



RUTGERS

Graduate School of Education

Fall 2022
Program Evaluation Outcomes Report
for the Ed.M. Program in
School Counseling

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey –
New Brunswick
Graduate School of Education (GSE)

Table of Contents:

Assessment Plan Alignment Tables

- [Program Learning Objectives Aligned to CACREP Standards](#)
- [Key Assessments Aligned to CACREP Standards](#)
- [Key Performance Indicators \(KPIs\) Assessed by the Program](#)
- [Counselor Characteristics and Dispositions for Effective Practice](#)

Program Evaluation Results

- [Student Learning & Dispositional Data Results](#)
- [Survey Data Results](#)
- [Demographic Data Results](#)

Program Modifications / Changes

- [Subsequent Program Modifications](#)
- [Other Substantial Program Changes](#)



Program Learning Objectives Aligned to CACREP Standards

Rutgers GSE School Counseling Program Learning Objectives	CACREP CORE and SPECIALTY AREAS								
	2.F.1.	2.F.2.	2.F.3.	2.F.4.	2.F.5.	2.F.6.	2.F.7.	2.F.8.	5.G.
1. Develop a professional identity that demonstrates foundational knowledge and skills necessary for success as professional school counselors.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
2. Possess the knowledge and skills needed to perform a range of school counselor responsibilities (i.e., counseling, coordinating, consulting).	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3. Demonstrate capacity and skills for empowering students, families and communities and adhere to ACA and ASCA ethical standards in their roles as leaders, advocates, and consultants.	X	X	X		X			X	X
4. Demonstrate the skills needed to coordinate a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program (i.e., foundation, management, delivery, accountability) using a data driven model to address academic, career and social-emotional development of K-12 students.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
5. Demonstrate sensitivity to socio-cultural factors that affect help-seeking behaviors and develop culturally appropriate counseling practices informed by counseling research.		X	X		X			X	X

CACREP Common Core Foundational Areas of Professional Counseling Identity:

- 2.F.1. Professional Counseling Orientation and Ethical Practice
- 2.F.2. Social and Cultural Diversity
- 2.F.3. Human Growth and Development
- 2.F.4. Career Development
- 2.F.5. Counseling and Helping Relationships
- 2.F.6. Group Counseling and Group Work
- 2.F.7. Assessment and Testing
- 2.F.8. Research and Program Evaluation

CACREP Specialty Area:

- 5.G. School Counseling



Key Assessments Aligned to CACREP Standards

KEY ASSESSMENT	2.F.1.	2.F.2.	2.F.3.	2.F.4.	2.F.5.	2.F.6.	2.F.7.	2.F.8.	5.G.
Mock Counseling Video Assignment <i>(new in 2021-2022)</i>		a, c, f, h	h, i	a, b, j	d, f, g, i				3.f, h
Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Assignment		a, e, h	a, b, e, f, i		b, g, h, i, j	a, b, c, e, f, g	e, f, i, j, m	a, b, c, d, e	1.b, d, e; 2.a, b, g, k; 3.b, c, d, f, h, i, k, l, n, o
Capstone 1 Assignment		a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h	a, e, f, i		a, b, c, d, g, h, i, j, n			a, b, e	1.b, d; 2.g, k, n; 3.c, d, f, h, i, k
Capstone 2 Assignment	e, f, i	a, b, c, d, e, h	a, b, c, e, f, g, h, i		a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n		e, f, g, h, i, j, m	a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j	1.a, b, d; 2.a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m; 3.a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, o
Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV)	b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m	a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h	b, c, d, e, h, i	a, h, j	a, b, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m	a, c, g	a, b, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m	a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j	1.d; 2.a, b, d, e, f, k, m, n; 3.a, b, c, d, i, j, k, l, m, n
Counselor Perceptual Rating Scale (CPRS)		c, e, f, h	h, i		b, f, g, i	d			
Site Supervisor Evaluation - Practicum and Internship Versions	b, c, d, e, i, k, m	a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h	a, b, c, e, f, i	a, b, c, e, f, h, i, j	b, d, e, f, g, i, n	d, e, f, g	a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, j, k, l, m	a, b, c, e, g, h, i, j	2.a, d, j, k; 3.e, l
Site Supervisor Evaluation - Practicum Version ONLY	a, b, c, d, e, i, l, m	a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h			a, b, c, e, f, h, i, j, l, m, n	d, g, h			2.a, b, d, k, l, m, n; 3.d, f
Site Supervisor Evaluation - Internship Version ONLY	a, b, c, d, e, g, i, m	a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h	a	a	a, b, d, g, j	a, b, d, e, g	e, h, m	a, b, c, e, f, i, j	1.b; 2.g, k, m, n; 3.l



Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) Assessed by the Program

CACREP STANDARD	KPI	KNOWLEDGE OR SKILL	ALIGNED KEY ASSESSMENTS
1. PROFESSIONAL COUNSELING ORIENTATION AND ETHICAL PRACTICE	2.F.1.i: Ethical standards of professional counseling organizations and credentialing bodies, and applications of ethical and legal considerations in professional counseling	Skill	Capstone 2 Assignment, KSV, and Site Supervisor Evaluation
2. SOCIAL AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY	2.F.2.h: Strategies for identifying and eliminating barriers, prejudices, and processes of intentional and unintentional oppression and discrimination	Skill	Mock Counseling Video Assignment, MTSS Assignment, Capstone 1 Assignment, Capstone 2 Assignment, KSV, CPRS, and Site Supervisor Evaluation
3. HUMAN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT	2.F.3.i: Ethical and culturally relevant strategies for promoting resilience and optimum development and wellness across the lifespan	Skill	Mock Counseling Video Assignment, MTSS Assignment, Capstone 1 Assignment, Capstone 2 Assignment, KSV, CPRS, and Site Supervisor Evaluation
4. CAREER DEVELOPMENT	2.F.4.a: Theories and models of career development, counseling, and decision making	Knowledge	Mock Counseling Video Assignment, KSV and Site Supervisor Evaluation
5. COUNSELING AND HELPING RELATIONSHIPS	2.F.5.g: Essential interviewing, counseling, and case conceptualization skills	Skill	Mock Counseling Video Assignment, MTSS Assignment, Capstone 1 Assignment, Capstone 2 Assignment, KSV, CPRS, and Site Supervisor Evaluation
6. GROUP COUNSELING AND GROUP WORK	2.F.6.f: Types of groups and other considerations that affect conducting groups in varied settings	Knowledge	MTSS Assignment and Site Supervisor Evaluation
7. ASSESSMENT AND TESTING	2.F.7.f: Basic concepts of standardized and non-standardized testing, norm-referenced and criterion-referenced assessments, and group and individual assessments	Knowledge	MTSS Assignment, Capstone 2 Assignment, KSV and Site Supervisor Evaluation
8. RESEARCH AND PROGRAM EVALUATION	2.F.8.a: The importance of research in advancing the counseling profession, including how to critique research to inform counseling practice	Knowledge	MTSS Assignment, Capstone 1 Assignment, Capstone 2 Assignment, KSV, and Site Supervisor Evaluation
SPECIALTY AREA: SCHOOL COUNSELING	5.G.2.a: School counselor roles as leaders, advocates, and systems change agents in P-12 schools	Knowledge	MTSS Assignment, Capstone 2 Assignment, KSV, and Site Supervisor Evaluation



