

2022 Human Development Counseling (HDC) Program Outcomes Report Peabody College at Vanderbilt University

Program Statistics

Completion Rate

In the academic year ending in May 2022, of the 38 students admitted to the Human Development Counseling (HDC) program with a specialization in clinical mental health counseling (CMHC), 33 students (86.8%) completed the M.Ed. degree in human development counseling (CMHC). Of the other original five (5) CMHC students, three (7.9%) completed the M.Ed. degree in counseling studies and two (5.3%) withdrew from the program. Of the 12 students admitted to the school counseling on-campus track, nine students (75%) completed the degree in human development counseling with a specialization in school counseling (SC). Of the remaining three students, one student withdrew (8.3%) and two (16.7%) completed the M.Ed. degree in counseling studies. The now sunsetted school counseling digital learning (SCDL) program was in its sixth year with the fourth group of graduates completing the program in May 2022. Of the 14 original SCDL students due to graduate in 2022, 12 graduated (85.7%). The remaining two (2; 14.3%) withdrew or were academically dismissed. HDC graduated the first dual track student this year. This student graduated after having met the requirements for both the school and CMHC tracks. Overall, HDC graduated 84.4% of original matriculating students from an HDC specialization track, graduated an additional 7.8% from the counseling studies non-licensure track, and experienced a 7.8% withdrawal or dismissal rate. As important context, this group of graduates experienced 4.5 to 5.5 semesters of education and training under pandemic circumstances.

National Counselor Examination (NCE)

Because university is accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), HDC students are eligible to take the National Counselor Examination (NCE) the semester before graduation. The NCE is not a program requirement, but the majority of students usually sit for this exam before graduation. Of the 31 CMHC students and six (6) school counseling track students who took the NCE exam in 2022, all (100%) passed the national licensure exam.

Praxis Exam for School Counselors

School counseling students are required to take the Praxis exam as part of the requirements for Tennessee licensure as a school counselor, so most school counseling and dual track graduates sit for the Praxis exam. The HDC pass rate for this exam was 100% (20 of 20) in 2022.

Job Placement Rate

Of students pursuing full time employment after graduation, 100% (9/9) of school counseling on campus students, 100% (12/12) of SCDL, 100% (1/1) of dual track graduates, and 100% (33/33) of CMHC 2022 graduates continued or obtained full-time employment as a counselor or continued in graduate studies in a doctoral program within five months of graduation.

Demographic Characteristics of the 2022 HDC Graduating Class

The demographic characteristics of HDC graduates in 2021 by specialty track are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. 2022 Graduates Demographic Characteristics

N Program	Gender		Descent				
	Men	Women	White	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Multiracial
33 CMHCoc	6(18.2%)	27(81.8%)	27(81.8%)	0(0.0%)	6(18.2%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
1 Dual	0(0.0%)	1(100%)	1(100%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
9 SCoc	2(22.2%)	7(77.8%)	8(88.9%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	1(11.1%)
12 SCDL	0(0.0%)	12(100%)	11(91.7%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	1(8.3%)	0(0.0%)
55 Total	8(14.5%)	47(85.5%)	47(85.5%)	0(0.0%)	6(10.9%)	1(1.8%)	1(1.8%)

Total Enrollment and Demographics by Track

During AY2021-2022 HDC had 86 CMHC on-campus students, 21 on-campus dual track students, 20 on-campus school counseling students, and 16 school counseling digital learning program (SCDL). Table 2 disaggregates gender and race by on-campus and digital learning (SCDL) programs.

Table 2. Demographic characteristics of all HDC program students during the 2021-2022 academic year.

