

Notes to reviewers: Please complete all information in brackets and shaded boxes before submitting this document.

A draft version of this report will be shared with the provider for factual corrections.

AAQEP Quality Review Team Report for Utah State University

Quality Review Team Members

Ray Francis, Professor, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant MI

Jennifer Hartman, Local Practitioner, Green Canyon High School,
Logan Utah

Linda McKee, Chief Operating Officer, AAQEP, Fairfax Station VA

Review Schedule

Off-Site Review Meeting: January 28, 2019, 6:30pm (EST)

Quality Assurance Review: February 12-13, 2019

Purpose and Scope of Review

The AAQEP Quality Review Team listed above conducted a review of the School Counseling Program put forward by Utah State University. The Team considered the case presented in the Quality Assurance Report by verifying the claims made in the report and by gathering additional relevant evidence to corroborate the claims.

Report Contents

1. Case Specification	Page 3
2. Summary of the Case	Page 3
3. Summary of the Evidence Examined	Page 5
4. Analysis of Evidence of Capacity by Standard	Page 6
5. Common Accreditation Indicators	Page 26
6. AAQEP Stakeholder Survey Results	Page 28
7. Conclusions and Recommendation	Page 29

1. Case Specification and Case Review History: *What accreditation status is this provider seeking, and what is the scope of the program being reviewed? Include specific state licenses or other relevant factors defining the program.*

Utah State University School Counseling Program is seeking full accreditation of 7 years through AAQEP. Program completers qualify for the License 1 in counseling through the state of Utah. The program is housed in Department of Psychology within the College of Education and Human Services.

2. Summary of the Case: The Summary of the Case is a concise statement of the Quality Review Team's understanding of the case being made by the provider that each AAQEP standard is met. Following an opportunity for the provider to review and correct the language, the summary shown below has been agreed to by both the Quality Review Team and the provider.

2.a. Provider profile: *Briefly describe the provider's context.*

The summary of the Case is: The School Counselor Program of Utah State University is currently seeking accreditation through AAQEP for 7 years. The program provides a variety of evidences for Program/Completer Performance, Professional Competence and Growth, Quality Program Practices, and Program Engagement in Systematic Improvement. The evidences provided included information related to reliability and validity of measures, overall explanations, and uses within the program. As a result of the information provided, the provided indicates it demonstrates that all standards are met through the evidence provided.

2.b. Program under consideration: *Briefly summarize the scope of the program seeking accreditation.*

USU School Counseling: The program is specifically designed to train individuals for school counseling positions in grades K-12 within public and private schools in elementary, middle, and high school settings. Graduates of the program also find placement in academic advisement centers located at public and private colleges and universities. Training is provided in the design and implementation of school-based, systemic counseling programs.

2.c. Evidence that AAQEP standards are met: *Describe the evidence on which the case is made and the related findings for each of the four standards. Indicate improvement or innovation goals and associated evidence.*

The Utah State University School Counseling Program presented data in support of Standards 1 and 2 from five main sources: 1) Praxis II Test scores in the area of Professional School Counseling 2) overall and course specific GPA; 3) rating items from the practicum Classroom Supervisor Evaluation; 4) identified domain scores and specific items from the Internship Supervisor Evaluation; and 5) selected items from the Employer Survey and Graduate Survey.

1. Praxis scores indicated that the vast majority of students pass the Praxis, as required for licensure in the state of Utah.
2. Overall and course specific GPAs showed consistent understanding of the program expectations, as aligned with state and national standards.
3. Internship Supervisor ratings, showed that the majority of candidates across the program were meeting or exceeding expectations in all areas.
4. Rating items from the practicum and Supervisor Evaluations indicated the program candidates were meeting or exceeding the program expectations, as aligned with state and national standards for school counseling.
5. Employer and Graduate Survey data showed that candidates are rated at high levels for the different aspects of Standards 1 and 2.

The program also provided appendices related to Standards 3 and 4 which address Program Practices. In Appendices A, B, C, D, and G, the program clearly outlined evidence to support the program's capacity to ensure a program of quality.

In the USU School Counseling Program report, the Conclusions and Findings exhibited the program's inherent intent toward Improvement goals as identified by the program stakeholders and faculty. Conclusions and suggestions for improvement that have been developed by the program include:

Address the question of whether our data suggest significant differences in performance based on which of the formats students are enrolled in; update the Graduate and Employer Surveys to reflect the new standards, and query if our students are performing to expectations in related skills and behaviors; 3) analyze data derived from the newly revised Practicum and Internship Supervisor Evaluations to determine if students in the experiential components of our program are performing with efficacy **(Standard 1)**;

Change our method of collecting surveys from employers; Create a committee comprised of program faculty, practicum and internship onsite supervisors and graduates to revise the Graduate and Employer Surveys **(Standard 2)**;

In-depth scrutiny of program curriculum by the entire faculty led to creation of a new course, revision of several existing courses, and updated learning objectives for all courses; We will pilot the newly developed Practicum Supervisor Evaluation spring 2019; Create a larger stakeholder advisory body than we currently employ **(Standard 3)**;

We will establish a method of assessing the effectiveness of our support for program completers by fall 2019; Generate options for replacing the current program director upon her retirement, and also decide if we should request additional tenure track lines for the Program. Seek input from the Psychology Department Head, Program steering and advisory committee and the entire School Counselor Education Program faculty, and the Dean of the EEJCEHS. Review and discuss options **(Standard 4)**.

(NOTE: These are only a sample of the table of Conclusions and Findings developed by the School Counseling Program for the Quality Assurance Report.)

3. Summary of Evidence Examined by the Quality Review Team: *The Quality Review Team bases the analysis that follows on examination of the following documents and evidence sources.*

- Reports of
- [list supplemental evidence gathered by the team]
- [list individuals and groups interviewed]
- [include results of third-party surveys]

Candidates complete a defined sequence of courses including:

PSY 6530 Developmental Psychology,
PSY 6330 Principles of Psych Measurement and Test Theory,
PSY 6460 Ethical Legal and Professional Issues in School Counseling,
PSY 6240 Comprehensive School Counseling Programs,
PSY 6350 Intro to Theories of Intervention in Psychology
PSY 6340 Consultation in the Schools
PSY 6260 Career Development,
PSY 6130 Evidence-Based Practice: School Interventions,
PSY 6290, Diversity issues in Treatment and Assessment
PSY 6420 Group Counseling in Schools,
PSY 6390 Program Evaluation in the Schools,
PSY 6580 – Collaborative Classroom Instruction, Leadership and Professional
PSY 6810 College and Career Readiness for School Counselors, &
PSY 6700 Grant Writing for School Counselors

Overall GPA related to content and pedagogy courses demonstrate a mastery perspective on material, content, and performance by candidates.

Learners, learning theory and appropriate content are appropriately described within course content and observable within expected assignments. This includes the identification, and

develop of positive learning environments.

Several courses include foundation principles of culturally responsive practice that includes course and field experiences.

Candidates are exposed to, develop, and interpret assessments related to appropriate content and conceptual principles.

Internship supervising ratings indicate candidate performance in social & cultural diversity, human growth & development, relationship building, and many other aspects of candidate performance are monitored and evaluated. The program identifies the evaluations as demonstrating a professional understanding by internship supervisors that candidates are performing appropriately in the areas of content, pedagogy, and professional knowledge in the area of school counseling. Data provided through raw scores and processed scores (ex Table 1.5) support performance in Standard 1.

4. Analysis of Evidence of Capacity by Standard

Standard 1: Candidate/Completer Performance

Completers perform as professional educators with the capacity to support success for all learners.

Candidates and completers exhibit the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of competent, caring, and effective professional educators. Successful candidate performance requires knowledge of learners, context, and content. Candidates demonstrate the ability to plan for and enact and/or support instruction and assessment that is differentiated and culturally responsive.

All six aspects of the standard (see table below) must be addressed in the evidence set.

Evidence must include multiple measures, multiple perspectives (program faculty, P-12 partners, program completers, graduates' employers), and direct measures of performance in program-appropriate field/clinical setting.

Evidence pertaining to aspects of Standard 1: *In the cells below, briefly describe the sampled evidence, observation, or data point that you have verified regarding each aspect of the standard.*

Guidance for Review Team Members in providing evidence and comments

Evidence of quality or capacity:

1. The program provides a variety of evidence related to this standards. These evidences include Praxis II Test scores in the area of Professional School Counseling, overall and course specific GPA Grades within the program, rating items from the practicum Classroom Supervisor Evaluation, identified domain scores and specific items from the Internship Supervisor Evaluation, and selected items from the Employer Survey and Graduate Survey.
2. Evidences provided were either triangulated on site through interviews and supporting documentation, or were reviewed and confirmed through the evidence room provided by the program.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

The program is consistently using collected data such as Praxis II Test Scores, supervisor evaluations, and graduate/employer surveys to make refinements to the program. In addition, these data are used by faculty to refine the delivery and content to meet the needs of students in the program.

Negative evidence or lack of evidence:

This box may be blank in some cases

Comment

This box may be blank in some cases

Evidence shows that, by the time of program completion, candidates exhibit knowledge, skills, and abilities of professional educators appropriate to their target credential or degree, including:

Aspect: Content Knowledge/Pedagogical Knowledge OR Professional Knowledge

Evidence of quality or capacity:

The program provides evidence in the form of course grades focused on the acquisition of content, pedagogy, and professional knowledge. In addition, candidate Praxis scores for the Professional School Counseling Program are provided. Other evidence includes the ratings from Internship Supervisors, Graduate Surveys, and intern surveys. In all cases the evidence demonstrates candidates who, by the time of program completion, effectively demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities of professionals. Evidence demonstrates an expectation of mastery, and course scores, grades, test performance, and supervisor rating align across the components of the program.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

One demonstrated example of innovation is the effective two-way communication between stakeholders and the program. Individuals work together well, receive information, and act in a manner reflective of partners in a system.

Negative evidence or gap:

NA

Comment:

Evidence shows that, by the time of program completion, candidates exhibit knowledge, skills, and abilities of professional educators appropriate to their target.

Aspect: Learners, learning theory (including social, emotional, academic); application of learning theory in practice

Evidence of quality or capacity:

The program provides reliable and valid evidence including grades in courses with a focus on social and emotional aspects of learning and practice. In addition the Practicum supervisor evaluation ratings and internship supervisor ratings

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

In recent years, syllabi for admitted cohorts reflect specific topics and assignments designed to demonstrate key ideas related to learning theory, including social, emotional, and academic aspects. In addition, supervisor evaluations in the practicum and internship connect, and align, with prior learning and expectations within the curriculum

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

As a program, candidates are consistently connected to ideas of learners and learning theory within coursework, internship, and practicum experiences. The program views the topic in a broad sense with key ideas relating to social, emotional, and academic perspectives included within and throughout the program.

Aspect: Culturally responsive practice, including intersectionality of race, ethnicity, class, gender identity & expression, sexual identity, and the impact of language acquisition and literacy development on learning

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Program evidence includes course syllabi, samples of candidate work, internship supervisor evaluations, and practicum supervisor evaluations. Within the aligned evaluations there are specific items related to intersectionality of race, ethnicity, class, gender identity & expression, sexual identity, and the impact of language acquisition and literacy development. These reliable and valid instruments include specific observations and evaluations across specific evaluations, identified course assignments and candidate projects, and aligned responses from employers and graduates.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

The data across multiple instruments demonstrate an aligned program with key elements of practice such as culturally responsive practice, including intersectionality of race, ethnicity, class, gender identity & expression, sexual identity, and the impact of language acquisition and literacy development on learning. Across the program, data and results are aligned with respect to the identified levels of mastery and performance.

Aspect: Assessment of/for learning; assessment and data literacy; use of data to inform practice; formative assessment

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Program evidence includes data from PSY 6130 Evidence-Based Practice: School Interventions (mean = 3.94) with an N = 119 and SD = 0.208. In addition, PSY 6390 Program Evaluation in the Schools (mean =3.94 on a 4.0 point scale) with an N = 119 and 0.141. Alignment of course data indicates an alignment of candidate performance at the level expected for candidates. In addition, Practicum Supervisor ratings of key items (7-1 & 9-2) aligned with the level of performance including 7-1 with an N=115 and a SD of 0.825, and 9-2 with an N = 105 and a SD = 0.903. In addition, mean ratings for Internship Supervisor Evaluation items ranged from 7.80 to 8.35. In all but one instance, no student received any rating on these items below a rating of Average. Based upon these ratings, it appears that internship supervisors rated candidate performance with more than adequate knowledge of data literacy and the use of data to inform practice.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

In the area of Assessment of/for learning; assessment and data literacy; use of data to inform practice; formative assessment, data across content courses aligned with field experience evaluations for the cohort data.

Aspect: Creation and development of positive learning and work environments

Evidence of quality or capacity:

The program provide a variety of course grade and performance data with respect to this aspect. These data include 3 cohort reports for PSY 6530-Developmental Psychology (Mean = 3.85 Range: 3.33 – 4.00 SD = 0.215 N = 119), PSY 6240 Comprehensive School Counseling Programs (Mean = 3.86 Range: 2.00 – 4.00 SD = 0.327 N = 118), PSY 6340 Consultation in the Schools (Mean = 4.00 Range: 4.00 – 4.00 SD = .000 N = 119), PSY 6290 Diversity Issues in Treatment & Assessment (Mean = 3.97 Range: 3.00 – 4.00 SD = 0.153 N = 119), PSY 6420 Group Counseling in Schools (Mean = 3.84 Range: 3.00 – 4.00 SD = 0.316, N = 119), and other courses. The program reported “The comparison of means for grades in courses for the various cohorts calculated using ANOVAs indicate only one course, PSY 6240 evidenced a difference among cohorts (F = 3.771. df = 3, p < 0.026), with the 2012 cohort performing statistically significantly better than the 2014 cohort. There were no other statistically significant differences observed across cohorts for any other courses.” In addition, Practicum Classroom Supervisor Evaluation Ratings for items such as 14. Ability to balance administration needs with needs of the student/child, 16. Respect accorded for school faculty, 17. Respect accorded to school Administration, and 19. Demonstration of being a team player at school site were relatively consistent with SDs ranging from 0.308 to 0.45 for N = 84 - 86. Data provided, and confirmed

that the cohorts were performing at a consistent level across all reported data and results. Similar results were confirmed for Tables 1.27 & 1.28 for Practicum Supervisors.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

Aspect: Dispositions and behaviors required for successful professional practice

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Program provides evidence related to candidate performance such as Practicum Supervisor Evaluations on 1. Diplomacy, tact in interactions with peers and supervisor during class, 3. Weekly preparation for class (completion of tasks and assignments), 6. Initiative, ability to work without prompting, 8. Openness to feedback, constructive criticism from peers, and 9. Openness to feedback, constructive criticism from supervisor. Typical ratings included Mean = 4.80 Range: 4.00 - 5.00 SD = 0.405 and N = 108. Similar findings are reported for the Practicum Supervisor Evaluation items (Table 1.31, and 1.32). Data were confirmed through sample calculations from raw data provided. In addition, Graduate surveys for the question "Please rate the degree to which you think the children/adolescents with who you work see you as caring about them." yielded results including Mean = 4.42 Range: 3.0 – 5.0 SD = 0.686 N = 73. Similar results were confirmed through review of Employer survey data.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

Data provided supports the self-study finding that candidates are well-prepared in the area of creation and development of positive learning and work environments.

To what degree does the evidence for the standard meet evidence expectations?

*Evidence must include multiple measures, multiple perspectives (program faculty, P-12 partners, program completers, graduates' employers), and direct measures of performance in program-appropriate field/clinical setting. Note that "multiple perspectives" are needed **across** the standard, not for each aspect of the standard.*

The evidence for the standard represents multiple perspectives across the standard and includes individuals such as stakeholders, P-12 partners, program completers, graduates, and employers. Both direct and indirect measures are evident within the evidence presented, and items related to reliability and validity are presented. Across all areas of the standard, the Program provides sufficient evidence to meet the evidence standard.

Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth

Program completers adapt to working in a variety of contexts and grow as professionals.

Program completers engage in professional practice in educational settings and show that they have the skills and abilities to do so in a variety of *additional* settings and community/cultural contexts. For example, candidates must have broad and general knowledge of the impact of culture and language on learning, yet they cannot, within the context of any given program, experience working with the entire diversity of student identities, or in all types of school environments. Candidate preparation includes first-hand professional experience accompanied by reflection that prepares candidates to engage effectively in different contexts they may encounter throughout their careers.

All six aspects of this standard (see table below) must be addressed in the evidence set for the standard.

Evidence for this standard will show both that program completers have engaged successfully in relevant professional practice and that they are equipped with strategies and reflective habits that will enable them to serve effectively in a variety of school placements and educational settings appropriate to the credential or degree sought.

Evidence pertaining to aspects of Standard 2: *In the cells below, briefly describe the sampled evidence, observation, or data point that you have verified regarding each aspect of the standard.*

Guidance for Review Team Members in providing evidence and comments

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Program data include evidence from the Practicum and Internship Student Evaluations and through passing grades for both the practicum and internship experiences. Additionally, students' professional competence and growth is assessed through qualitative comments provided by supervisors on the Practicum and Internship Student Evaluations.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

This box may be blank in some cases

Negative evidence or lack of evidence:

This box may be blank in some cases

Comment

In this space, reviewers briefly note observations relevant to the aspect that might be of interest to the Accreditation Commission (such as noting salutary or negative details regarding an aspect of the program's work) or to the provider (such as positive evaluations of the program shared in interviews in which provider representatives were not present). These comments should be brief and should illuminate or add relevant detail to the evidence related to the aspect.

This box may be blank in some cases

Evidence shows that completers have the capacity to:

Aspect: Understand and engage local school and cultural communities; communicate and foster relationships with diverse families/guardians/caregivers

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Candidates are placed in Title 1 schools to provide additional support, and learn about the professions. Samples of Practicum and Internship evidence demonstrate candidates - 2-3 Engages in social justice, advocacy, and conflict resolution (Mean = 8.15 Range: 5.0 – 9.0 SD = 0.895 N = 108), and 3-1 Demonstrates an understanding of the nature and needs of individuals and families across the lifespan (Mean = 8.04 Range: 5.0 – 9.0 SD = 1.226 N = 116). In addition, Table 2.2 includes evidence in the form of Internship Supervisor ratings such as 2-3 Engages in social justice, advocacy, and conflict resolution (Mean = 8.02 Range: 5.0 – 9.0 SD = 0.969 N = 116) and 3-1 Demonstrates an understanding of the nature and needs of individuals and families across the lifespan (Mean = 8.10 Range: 5.0 – 9.0 SD = 1.13 N = 117). In addition, this aspect is confirmed through candidate, faculty, and stakeholder reports from interviews during the visit.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Participation in VISTA and AmeriCorps provides practicum students and interns in unpaid positions with compensation.