Counselor Characteristics and Dispositions for Effective Practice

General Dispositional Category	Dispositions	KSV Rubric Component
Ethics and Legal Standards	Abides by Standards of Legal and Ethical Practice	V.1. Abides by ACA ethical and legal standards in assessment, practice, and research.
Cross-Cultural Competencies	Respects and appreciates individual and cultural differences, talents, and perspectives.	V.2. Appreciates individual, cultural, and linguistic differences and demonstrate respect for diverse talents and perspectives.
Positive Regard	Values and creates a positive climate and serves as a role model.	V.3. Establishes a positive climate for change and serves as positive role models and change agents.
Commitment to Personal and Professional Growth as a Counselor	Is committed to personal and professional growth	V.4. Commits to continual personal and professional growth and competence.
Genuineness and Empathy	Expresses and affirms an ethic of caring for all people.	V.5. Affirms an ethic of caring for all people.
General Dispositional Category	Dispositions	CPRS Scale
Self-Regulation and Adaptability	Is flexible and engaging with others	Perception of Self
Practices Professional Behavior	Sees others as capable and worthy of respect.	Perceptions of Others
Positive Regard	Warm and accepting of others	Perception of Purpose
Genuineness and Empathy	Shows interest in others and is interested in their thoughts and feelings	Frame of Reference
General Dispositional Category	Dispositions	Site Supervisor Evaluation Component
Practices Professional Behavior	Dependable, prepared and able to work independently and cooperatively, developing a professional identity	Section 1: Professionalism (All) Section 6: Clinical Practice Overall Assessment (POC4, POC8, IC6, IC7)
Self-Regulation and Adaptability	Self-regulated and self-aware, open to feedback and able to adjust	Section 2: Personal Characteristics (All) Section 6: Clinical Practice Overall Assessment (POC5)
Genuineness and Empathy	Genuine interest in students and ability to develop a caring working relationship	Section 3: Attitude Toward Students (ATS1-4) Section 4: Counseling Skills (CS1) Section 6: Clinical Practice Overall Assessment (POC1, POC2)
Cross-Cultural Competencies	Ability to work with diverse populations; ongoing development of cultural competencies.	Section 3: Attitude Toward Students (ATS5) Section 6: Clinical Practice Overall Assessment (POC6, IC2)
Ethics and Legal Standards	Abides by Standards of Legal and Ethical Practice	Section 4: Counseling Skills (CS2) Section 6: Clinical Practice Overall Assessment (POC9, IC4)



Student Learning & Dispositional Data Results

Key Assignments / Evaluations assessing student knowledge, skills and professional dispositions, and aligned to the program’s objectives, CACREP Standards, and KPIs from the 2021-2022 academic year include:

1. Mock Counseling Video Course Assignment (*new in 2021-2022*)
2. Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) Course Assignment
3. Capstone 1 Course Assignment
4. Capstone 2 Course Assignment
5. Site Supervisor Evaluation
6. Knowledge, Skills and Values (KSV) Assessment (Faculty)
7. Knowledge, Skills and Values (KSV) Student Self-Assessment
8. Counselor Perceptual Rating Scale (CPRS) Assessment (Faculty)
9. Counselor Perceptual Rating Scale (CPRS) Student Self-Assessment

The following tables summarize the ability of students to meet student learning and dispositional benchmarks for satisfactory progress in the School Counseling program. Note that items 7 and 9 above are self-assessments which provide program faculty with important information about students’ perceptions of their knowledge, skills, and dispositions, however their scores are not included in the tables below. Only faculty assessment of students’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions are reviewed when determining if students have met benchmarks.

Ability of Students to Meet Student Learning and Dispositional Benchmarks

Key Assignments	# Met Benchmark for Satisfactory Progress	# Did Not Meet Benchmark for Satisfactory Progress	Maximum Score	Assignment Average Score for Satisfactory Progress	Comments
Mock Counseling Video Session Course Assignment	8	2	4.0	2.5	Average score was 2.0 for two students
Multi -Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) Course Assignment	9	0	4.0	2.5	
Capstone 1 Course Assignment	8	0	4.0	2.5	
Capstone 2 Course Assignment	8	0	4.0	2.5	