Program	Total	Gender			Descent				
		Men	Women	Nonbinary	White	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Multiracial
CMHC on-campus	86	16(18.6%)	68(79.1%)	2(2.3%)	67(77.9%)	2(2.3%)	15(17.4%)	0(0.0%)	2(2.3%)
Dual Program on	21	3(14.3%)	18(85.7%)	0(0.0%)	17(81.0%)	2(9.5%)	2(9.5%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)
School C on-campus	20	2(10.0%)	18(90.0%)	0(0.0%)	17(85.0%)	0(0.0%)	1(5.0%)	1(5.0%)	1(5.0%)
SCDL	16	2(12.5%)	14(87.5%)	0(0.0%)	15(93.8%)	0(0.0%)	0(0.0%)	1(6.2%)	0(0.0%)
Totals	143	23(16.1%)	118(82.5%)	2(0.7%)	116(81.1%)	4(2.8%)	18(12.6%)	2(1.4%)	3(2.1%)

Average Class Size

On-campus class sizes ranged from 10-35 students and a 2022 average of 19.4 students per class.

Applicant Admission Data

Table 3 summarizes the applicant pool diversity and decisions for the on-campus and SCDL programs for the 2022 admission cycle.

Table 3: 2021 On-campus Admissions Data

Total Applicants = 317	Total Offers = 89	Total Yield = 45
Gender:	Gender:	Gender:
Male: 52(16.4%)	Male: 14(15.7%)	Male: 9(20.0%)
Female: 265(83.6%)	Female: 75(84.3%)	Female: 36(80.0%)
Race:	Race:	Race:
White: 182(79.5%)	White: 57(64.0%)	White: 27(60.0%)
Asian: 13(5.7%)	Asian: 14(15.7%)	Asian: 6(13.3%)
Black: 11(4.8%)	Black: 6(6.7%)	Black: 3(6.7%)
Multiracial: 10(4.4%)	Multiracial: 5(5.6%)	Multiracial: 4(8.9%)
Latinos: 12(5.2%)	Latinos: 6(6.7%)	Latinos: 5(11.1%)
Not reported: 1(0.4%)	Not reported: 1(1.1%)	Not reported: 0(0.0%)
Domicile:	Domicile:	Domicile:
United States: 209(63.9%)	United States: 80(89.9%)	United States: 43(95.6%)
International: 108(34.1%)	International: 9(10.1%)	International: 2(4.4%)

Missing applicant data is not reported because not all applicants self-identify with these demographic details in their applications. Of the 317 completed applications reviewed, HDC denied 228 applications (71.9%) and admitted 89 applicants (28.1%). Of the 89 applicants admitted, 45 (50.6%) matriculated (CMHC, dual, and school counseling) and 44 applicants (49.4%) declined the admission. The School Counseling Digital Learning (SCDL) track was sunsetted during the summer of 2020, so no SCDL applications were received or considered in 2021 or 2022.

Annual Program Evaluation Data

The following information is collected annually by HDC program faculty and includes CPCE exit exam (see Table 4), comprehensive oral exam results (see Table 4), and NCE scores (see Table 5), and a 3-year rolling survey of employers, site supervisors, and graduates.

Table 4. HDC CPCE 2021 Results.

Area	<i>P</i>	Total (<i>n</i> = 55) <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i>	CMHC (<i>n</i> = 33) <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i> (<i>Mast</i>)	SC-OC (<i>n</i> = 10) <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i> (<i>Mast</i>)	SCDL (<i>n</i> = 12) <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i> (<i>Mast</i>)
PC Orientation & Ethical Practice	.62	0.65[74]	0.79[79](2.00)	0.67[75](1.90)	0.14[55](1.70)
Social & Cultural Diversity	.54	0.74[77]	0.81[79](1.62)	0.48[68](1.30)	0.69[76](1.50)
Human Growth & Development	.61	0.54[70]	0.59[73](1.44)	0.54[70](1.40)	0.38[65](1.30)
Career Development	.59	1.05[85]	1.14[87](1.91)	0.96[83](2.00)	0.80[79](1.80)
Counseling & Helping Relations	.61	0.60[73]	0.84[80](1.56)	0.10[54](1.00)	0.26[61](1.20)
Group Counseling & