Based on updates in the four documents, we assigned new learning objectives to each course and instructors, and incorporated the new objectives into course curriculum, activities, and evaluations. We also changed the sequence of courses, and added a new course.	Curriculum was updated to reflect The Praxis Crosswalk, the revised CACREP standards (2016), the ASCA training standards.	See section 3.6 Narrative explanation of evidence available from program completers and 3.7 Narrative explanation of evidence available from employers of program completers. Review of ratings and comments of graduates and employers on surveys informed us that the curriculum changes we implemented prepared our students to perform effectively upon graduation.

	Need	We need to continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions above in aligning learning objectives and curricula with the updated standards developed by the organizations listed above.			
	Goal	Evaluate the effectiveness of our interventions.	Instructors must add curriculum designed to train our students to effectively engage in elementary school level school counseling.	Using an ongoing process over the next three – five years, we will review the measures we identified to assess the effectiveness of our curriculum revisions.	This goal is ongoing. We continue to record and analyze Praxis data for program completers. This is done every year. The Employer and Graduate surveys were updated in spring 2019 with program faculty members and stakeholders. Practicum and Internship Evaluation data has been collected and will be analyzed to determine efficacy.
2	Strength	Every year the program sends out an Employer survey to evaluate program effectiveness.			The survey was distributed, including new items to reflect the annual report. The surveys were presented to our program faculty during our 2 nd fall

					meeting and were analyzed by our committee.
	Need	Increase survey response rate.			
	Goal	Increase response rate to 30%. While our response rate in 2021 has greatly improved, improvements are still needed. In 2022 we plan to implement an updated procedure that is informed by new processes available within the college.	Changing the method of delivering the survey is our priority. One instance of a new approach proved to be highly effective. Before changing the method of delivery we would receive around 20 responses. In 2019, we received 66 responses, and in 2021 we received 69 responses. Overall, changing the delivery method has increased our response rate	Before 2019, the program sent the Employer survey to graduates of the program and requested that they forward the survey to their employer. In June 2021, we sent the Employer survey directly to employers. This was the second year sending the surveys this way, increasing our response rate.	This ongoing goal uses the best method available to distribute our Employer and Graduate surveys for the highest response rate possible.
3	Strength	Graduate and Employer surveys are sent out each year to determine program effectiveness.			
	Need	Our need was to add questions that reflect the curriculum revision and revised national and state standards.			The faculty committee is currently reviewing the evidence to evaluate the effectiveness of our intervention to increase classroom management

					skills. Our Employer and Graduate surveys are being analyzed to determine progress in this area. Preliminary results and anecdotal evidence are positive. We are doing further analysis to disaggregate our data for final review.
	Goal	Revise the Employer and Graduate surveys	Create a committee comprised of program faculty, practicum and internship on-site supervisors and graduates to revise the Graduate and Employer surveys.	Pilot the surveys with program completers and employers.	A committee was created in May 2019, including the program director, advisor, faculty members and stakeholders. The surveys were revised prior to sending them out. Feedback was evaluated and new items were added to the survey to reflect curriculum revision and national and state training standards. The surveys were launched in June 2021. Results are being reviewed and found to be very

					positive. Preliminary results were presented to the faculty. Faculty will make adjustments in courses based on the overall findings. Results are being evaluated by a committee comprised of faculty and staff.
4	Strength	We include questions on our Practicum and Internship evaluations inquiring about the ability of our students' to effectively collaborate with colleagues.			
	Need	We want to be able to provide documentation of querying program completers and their employers regarding program completers' capacity to successfully collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning.			
	Goal	Find out if our completers and their employers are happy with the capacity of completers to collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning.	Add items to our Graduate and Employer surveys to collect information on this topic.	Assess the effectiveness of attaining responses that inform our question.	Revisions were made to the surveys prior to the annual launch of it in spring 2019. Evaluate feedback, make refinements to

					questions as deemed appropriate. Analysis is being done to review responses to our new items.
5	Strength	We include questions on our Practicum and Internship evaluations inquiring about our students' engagement in local school and community cultural endeavors and events.			
	Need	We do not have evidence that program completers engage in local school and community cultural endeavors and events, including with families/guardians/caregivers in diverse communities.			
	Goal	Obtain evidence for the skills listed in the need column.	We will develop questions to tap this information and add them to our Graduate and Employer surveys. Questions to obtain evidence of these skills were added to the surveys spring 2021.	Please see the narrative in table 3.6 and 3.7. Initial results have been gathered. A committee is currently reviewing and analyzing the results to assess the skill level and willingness of our completers to engage in local school and community cultural endeavors and events, including with	Please see the narrative in table 3.6 and 3.7. We will report our findings to faculty and other stakeholders and will include the continued findings in our next AAQEP annual report.