Key Evaluations / Assessments	# Met Benchmark for Satisfactory Progress	# Did Not Meet Benchmark for Satisfactory Progress	Maximum Score	Year 1 Assessment Average Score for Satisfactory Progress	Year 2 Assessment Average Score for Satisfactory Progress	Comments
Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV) Assessment (Part-time Student – Faculty Rating)	3	0	3.0	2.0		
Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV) Assessment (Practicum – Faculty Rating)	6	0	3.0	2.0		
Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV) Assessment (Practicum – University Supervisor Rating)	6	0	3.0	2.0		
Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV) Assessment (Internship – Faculty Rating)	7	1	3.0		3.0	Average score was 2.87 for one student
Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV) Assessment (Internship – University Supervisor Rating)	2	6	3.0		3.0	Average score was between 2.73 and 2.93 for six students
Counselor Perceptual Rating Scale (CPRS) Assessment (Part-time Student)	3	0	7.0	3.0		
Counselor Perceptual Rating Scale (CPRS) Assessment (Practicum)	6	0	7.0	3.0		
Counselor Perceptual Rating Scale (CPRS) Assessment (Internship)	8	0	7.0		5.0	
Site Supervisor Evaluation (Practicum Mid-semester)	6	0	5.0	2.0		
Site Supervisor Evaluation (Practicum Final)	6	0	5.0	2.0		
Site Supervisor Evaluation (Internship 1)	8	0	5.0		3.0	
Site Supervisor Evaluation (Internship 2)	8	0	5.0		3.0	



Student Learning and Dispositional Assessments	# Met Benchmark for Satisfactory Progress	# Did Not Meet Benchmark for Satisfactory Progress	Maximum Score	Year 1 Assessment Average Score for Satisfactory Progress	Year 2 Assessment Average Score for Satisfactory Progress
Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV) Assessment (Part-time Student – Faculty Rating) - <i>Values Section</i>	3	0	3.0	2.0	
Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV) Assessment (Practicum – Faculty Rating) - <i>Values Section</i>	6	0	3.0	2.0	
Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV) Assessment (Practicum – University Supervisor Rating) - <i>Values Section</i>	6	0	3.0	2.0	
Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV) Assessment (Internship – Faculty Rating) - <i>Values Section</i>	8	0	3.0		3.0
Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV) Assessment (Internship – University Supervisor Rating) - <i>Values Section</i>	8	0	3.0		3.0
Counselor Perceptual Rating Scale (CPRS) Assessment (Part-time Student)	3	0	7.0	3.0	
Counselor Perceptual Rating Scale (CPRS) Assessment (Practicum)	6	0	7.0	3.0	
Counselor Perceptual Rating Scale (CPRS) Assessment (Internship)	8	0	7.0		5.0
Site Supervisor Evaluation (Practicum Mid-semester) - <i>Selected Items</i>	6	0	5.0	2.0	
Site Supervisor Evaluation (Practicum Final) - <i>Selected Items</i>	6	0	5.0	2.0	
Site Supervisor Evaluation (Internship 1) - <i>Selected Items</i>	8	0	5.0		3.0
Site Supervisor Evaluation (Internship 2) - <i>Selected Items</i>	8	0	5.0		3.0

Students are assessed by course instructors, core program faculty, university-hired supervisors, and school-based site supervisors, providing multiple perspectives on the students’ progress and development through the program. All assignments and evaluations are aligned to program objectives, CACREP Standards, and KPIs, and as such the program faculty feel confident that meeting the benchmarks is a strong indication that students’ knowledge, skills and dispositions meet program expectations during and at completion of the program. Almost all students in the School Counseling program in 2021-2022 met all assessment benchmarks for satisfactory progress.

Key Assignments

The first of the three tables above include data for the four key course-based assignments collected during 2021-2022. Two students did not meet the benchmark for satisfactory progress on the Mock Counseling Video Assignment, a new key assignment completed in the required Introduction to



Counseling and Interview Skills course which most students take during their first semester in the program. Both earned an average score of 2.0, below the 2.5 threshold. Students who have not met the benchmark were given support by the faculty through advisement, provision of additional counseling resources to review, as well as provided close supervision by their site supervisor and faculty supervisor during their first clinical experience, Practicum, the following semester. All students met the benchmarks set for the three other key course assignments, which assess student knowledge and skills aligned to all Program Learning Objectives and all but one CACREP Standard in the first semester (MTSS) and again in the fall (Capstone 1) and spring (Capstone 2) of the final year in the program.