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

The Program demonstrates Understand and engage local school and cultural communities; communicate and foster relationships with diverse families/guardians/caregivers through a variety of evidence gathered from multiple perspectives.

Aspect: Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and engage in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Practicum and Internship Supervisors Rate candidates on a number of items. Among the ratings, Practicum Supervisor items included 2-1 Awareness of own culture and its impact on counseling activities (Mean = 8.13 Range: 6.0 – 9.0 SD = 0.836 N = 117) and 2-2 Knowledge and application of theories of multicultural counseling (Mean = 8.01 Range: 5.0 – 9.0 SD = 0.986 N = 107). Internship Supervisor ratings included 2-3 Engages in social justice, advocacy, and conflict resolution (Mean = 8.02 Range: 5.0 – 9.0 SD = 0.969 N = 116), and 3-3 Recognizes different learning styles and is familiar with associated strategies for student success (Mean = 8.07 Range: 5.0 – 9.0 SD = 0.927 N = 117). Results were confirmed through sample calculations and affirmed through faculty, and stakeholder, interviews.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

The evidence provided supports the Program self-study that candidates “Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and engage in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts”

Aspect: Create productive learning environments and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in diverse contexts

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Practicum and Internship Supervisors Rate candidates on a number of items. Among the ratings, Practicum Supervisor items included 2-1 Awareness of own culture and its impact on counseling activities (Mean = 8.13 Range: 6.0 – 9.0 SD = 0.836 N = 117) and 2-2 Knowledge and application of theories of multicultural counseling (Mean = 8.01 Range: 5.0 – 9.0 SD = 0.986 N = 107). Internship Supervisor ratings included 2-3 Engages in social justice, advocacy, and conflict resolution (Mean = 8.02 Range: 5.0 – 9.0 SD = 0.969 N = 116), and 3-3 Recognizes different learning styles and is familiar with associated strategies for student success (Mean = 8.07 Range: 5.0 – 9.0 SD = 0.927 N = 117). Results were confirmed through sample calculations and affirmed through faculty, and stakeholder, interviews.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

Aspect: Support students' growth in international and global perspectives

Evidence of quality or capacity:

p48

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

Aspect: Establish goals for their own professional growth; engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection on their practice

Evidence of quality or capacity:

The program evidence relies Psychology 6290 - Diversity in School Counseling. In addition, relatively high performance ratings are supported by Employer Survey Ratings (Table 2.12), as well as Internship Supervisor ratings and Practicum Supervisor ratings. The relatively high performance ratings are supported by program faculty, stakeholders, and candidates.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

Overall the Program evidence supports the idea candidates learn multicultural and pluralistic characteristics within and among diverse groups nationally and internationally. Another objective of the course is to learn and put into practice theories and models of multicultural counseling, cultural identity development, and social justice and advocacy. Students also learn strategies for advocating for diverse clients' career and educational development and employment opportunities in a global economy.

Aspect: Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Program faculty, candidates, and stakeholders consistently shared ongoing examples of candidates collaborating with colleagues to support professional learning. This position is supported through Employer Survey results (Table 2.18).

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

P59 - Another way the program provides opportunities for students to collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning is through PSY 6370 - Practicum in School Counseling. The program hires Utah level-2 school counselors to be classroom facilitators, with ratios of one counselor to every 2 – 4 students. Students meet with their facilitator each week during the semester. Students bring case studies, questions and concerns to discuss with their facilitator. Classroom facilitators guide discussion and provide resources for the students.

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

Program faculty, stakeholders, employers, and candidates consistently referenced the level of communication and collaboration as a strength of the program. In addition, PSY 6370 serves as a model for effective collaboration and mentoring.

To what degree does the evidence for the standard meet evidence expectations?

*Evidence must include multiple measures, multiple perspectives (program faculty, P-12 partners, program completers, graduates' employers), and direct measures of performance in program-appropriate field/clinical setting. Note that "multiple perspectives" are needed **across** the standard, not for each aspect of the standard.*

The evidence for the standard represents multiple perspectives across the standard and includes individuals such as stakeholders, P-12 partners, program completers, graduates, and employers. Both direct and indirect measures are evident within the evidence presented, and items related to reliability and validity are presented. Across all areas of the standard, the Program provides sufficient evidence to meet the evidence standard.

Standard 3: Quality Program Practices

The program has the capacity to ensure that its completers meet Standards 1 and 2.

Preparation programs ensure that candidates, upon completion, are ready to engage in professional practice, to adapt to a variety of professional settings, and to grow throughout their careers. Effective program practices include: consistent offering of coherent curricula; high quality, diverse clinical experiences; dynamic, mutually-beneficial partnerships with stakeholders; and comprehensive and transparent quality assurance processes informed by trustworthy evidence. Each aspect of the program is appropriate to its context and to the credential or degree sought.

All six aspects of this standard (see table below) must be addressed in the evidence set for the standard.

Evidence related to this standard will include documentation of program practices and resources as well as the program's rationale for its structure and operation.

Note: Evidence related to Standards 3 and 4 will be found in the main body of the Quality Assurance Report and in the Appendices.

Appendix A: Candidate recruitment, selection, and monitoring (Standard 3)

Appendix B: Completer support and follow-up (Standard 4)

Appendix C: Capacity: faculty, resources, institutional commitment (Standard 3)

Appendix D: Internal Audit: describe/test internal quality controls (Standard 3)

Appendix E: Jurisdictional obligations specified in state agreement (IF ANY)

Appendix F: Missional commitments and distinct contributions (Standard 4)

Appendix G: Data quality: reliability, validity, fairness, trustworthiness (Standard 3)

Evidence pertaining to aspects of Standard 3: *In the cells below, briefly describe the sampled evidence, observation, or data point that you have verified regarding each aspect of the standard.*

Evidence shows that the program:
Aspect: Offers coherent curricula with clear expectations that are aligned with state and national standards, as applicable
Evidence of quality or capacity: Meeting minutes, reports, updated syllabi, and results of interviews with faculty and stakeholders confirm the current configuration of courses and experiences are aligned with expectations from organizations such as Praxis, ASCA, CACREP, Utah Standards for School Counselor Education Programs, and assessments/data sources are being established.
Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement: During the 2017 and 2018 academic year, program staff undertook a project to examine how the CACREP and ASCA standards align and in which courses the standards are addressed. Based upon the Praxis Crosswalk, ASCA, CACREP, and Utah Standards for School Counselor Education Programs, program staff examined and modified the learning objectives to ensure all standards/outcomes were being addressed.
Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

The Program has developed, and is delivering, a coherent curriculum with clear expectations that are aligned with state and national standards, as identified by Program faculty and leadership.