				families/guardians/caregivers in diverse communities.	
6	Strength	Informed by best practices for evaluating mental health practitioners in training, we implemented a Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale (BARS) system of assessment to our Practicum and Internship Supervisor Evaluations			
	Need	This new approach has not been piloted and evaluated for 1) supervisors' satisfaction with the BARS approach, and 2) the effectiveness of the instruments in evaluating practicum student and internship preparation.			
	Goal	Successfully pilot the evaluations and undertake analysis of their effectiveness on the two criteria listed in the need column directly above.	We piloted the BARS revised Internship Supervisor Evaluation fall semester 2018, using it as our evaluation document for our interns, who graduated in December 2018 or May 2019. We piloted the BARS revised Practicum Supervisor Evaluation spring 2019.	We have analyzed two cohorts of internship supervisor evaluation. The data analysis can be found on our website here: Data Analysis . We will analyze the data we receive from the supervisor evaluations and compare it against our identified measures for effectiveness,	We have collected data on the new Practicum and Intern Supervisor Evaluations. This goal is on-going. We continue to evaluate data from the Internship and Practicum evaluations each year to compare cohort years in our annual data cycle.

				namely: Congruence with Praxis scores, grades in the program, results of the two surveys compared to results from years prior to introducing the new BARS-approach surveys. We will consult with our statistician to see if we need to include other measures to evaluate effectiveness.	
7	Strength	We have improved our outreach to stakeholders to participate in program review.			
	Need	We do not have broad enough representation of stakeholders in assessing data collection, analysis, planning, improvements and innovation.			
	Goal	Create a larger stakeholder advisory body than we currently employ. The board will be comprised of representatives of program faculty, students, completers, practicum and internship supervisors, employers, the Psychology department, and Utah School	Identify individuals to serve on stakeholder advisory committee/board and invite their participation. Establish a meeting schedule and delivery system.	We will establish a board of stakeholders and develop a schedule for quarterly or semi-annual meetings to seek input from the board/committee members on needs.	Changes to the advisory board have been made. The board has been meeting twice each month. Currently, the board consists of program level staff and instructors. We plan to invite program students, representatives from

		Counselor Association (USCA).			the Utah State Board of Education and district-level school counseling specialists to join the board beginning in the fall of 2022.
8	Strength	The program director continues to send relevant information to program graduates.			
	Need	We do not have a method of assessing the effectiveness of numerous methods of completer support we engage in. It should be noted that some of these supports tie to aspects of the program in other silos. For example, we invite program completers to attend colloquia in classes of current students.			
	Goal	Develop a method of assessing the effectiveness of methods we use to support program completers.	Consider the following: Add questions to our Graduate survey, consult our newly developed stakeholder board, or create a focus group. Consider a multimodal approach composed of one or more of these options.	Once we have decided which of the methods of assessment is most salient and effective, implement the methods and review outcomes from the intervention.	The smooth transition of directors was our priority. We will establish a method of assessing the effectiveness of our support for program completers by the end of summer term 2022. We will respond to feedback by

			We added a question to the graduate survey in the spring 2021 “Do you feel you have support from the program now that you have graduated?” 183 graduates responded to the question. 97.81% responded that they are happy with the support they receive. 2.19% responded “I need greater support.” An opened-ended question was created to follow up with the question “What ways could the program support you now that you have graduated?”		continuing to engage in those practices deemed to be effective and discontinue those that are deemed to be ineffective or unnecessary.
9	Strength	We developed Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale (BARS) documents for our “Practicum Supervisor Evaluation” form and our “Internship Supervisor Evaluation” form. This is in keeping with best practices for evaluation. We have been using the new BARS evaluation for four years.			
	Need	Compare the outcomes of the old Likert format for gathering			

		data to our new BARS method using the BARS approach. We have been using the new BARS evaluation for three years.			
	Goal	We will do a study to evaluate the effectiveness of the new BARS method of evaluation using three years of data. This goal will be completed during the upcoming year. And will be reported in our annual report for 2022.	Consult with practicum and internship supervisors to gauge satisfaction with the BARS method of evaluation.	The Accreditation Writing Team will meet early in 2022 to decide on next steps for getting the evaluation underway.	

Overall Comments in Response to Evidence

Optional explanation or elaboration on the findings noted in the final column of Table 5.