Key Evaluations/Assessments

The three key evaluations/assessments are the *Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV) Assessment*, *Counselor Perceptual Rating Scale (CPRS) Assessment*, and *Site Supervisor Evaluation (SSE)*, with data presented in the second of the three tables above. The KSV, CPRS, and SSE assessments are used by the School Counseling program, faculty, and site supervisors to assess each students' counseling behaviors, attitudes, and ability to be effective in the role of a professional school counselor. The KSV is scored by core faculty who teach the Practicum and Internship courses annually. It is also scored by core faculty for part-time students who are not in either of the previously mentioned courses. In addition, an adjunct faculty member, who teaches in the program, also served as a university supervisor and conducted site visits for all Practicum and Internship students. This person completed the KSV as well. One Internship student's score on the KSV fell below the 3.0 benchmark as scored by both the core faculty member/Internship instructor and by the adjunct/university supervisor (2.87 by both assessors). In addition, the adjunct/university supervisor scored five students between 2.73 and 2.93, with the remaining two students scoring a 3.0 (the benchmark). While some students may continue to need additional guidance as they approach graduation and the professional world, particularly the student who scored below the benchmark by the core faculty member, the faculty believe the lower than anticipated scores for the five other students may be more emblematic of an inconsistency in scoring rather than students not meeting expectations. Further training on the use of the KSV and how to score it, or a reconsideration of the KSV as the site visit assessment tool is warranted – if the program continues to seek the feedback of a university supervisor conducting site visits. The KSV, CPRS, and SSE serve as valuable tools that provide data on students' counseling status and progress as it pertains to their attitudes, behaviors, and skills as effective helpers. All students met the benchmarks set for the two other key evaluations/assessments.

Dispositional Assessments

The final table above contains dispositional data taken from the three key evaluations/assessments. This includes the Values section of the KSV, the entire CPRS, and selected items of the SSE. Further details about the assessed dispositions and how they are captured on these three evaluations can be found in the [Counselor Characteristics and Dispositions for Effective Practice](#) table earlier in this report. All students met the dispositional benchmarks set for the three key evaluations/assessments. Students meeting the program's dispositional benchmarks indicate the ability to demonstrate key characteristics important to being a helping professional, and that they understand their ethical, legal, and professional role as a school counselor.



Survey Data Results

During the 2021-2022 academic year, surveys were administered to Site Supervisors, Alumni, and Employers of Alumni. The End of Program Survey was also sent to May 2022 graduates upon completion of the program. What follows is a summary of data-informed findings that may inform program and curricular decisions as a result of these four surveys.

Site Supervisor Survey Results

The purpose of the 2022 Site Supervisor Survey was to collect feedback about the experience of serving as a site supervisor. The survey was sent to all 15 site supervisors from the 2021-2022 academic year. Eight responded (including an incomplete response) for a 53% response rate. Of the respondents, five supervised Practicum students while three supervised Internship students.

Site supervisors felt they provided positive Practicum and Internship experiences, and that their students were prepared and had a positive impact on P-12 students. Overall, site supervisors had an excellent experience with their student(s). When asked how Rutgers could better support site supervisors, some suggestions included: communicating expectations earlier, providing Site Supervisor Evaluation due date reminders and clarifying some of the components on the Site Supervisor Evaluation. The faculty will use the information gleaned from this survey to implement future changes in how to communicate with site supervisors and will work to clarify expectations for students and site supervisors.

Site supervisor feedback helps program faculty assess if students are meeting the program's learning objectives (PLOs). Overall, this feedback indicates that through their Practicum and Internship experiences, students are developing the knowledge and skills needed for success as professional counselors (PLO 1) and had opportunities to successfully perform a range of school counselor responsibilities with guidance and support from their site supervisor (PLO 2).