Aspect: Develops and implements quality clinical experiences, where appropriate, in the context of documented and effective partnerships with P-12 schools and districts

Evidence of quality or capacity:

The Program relies on 2 clinical experiences focused on K-12 schools, including Title 1 settings. Curriculum from courses, and confirmed by interviews of stakeholders, faculty, and candidates confirm the first experience, the Practicum Experience, is a combination of in-class (50 hrs) and school-based (150 hrs) completed in collaboration with, and mentored by, Utah Level 2 counselors. In addition, the Internship includes either single or multiple school placements made in collaboration between candidates and program faculty/staff. An additional indicator of the capacity of the program is the extent to which schools (administrator and school counselors) are willing to continue to place students in existing school sites. In addition, Graduate survey results support a high level of satisfaction (Table 3.1: mean = 4.07 on a 5.0 point scale). Support for the confirmation in this aspect is the Employer Survey results which also demonstrate a high level of satisfaction (Table 3.2: mean = 4.62 on a 5.0 point scale).

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

As a result of the ongoing Practicum and Internship, the Program consistently demonstrates ongoing 2-way communication and effective collaboration.

Negative evidence or gap:**Comment:**

As a result of the extensive school-based clinical experiences, the Program demonstrates the development and inclusion of quality clinical experiences.

Aspect: Engages multiple stakeholders, including completers, local educators, schools, and districts, in data collection, analysis, planning, improvement, and innovation

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Evidence provided by the Program provide a view of consistent and ongoing engagement by stakeholders including program faculty, school administrators, school counselors, graduates, etc. In addition, evidence confirms the engagement in processes such as data collection, planning, improvement, and innovation to meet the needs of program candidates.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:**Negative evidence or gap:****Comment:**

Evidence from existing surveys, curriculum, interviews, and testimonials confirm the Program engages multiple stakeholders, including completers, local educators, schools, and districts, in data collection, analysis, planning, improvement, and innovation efforts.

Aspect: Enacts admission and monitoring processes linked to candidate success as part of a quality assurance system aligned to state requirements and professional standards

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Related to admission, the Program requires a Bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, minimum 3.2 GPA. GRE or MAT score at the 40th percentile or above; B or better grades earned at an accredited institution in: Abnormal Psychology, Analysis of Behavior, and Statistics (2000-level or above), three letters of recommendation, and a Statement of Purpose. This practice is confirmed by faculty interviews, and student record profiles provided in Table 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6.

Related to monitoring, the Program maintains and monitors 2 specific checklists. The first is the non-experiential checklist, and the second is the experiential checklist. Both checklists are monitored to ensure candidates conform to existing expectations within the program (Table 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, and 3.10).

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

From the Program evidence reviewed, it was confirmed that the Program enacts admission and monitoring processes linked to candidate success as part of a quality assurance system aligned to state requirements and professional standards

Aspect: Engages in continuous improvement of programs and program components, and investigates opportunities for innovation, through an effective quality assurance system

Evidence of quality or capacity:

The evidence provided in Table 3.1 was confirmed through interviews with stakeholders, meeting minutes, and the review of curriculum documents. This includes revisions to outcomes, internship experiences, individual courses, grade policy, and the administration of the Praxis II exam,

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

The Program engages in continuous improvement of programs and program components, and investigates opportunities for innovation, through an effective quality assurance system

Aspect: Maintains capacity for quality reflected in staffing, resources, operational processes, and institutional commitment

Evidence of quality or capacity:

The program describes a variety of dimensions of the program including Program and Courses (Number of credits), Faculty (percentages at ranks; workload), Facilities (space & equipment provided), Fiscal and administrative (support dollars/faculty member), and other aspects. The

reported data were confirmed through published annual reports, institutional reports, departmental meeting minutes, faculty and stakeholder interviews, and interviews with leadership.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Negative evidence or gap:

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), the Program identifies faculty composition as a topic for inspection in the next two years, with the intention of adding up to 2.5 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, there is recognition that the phased retirement of the director in the next 3 – 4 years may change the needs of the Program. 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 recognizes the phased retirement of the program director in the next three to four years. 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.

Comment:

The Program maintains capacity for quality reflected in staffing, resources, operational processes, and institutional commitment that is sufficient to deliver a quality program.

To what degree does the evidence for the standard meet evidence expectations?

*Evidence must include multiple measures, multiple perspectives (program faculty, P-12 partners, program completers, graduates' employers), and direct measures of performance in program-appropriate field/clinical setting. Note that "multiple perspectives" are needed **across** the standard, not for each aspect of the standard.*

The evidence for the standard represents multiple perspectives across the standard and includes individuals such as stakeholders, P-12 partners, program completers, graduates, and employers. Both direct and indirect measures are evident within the evidence presented, and items related to reliability and validity are presented. Across all areas of the standard, the Program provides sufficient evidence to meet the evidence standard.

Standard 4: Program Engagement in System Improvement

Program practices strengthen the P-20 education system in light of local needs, in keeping with the program's mission.

The program is committed to and invests in strengthening and improving the education profession and the P-20 education system. Each program's context (or multiple contexts) provides particular opportunities to engage the field's shared challenges and to foster and support innovation. Engagement with critical issues is essential and must be contextualized. Sharing results of contextualized engagement and innovation support the field's collective effort to address education's most pressing challenges through improvement and innovation.

All six aspects of this standard (see table below) must be addressed in the evidence set for the standard.

Evidence for this standard addresses identified issues in light of local and institutional context.

Evidence pertaining to aspects of Standard 4: *In the cells below, briefly describe the sampled evidence, observation, or data point that you have verified regarding each aspect of the standard.*

Note: Evidence related to Standards 3 and 4 will be found in the main body of the Quality Assurance Report and in the Appendices.