--

7. Evidence Related to AAQEP-Identified Concerns or Conditions

This section documents how concerns or conditions that were noted in an accreditation decision are being addressed (indicate “n/a” if no concerns or conditions were noted).

A review of the “Counseling Quality Review Team Report Final” (see <https://cehs.usu.edu/about/annual-report-school-counseling>) confirms the only negative evidence or gap from our Self Study is the following, on page 18: The Program does operate with a relatively high level of non-tenure track faculty. However, the premise of this approach is that faculty are clinical practitioners, and their connection to the field, schools, and professional practice are invaluable to program, and contribute substantially to the effective training of candidates. The Program asserts that triangulated evidence of successful outcomes offers support for the current faculty configuration. In addition, in their Findings and Recommendations (See the table on Page 101 of the Self Study), the Program identifies faculty composition as a topic for continual inspection over the next two years, with the intention of adding up to two full-time additional faculty lines in the next two to five years. While the program asserts that the current model is effective, and provides evidence to support that assertion, the needs of the program may change in the coming years with the retirement of the previous director. Increasing faculty lines will also address the topic of parity within the Department of Psychology. The program commits to detailed reporting of progress and results regarding this aspect of continuing evaluation in annual reports, beginning with the first report.

An aligned item to the one above recognized the retirement of the program director in December 2021. The program commits to detailed reporting of progress in this endeavor in annual reports, beginning with the first report. Sufficient attention should be given to this position with regard to an effective succession plan and implementation strategies for the program.

Program Response and Progress Report:

The search for a new program director was successful. The new director, Dr. Jessica Koltz, was appointed as the current director in August 2021, where the past director, Camille Odell, will retire in December 2021. The search for a new full-time term faculty member was approved in November 2021 to support the search for additional full-time instructors within the program. Follow [this link](#) to review the ad for the term faculty position: [Lecturer - School Counselor Education in Logan, Utah | Careers at Logan Campus \(icims.com\)](#)

8. Anticipated Growth and Development

This section summarizes planned improvements, innovations, or anticipated new program developments, including description of any identified potential challenges or barriers.

Please see Section 5 in Part I

9. Regulatory Changes

This section notes new or anticipated regulatory requirements and the provider's response to those changes (indicate "n/a" if no changes have been made or are anticipated).

In July, 2020, the Utah State Board of Education implemented new licensure changes. Specifically, students who are in a training program are now eligible to receive an Associate Educator's License (AEL). Once the student has earned the MEd degree and been recommended for licensure from the training program, the student receives a Professional Educator License. The Professional School Counselor Education program has adapted to implement these changes from the state level, while still advocating for the integrity of the training needed for the students.

Pre-Service Collaborative. The USU Professional School Counselor Education program is a member of the Utah State Board of Education Pre-Service Collaborative. Meetings are held twice a year, in the spring and fall. The collaborative consists of the directors of the four school counselor training programs in the state, including a new training program which opened this fall at Utah Valley University.

New leadership for the collaborative was installed summer 2021 when Kim Herrera and Jeri Sagers stepped down. Their positions have been filled by Bethany Marker and Michelle Glaittli. Organizational changes at the Utah State Board of Education moved School Counseling programs under the Department of Prevention and At-Risk Programs. The move is a lateral one and should not impact the status of Professional School Counseling in the state. To review the placement of School Counseling, and other information regarding the state-level School Counseling program, please review the website located at [School Counseling Programs \(utah.gov\)](https://schools.utah.gov)

Grow Your Own Teacher and School Counselor Pipeline Program Grant. In February 2021 the Utah legislature appropriated funding for a pilot program designed to encourage qualified and interested Utahns to engage in training to be a teacher or school counselor in Utah's K-12 public schools. Funding is available through a competitive grant process to local education agencies (LEAs) to support students enrolled in approved training programs. USU's MEd program in Professional School Counselor

Education is an approved program. USU's program does not have a financial obligation to students, nor is the program obligated to admit students who qualify for funding by the grant. However, students who are admitted to USU's MEd program are able to participate in the Grow Your Own Teacher and School Counselor Pipeline Program Grant. The program is obligated to work with LEAs who receive funding. Detailed information about this grant is located via this link
<https://www.schools.utah.gov/prevention/schoolcounselingprograms/grantopportunities?mid=5474&tid=2>

10. Sign Off

Provider's Primary Contact for AAQEP (Name, Title)	Dean/Lead Administrator (Name, Title)
Jessica Koltz, Ph.D., Director	Sylvia Read, Ph.D., Associate Dean

Date sent to AAQEP: December 21, 2021