Alumni Survey Results

The 2022 Alumni Survey was sent to the nine graduates from the class of 2020 to gather their 2021-2022 employment information, feedback on their program experience, and their perceptions of their preparation. Five completed the survey for a 56% response rate.

Three alumni reported working as school counselors while one was working in higher education, and another was not employed but seeking employment, further education, or another opportunity. Those who were working seemed satisfied with their current employment. Alumni generally had positive responses to questions about their coursework, Practicum, Internship, site supervisors and faculty, and would recommend the program to prospective students.

Alumni were asked a series of questions aligned to CACREP Standards, and thus also the PLOs. While responses were generally very positive, alumni indicated they felt they had been least prepared for assessment, which connects to PLOs 2, 4, and 5. Alumni also provided this feedback when they were students several years ago. In the intervening years, the program faculty have made changes to the Assessment course and its assignments, including the MTSS Course Assignment, which was documented in the [2021 Program Evaluation Outcomes Report](#). This is an area the program faculty will continue to



monitor, and we are hopeful future surveys will indicate that students and alumni feel better prepared for their professional assessment responsibilities.

Employer Survey Results

The process of conducting the Employer Survey this year has led the faculty to reconsider how to best collect feedback about program graduates and their mastery of the PLOs, and the program itself, from this important constituent group. The intent was to collect this feedback from those who, in 2021-2022, supervised or employed the program's May 2020 graduates. On the Alumni Survey, graduates were asked to provide the name and contact information for their professional, school-based supervisor, and to indicate their permission for the program to contact the listed person. Additionally, the program reached out to the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) to request 2021-2022 employment information for the graduates. The NJDOE can provide this information for graduates who are employed in New Jersey public schools. In total, eight of the 2020 graduates were employed this past year in a New Jersey public school and the program had contact information for either their direct supervisor (1) or their school principal (7) for the survey. Unfortunately, the Employer Survey received only one response, and that person indicated they did not know who they supervised/employed who was a Rutgers GSE school counseling graduate, and they were unable to complete the survey.

Moving forward, the program has several ideas to increase survey participation. First, the Employer Survey will be sent earlier, before the school year ends, when school-based employees may be checking their emails more frequently. Second, the survey will be revised to ask supervisors/employers a series of questions about where they believe new school counselors need enhanced preparation, trends they are seeing in school counseling, how a program like the Rutgers GSE's can help, etc. Then, if they indicate that they know they employ a Rutgers GSE graduate, the survey will ask targeted questions to understand their perception of the program graduate's preparation. Third, the faculty will request permission from second-year school counseling students to contact their future employers, so this step can be removed from the Alumni Survey, which some graduates may not complete. Lastly, the faculty are considering distributing the Employer Survey every two years, instead of annually, to hopefully get more responses to synthesize at a time. If these changes do not yield an improved response rate, the faculty will consider shifting toward focus groups or 1-on-1 phone calls to collect feedback from employers.

End of Program Survey Results

The 2022 End of Program Survey was sent to the eight May 2022 graduates at the end of the academic year to collect information about their future employment, their overall satisfaction with the program, and their perceptions of their preparation. Seven responded for an 88% response rate. Five recent graduates had job offers as school counselors lined up and one planned to continue in their current position while seeking new employment.