Appendix A: Candidate recruitment, selection, and monitoring (Standard 3)

Appendix B: Completer support and follow-up (Standard 4)

Appendix C: Capacity: faculty, resources, institutional commitment (Standard 3)

Appendix D: Internal Audit: describe/test internal quality controls (Standard 3)

Appendix E: Jurisdictional obligations specified in state agreement (IF ANY)

Appendix F: Missional commitments and distinct contributions (Standard 4)

Appendix G: Data quality: reliability, validity, fairness, trustworthiness (Standard 3)

The program provides evidence that it:

Aspect: Engages with local partners and stakeholders to support high-need schools and participates in efforts to reduce disparities in educational outcomes

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Although the Program faculty engage with local partners in many ways, it is through the Practicum and Internship where local partners in high-need schools participate in efforts to reduce disparities in educational outcomes. Sampled curriculum, faculty interviews, interviews with practicum and internship supervisors, and administrators confirm the high level of engagement and support provided through the program.

There were some comments raised about the amount of data being collected from administrators (8% return rate) and the lack of alternative routes of collecting data.

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

Evidence confirms that the Program engages with local partners and stakeholders to support high-need schools and participates in efforts to reduce disparities in educational outcomes

Aspect: Seeks to meet state and local educator workforce needs and to diversify participation in the educator workforce through candidate recruitment and support

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Overall, the Program provides evidence reflecting an ongoing effort to recruit candidates representing a diverse population, and support those candidates throughout the program. In addition, data presented and confirmed demonstrates that the Program continues to work with completers to obtain employment, and that the employers of completers are satisfied with the quality of the completers (Table 4.8).

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

The Program sponsors professional development for program completers to assist completers in maintaining their skills following program completion.

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

The Program provides evidence, that was confirmed, that it seeks to meet state and local educator workforce needs and to diversify participation in the educator workforce through candidate recruitment and support.

Aspect: Supports completer entry into and/or continuation in their professional role, as appropriate to the credential or degree being earned

Evidence of quality or capacity:

Overall, the Program provides evidence reflecting an ongoing effort to recruit candidates representing a diverse population, and support those candidates throughout the program. In addition, data presented and confirmed demonstrates that the Program continues to work with completers to obtain employment, and that the employers of completers are satisfied with the quality of the completers (Table 4.8).

Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:

The Program sponsors professional development for program completers to assist completers in maintaining their skills following program completion.

Negative evidence or gap:

Comment:

The Program and institution supports completer entry into and/or continuation in their professional role, as appropriate to the credential or degree being earned.

Aspect: Investigates available, trustworthy evidence regarding completer placement, effectiveness, and retention in the profession; uses that information to improve programs

Evidence of quality or capacity:

The Program and institution provide evidence related to the placement and retention in the profession, and that information is used in the program review process. This evidence was

confirmed by interviews with institutional and program leaders, employers, and through communications with candidates.
Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:
Negative evidence or gap:
Comment: The Program investigates available, trustworthy evidence regarding completer placement, effectiveness, and retention in the profession, and uses that information to improve programs.
Aspect: Meets obligations and mandates established by the state, states, or jurisdiction within which it operates
Evidence of quality or capacity: The evidence provided in Table 3.1 was confirmed through interviews with stakeholders, meeting minutes, and the review of curriculum documents. This includes revisions to outcomes, internship experiences, individual courses, grade policy, and the administration of the Praxis II exam,
Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:
Negative evidence or gap:
Comment: Evidence shows that, by the time of program completion, candidates exhibit knowledge, skills, and abilities of professional educators appropriate to their target.
Aspect: Investigates its own effectiveness relative to its institutional and/or programmatic mission and commitments
Evidence of quality or capacity: The Program provides evidence related to all standards reflective of ongoing investigation of its own programmatic mission and commitments, and were confirmed through meeting minutes, and stakeholder interviews.
Evidence/examples of innovation or documented improvement:
Negative evidence or gap:
Comment: The Program provides evidence that it investigates its own effectiveness relative to its institutional and/or programmatic mission and commitments.

To what degree does the evidence for the standard meet evidence expectations?

Evidence must include multiple measures, multiple perspectives (program faculty, P-12 partners, program completers, graduates' employers), and direct measures of performance in

*program-appropriate field/clinical setting. Note that “multiple perspectives” are needed **across** the standard, not for each aspect of the standard.*

The evidence for the standard represents multiple perspectives across the standard and includes individuals such as stakeholders, P-12 partners, program completers, graduates, and employers. Both direct and indirect measures are evident within the evidence presented, and items related to reliability and validity are presented. Across all areas of the standard, the Program provides sufficient evidence to meet the evidence standard.

Appendix E: *For State Reviewer use only.*

E: Jurisdictional obligations met (only those that are specified in a state agreement)

Comments

NA

5. Common Accreditation Indicators

The following items are checked for every provider by the Quality Review Team. Notes can be brief, but should indicate clearly the source of the information.

Indicator	QRT Findings
<p>Curriculum—Program Authorization: Programs leading to certification or licensure for professional educators are in good standing with state or jurisdiction.</p>	<p>https://www.schools.utah.gov/file/5ff1f145-c2c4-4fe5-b8bc-61c744a27f51</p>
<p>Curriculum: Program curricula are aligned with state and/or national standards.</p>	<p>Utah School Standards matrix - https://www.schools.utah.gov/file/4d373a7e-808b-41a8-8e85-2ed8d30d62d3</p>
<p>Faculty: Full-time faculty teaching in the program, selected at random, have appropriate degrees and experience for assignments.</p>	<p>Appendix C</p>
<p>Faculty: Part-time faculty teaching in the program, selected at random, have appropriate degrees and experience for assignments.</p>	<p>Appendix C</p>
<p>Facilities: The space and other facilities assigned to the preparation program(s) are adequate.</p>	<p>Appendix C</p>
<p>Fiscal: Auditor’s statement or regional accreditor finds the provider or its host institution or entity to be financially sound.</p>	<p>The institution is backed by the full faith and credit of the state of Utah as noted: USU’s bond rating to be AA from the S&P https://higheredutah.org/pdf/agendas/20180720/TAB L 2018-7-20.pdf. Supporting documentation was presented.</p>
<p>Public Comment Results: Indicate the number and balance (positive or negative) of public comments received and any provider response(s).</p>	<p>A total of 20 of 22 comments were positive comments representing a diverse set of stakeholders.</p>
<p>Student Feedback: Candidates have opportunity to give feedback on courses and program (as in through course evaluations).</p>	<p>Confirmed in candidate interviews.</p>
<p>Student Complaints/Concerns: Candidates have opportunity to express complaints or concerns. QRT reviews files of any recent grievances (3 yrs)</p>	<p>Internal audit Table D1</p>