Recent program graduates had positive responses to questions about their coursework, Practicum, Internship, site supervisors and faculty. They felt their preparation to be school counselors was effective and would recommend the program to prospective students. Recent graduates were asked a series of questions aligned to CACREP Standards, and thus also the PLOs. Graduates indicated feeling most prepared to work with multicultural and diverse people (PLO 5), use counseling techniques to appropriately address individual needs (PLO 2), and to use appropriate career counseling theories (PLO



2). Areas where graduates indicated feeling less prepared included approaches to group formation (PLO 2), using a variety of assessments (PLO 2), using data to design and implement curriculum aligned with the school learning environment (PLO 4), and using data to evaluate interventions and programs (PLO 4). These are all areas the faculty will look to enhance in the program. Graduates also indicated, in alignment with their desire to use data to design and implement curriculum aligned with the school environment, that they would like more preparation in handling the emergencies and issues related to current events that come up that must be dealt with by school communities. The faculty will include more lectures around critical issues schools and school counselors face in the *School Based Practicum* (15:297:627) and the *Internship: School Counseling* (15:297:628) courses. Adding more content around crisis response will allow students to gain additional knowledge and skills in this area which they can apply at their placement sites and professional jobs after they graduate.



Demographic Data Results

School counseling student data is collected from the point of admission, during the program, and at completion to identify any potential bias in the program’s procedures. Part of the program’s mission has been to increase the recruitment and enrollment of diverse individuals to join the school counseling program to reflect the student body in New Jersey. Expanding on this goal, faculty continue to work with the Rutgers GSE recruitment and marketing teams to explore other avenues to encourage potential students from diverse backgrounds to apply to the program, which is central to the program’s mission.

Demographics of Applicants by Admissions Outcome and Year – Gender

Gender	2021
Female	28
Admitted, Accepted Admissions Offer	7
Admitted, Deferred Admission	2
Admitted, Did Not Accept Admissions Offer	4
After Deferral (2-year), Did Not Accept Admissions Offer	1
After Deferral, Did Not Accept Admissions Offer	1
Reapplied - Withdrew Application Prior to Admissions Decision	2
Withdrew Application Prior to Admissions Decision	11
Male	4
Admitted, Accepted Admissions Offer	4
Grand Total	32



Demographics of Applicants by Admissions Outcome and Year – Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	2021
Asian (Non-Citizen)	1
Withdrew Application Prior to Admissions Decision	1
Asian American or Pacific Islander	1
Withdrew Application Prior to Admissions Decision	1
Black or African American	5
Admitted, Accepted Admissions Offer	2
After Deferral, Did Not Accept Admissions Offer	1
Withdrew Application Prior to Admissions Decision	2
Hispanic or Latino	2
Admitted, Accepted Admissions Offer	2
Multiracial or Biracial	1
Admitted, Accepted Admissions Offer	1
Prefer Not To Say	1
After Deferral (2-year), Did Not Accept Admissions Offer	1
White or Caucasian	21
Admitted, Accepted Admissions Offer	6
Admitted, Deferred Admission	2
Admitted, Did Not Accept Admissions Offer	4
Reapplied - Withdrew Application Prior to Admissions Decision	2
Withdrew Application Prior to Admissions Decision	7
Grand Total	32

Demographics of New Students by Starting Term – Gender

Gender	Fall 2021
Female	7
Male	4
Grand Total	11

Demographics of New Students by Starting Term – Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Fall 2021
Black or African American	2
Hispanic or Latino	2
Multiracial or Biracial	1
White or Caucasian	6
Grand Total	11



Demographics of Graduates by Year – Gender

Gender	2022
Female	7
Male	1
Grand Total	8

Demographics of Graduates by Year – Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	2022
Asian (Permanent Resident)	1
Black or African American	1
Hispanic or Latino	2
White or Caucasian	4
Grand Total	8

Application Data Analysis

Counted within the application numbers in the tables above are those who withdrew their application prior to an admissions decision. This means several things – either an applicant let Rutgers know they no longer wish to be considered for the program before a decision was made, or an applicant may have submitted an incomplete application. Rutgers’ coding of applications does not differentiate between these two categories; however, the institution has recently adopted the Salesforce platform to manage the application process, which will hopefully offer more detailed information about applicant status. For now, the GSE’s application data tables include all applications in this category. Additionally, the application data includes two applicants who had applied in a previous year, been admitted, and deferred, and needed to officially decide to enroll or not.

Without “withdrawn” applications, there were nineteen applications, including four (21%) from males and fifteen (79%) from females. In general, the School Counseling program attracts significantly more female than male applicants. Six (32%) applicants were Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and twelve (63%) were White, with one applicant not indicating their race/ethnicity. The program also attracts more White applicants than BIPOC applicants. The program aims to recruit diverse individuals to join the School Counseling program and profession, and this data indicates that there is still work to be done before the applicant pool matches the P-12 student body in New Jersey.

Enrollment Data Analysis

All nineteen applicants were accepted, and all four males enrolled, while seven (47%) female applicants enrolled. Five (83%) of the admitted BIPOC applicants enrolled and six (50%) of the admitted White applicants enrolled. A higher percentage of underrepresented groups (male and BIPOC applicants) chose to enroll in the School Counseling program, which is an encouraging sign that perhaps these applicants feel the GSE’s program would be a good fit for them.

Graduate Data Analysis

As would be expected based on the program’s history of enrolling more female than male students, seven (88%) graduates in Spring 2022 were female and one (12%) was male. Graduates who identified as BIPOC represented 50% of the eight graduates in Spring 2022. Student diversity and supporting



RUTGERS

Graduate School of Education

program completion of BIPOC students is central to achieving the program's mission and program objectives.

Enrollment and Graduation Trends

In 2020, of the nine students that started the program, one Hispanic/Latino female and one White male were part-time students. The male student transferred into the GSE's administration and supervision program after the first semester. The female part-time student is expected to graduate in Spring 2023, while the seven remaining (full-time) students all graduated in Spring 2022. One Hispanic/Latino male student who began the program part-time in 2019 also graduated in Spring 2022. In general, all students who start the program have a high probability of completing it with very few students transferring to other programs or withdrawing, regardless of gender and race/ethnicity.



Subsequent Program Modifications

Described below are two program modifications that went into effect during the 2021-2022 academic year.

Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV) Assessment Revisions

The *Knowledge, Skills, and Values (KSV)* assessment is completed for all students at the end of each year. A 3-point scale with options of Does Not Meet (1), Progressing Toward (2), and Meets Expectations (3) was used for the faculty assessment in Spring 2021 to gather more nuanced information. It was determined that moving to a 4-point scale with the addition of Exceeds Expectations (4), would further increase the usefulness of the tool for the program by providing opportunities for differentiation, allowing for increased discernment by students regarding their progress and for faculty to more accurately reflect student progress at the midpoint and end of the program. The 4-point scale was used for the first time by faculty in Spring 2022.

Additionally, for the first time, as discussed in the [Key Evaluations/Assessments](#) section earlier in this report, an adjunct faculty member who teaches in the program served as a university supervisor, conducting site visits for all students in Practicum and Internship. As part of this process, the faculty member completed the KSV Assessment for all Practicum and Internship students, which provided additional information based on direct observation of student performance in a clinical setting. The faculty is currently considering if the KSV Assessment is the appropriate tool for site visit evaluations.

Transition from the *Counseling Skills Exam* to the *Mock Counseling Video Session Key Assignment* in Introduction to Counseling and Interviewing Skills Course

Following the Fall 2020 semester the faculty decided to move away from using the *Counseling Skills Exam* that tested basic counseling knowledge and skills to using a new assignment, the *Mock Counseling Video Session Assignment*, starting in Fall 2021. This transition from a multiple-choice exam to a hands-on, performance-based assignment was informed by data faculty reviewed from past counseling skills exams. Faculty felt the exam was one-dimensional and primarily focused on students' ability to recall information learned in the course and not on their ability to effectively apply helping skills. Where the exam lacked the ability to assess students' applicable skills, faculty believe the *Mock Counseling Video Session* will allow students to be evaluated applying their skills in a real-time mock situation. The mock scenario will add a dimension to students' learning where they need to think, react, and respond in real time to fictional scenarios posed by their group partner.



RUTGERS

Graduate School of Education

Other Substantial Program Changes

There were no other substantial program changes made during the 2021-2022 academic year.