<p>Student Support Services: Student support services meet candidate needs, and all candidates have access to services on equitable basis with others.</p>	Internal Audit - Appendix A
<p>Policies and Practices: Program requirements, academic catalog, student complaint process, and transfer of credit policy are all published and accessible to candidates.</p>	Available in program bulletin in print and online.
<p>Distance Education: If the provider offers programs entirely via distance or online education, provider verifies student identities, is able to respond to candidates in a timely manner, and has sufficient resources for current enrolment and anticipated growth.</p>	NA

6. Stakeholder Survey Results

This section reports the results from AAQEP Surveys of candidates, faculty, clinical supervisors, cooperating teachers or host principals [and others?]. Tables will report on sample size, opening and response rates, and descriptive statistics on all items.

7. Concluding Thoughts or Observations: *Keeping in mind that the Quality Review Team's role is to verify evidence presented by the provider and to gather any additional evidence needed to inform the Accreditation Commission in making its decision, please provide any concluding observations regarding the Team's findings in the course of the review.*

The team was able to consistently identify and verify the data presented by the program. Standards and the supporting evidences were presented in the self-study, and were consistently verified through documents provided in the evidence room as well as through interviews with faculty, staff, and many different stakeholders.

8. Supporting Materials: *Please copy or provide links to the following materials and any other relevant documents:*

- Clarification questions sent by the QRT and any written provider responses.
- Site visit schedule.

Schedule

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1D80hjj1YtyR1Ynb07xIDg0cOGNt1kdFDq7_4qXn5mxE/edit?usp=sharing

Responses to Clarifying Questions

ADDENDUM

Below are our updated responses to questions in the “AAQEP Off-Site Review Report for Utah State University, Counseling Program.” We included the questions and our responses below. We are happy to provide additional information during the site visit.

1. What are you gleaned from the GPAs (etc.) to help you in the program? (page 74) What revisions have you made according to that information? (ex.: Course 6290) as well as others.

In a general sense, we assert that student GPAs at completion of the program are reflective of mastery of the materials covered in coursework. We believe that students' grades are reflective of their proficiency and facility in applying and using the content presented within the courses in the program. Although statistical analyses (ANOVA) demonstrated only one course where student performance differed across cohorts (PSY 6240), we have used the data to ensure that there is not a systematic difference in terms of cohort performance. If systematic differences were observed, we would explore possible reasons (differences in course format [face-to-face vs IVC], new instructor, true differences in cohorts, etc.) for those differences.

Page 74 provides a case for the minimum GPA required for admission. Preceding the table is the rationale used in 2012 to raise the minimum GPA. We believe the minimum GPA of 3.20 helps ensure the program admits quality students who are able to successfully complete the program requirements and function as successful professional school counselors.

In a broader sense, the last two years have been highly productive for the Program in terms of utilizing data to inform updates to program curriculum in didactic coursework, and skills required in experiential components of the Program. As described in the paragraph leading up to Table 3.10 *Continuous Improvement of Program and Program Components*, (p.76), and in other places in the Self Study Report, we discuss faculty formal review of the new CACREP standards, ASCA training standards, the new Utah Model for School Counseling, and the Praxis Crosswalk for School Counseling. Table 3.10 provides detail regarding our significant response to our review. The table on p 96 "Findings and Recommendations" delineates our goal of evaluating the effectiveness of our revisions. During the site visit, we will be happy to discuss innovations implemented as a result of data collection and analysis, and discuss our plan to track the effectiveness of our changes via evaluation tools and feedback from stakeholders using multi-method approaches.

2. Where did you expand your measures to collect data, (i.e. focus groups, interviews, case studies) other than surveys?

We have not employed in a formal way, focus groups, and case studies. We do interview internship supervisors either via a conference call, or an electronic format, but these are focused on student performance. We glean insights by supervisor input in this setting, but it is not adequate. That being the case, we intend to implement these methods, as noted in our Self Study Report in the Findings and Recommendations table (p.99). However, despite the fact that

we have not instituted the methods in your query formally, we do use a variety of methods to inform the effectiveness of our training. For example, we utilized permanent products (e.g., course grades, GPA, Praxis scores, meeting minutes), as well as feedback from supervisors across the state on our practicum student and internship evaluations. We consider these evaluations to be measures of performance, as opposed to surveys.

In addition, in a way, we have had a De facto advisory council comprised of Utah Level 2, highly qualified school counselors who fill out supervisor evaluations on our students, and respond to open-ended questions on the instruments. Employers and graduates respond to our surveys. Internship supervisors participate in mid-semester reviews. Additionally, the program director receives face-to-face and email feedback from various stakeholder groups who either raise concerns or offer praise. Importantly, however, we recognize that this is a weakness for us, and we are taking steps to correct the dearth of qualitative input from our stakeholders. For example, at our January 2019 faculty meeting, we discussed the need to create a formal advisory board comprised of stakeholders across the state of Utah. At the faculty meeting we decided to begin with holding two meetings per year. Faculty will send nominations to the director regarding who to invite to be on the advisory council. We will solicit recommendations from USU College of Education colleagues. Our goal is to hold our first meeting this spring, and another one in academic year 2019-2020. We will report on our progress in our first annual report.

3. Most survey questions seem to be very general. How can your questions be developed to deepen your understanding of the program?

As a writing committee we are currently working on revising the Graduate and Employer surveys to meet the goals of AAQEP, and reflect the New Utah Model and our curriculum revisions. Examples of questions we would like to include in the surveys are located in the Findings and Recommendations Table on page 96.

4. How does the multi-method process include non-survey data (p8) as key items?

We include a variety of data sources including permanent products such as course grades, GPA, GRE/MAT/Praxis scores, meeting minutes, and practicum and internship evaluation forms. As stated above, we do not consider these evaluations to be surveys. They are measures of performance and provide direct feedback on our students' skills and abilities to function as school counselors. We consider these evaluations and our students' Praxis scores to be major sources of evidence of our completers' competence to practice as professional school counselors. As mentioned in our Conclusions section, we recognize a weakness in our lack of soliciting input in a formal way via focus groups, in particular. In our

Findings and Recommendations table (p. 96) we cite these findings, establish goals for remediating the weakness, identify action(s)/interventions, propose methods of assessing the effectiveness of the action and intervention, and establish a timeline for accomplishing the goal.

5. Who are your off-site Advisory Council members? How were they selected, and what are their relationships to the program.

Please see our response to Question 2, above.

6. How do areas differ from items based on responses (p10), and how might the data develop into themes?

We will need clarification on this question during our discussion Friday. We do not understand what is being asked. We will respond in a written format, or address the matter during the site visit after we receive clarification.

7. What does your data mean to your program (ex Table 1.5 p 16)

Honestly, we like to think that our data drives our Program. As mentioned previously in this response, we attempted to inform readers of our Self Study Report about ways we collect data, and use it to drive curriculum changes, new course development, revised supervisor rating forms, our surveys and our method of collecting data. Faculty meeting PowerPoint presentations report on our findings, and review of our syllabi document adoption of learning goals and objectives, and their implementation into our curriculum. Included in our Findings and Recommendations Table (p. 96) we propose ways to evaluate our data and our methods of data collection and analysis.

In terms of evaluating outcomes, our data provides information that our students demonstrate a high level of preparedness and competence across domains. Further, our data indicates that our students demonstrate strengths in regards to their role and identity as school counselors, the core attitudes and dispositions for establishing helping relationships, their understanding of comprehensive counseling program management, and the context in which school counselors function. Data demonstrate relative weaknesses in group work and assessment. These domains are both areas that require significant practical experience to enhance skills and competency, so it is not surprising that our students earn slightly lower ratings in these areas. We are looking for ways to improve outcomes, either through improved instruction, or enhanced insight provided by focus groups or interviews that would shed light on these two areas of relative weakness.

8. What is your ratio on program completers and non-completers? What data do you have on why the non-completers leave the program? If any, how have you revised your program?

Due to a lack of time, we will not report exact ratios here. We will have exact figures for the site visit. We do not have very many people who do not complete the Program, and those who do not cite personal reasons (e.g., serious health issues for the student or an immediate family member, move to be with a spouse, financial considerations).

9. For each standard (1, 2, 3, 4) in the findings: conclusions and recommendations, how are faculty working with data (development, collection, analysis) to meet the stated goals.

This is an overarching question, which we have responded to above, to some degree. Please review our Table Findings and Recommendations, located on p. 99. We look forward to providing additional insight during the site visit.

AAQEP reviewers queried our graduation rates, and specifically, data surrounding student withdrawal from the Program. To fully answer the query, we have provided the table below. The table below shows the USU School Counselor Education program graduation rates of our target years, 2012 – 2014. We have also included years 2015 – 2017 to give an overview of the most recent years of graduation rates.

Graduation Rate Information

2012 Cohort Graduation Rate				
<i>Students in Cohort</i>	<i>Students Graduated</i>	<i>Student of Leave of Absence</i>	<i>Students Withdrawn</i>	<i>Graduation Rate</i>
32	30	1	1	93.75%
2013 Cohort Graduation Rate				
<i>Students in Cohort</i>	<i>Students Graduated</i>	<i>Student of Leave of Absence</i>	<i>Students Withdrawn</i>	<i>Graduation Rate</i>
66	58	1	7	87.88%
2014 Cohort Graduation Rate				

<i>Students in Cohort</i>	<i>Students Graduated</i>	<i>Student of Leave of Absence</i>	<i>Students Withdrawn</i>	<i>Graduation Rate</i>
35	31	1	3	88.57%

2015 Cohort Graduation Rate

<i>Students in Cohort</i>	<i>Students Graduated</i>	<i>Student of Leave of Absence</i>	<i>Students Withdrawn</i>	<i>Graduation Rate</i>
64	58	3	3	90.62%

2016 Cohort Graduation Rate

<i>Students in Cohort</i>	<i>Students Graduated</i>	<i>Student of Leave of Absence</i>	<i>Students Withdrawn</i>	<i>Graduation Rate</i>
37	36	0	1	97.23%

2017 Cohort Graduation Rate

<i>Students in Cohort</i>	<i>Students Graduated</i>	<i>Student of Leave of Absence</i>	<i>Students Withdrawn</i>	<i>Graduation Rate</i>
62	58 (anticipated)	1	3	93.55% (anticipated)

The table below lists all students who withdrew or took a Leave of Absence through our target years, 2012 – 2014. We have also included years 2015 – 2017. When we have the information, we have listed the reasons for students withdrawing or taking a Leave of Absence. This search has shown us that we need to include reason for withdrawing from the program, connecting with the USU School of Graduate Studies, who do not appear to currently gather this information.

Withdraw or Leave of Absence

2012 Cohort Withdraw or Leave of Absence

Student 1	Withdraw	
Student 2	Withdraw	Had a baby
Student 3	LOA, never returned	

2013 Cohort Withdraw or Leave of Absence

Student 4	LOA, never returned	Work Related
Student 5	LOA	
Student 6	Withdraw	

Student 7	Withdraw	Moved
Student 8	Withdraw	
Student 9	Withdraw	Moved
Student 10	Withdraw	Financial Issues
Student 11	Withdraw	
2014 Cohort Withdraw or Leave of Absence		
Student 12	LOA, never returned	
Student 13	Withdraw	
Student 14	Withdraw	Different Career Choice
Student 15	Withdraw	Different Career Choice
2015 Cohort Withdraw or Leave of Absence		
Student 16	LOA, never returned	
Student 17	LOA, never returned	Family
Student 18	LOA, Returned spring 2019	Family
Student 19	Withdraw	Did not meet conditions of acceptance
Student 20	Withdraw	
Student 21	Withdraw	
2016 Cohort Withdraw or Leave of Absence		
Student 22	Withdraw	Work conflicts
2017 Withdraw or Leave of Absence		
Student 23	LOA, planning to return fall 2020	Health – cancer treatments
Student 24	Withdraw	Moved to Arizona

Student 25	Withdraw	Mental Health Issues
Student 26	Withdraw	Family issues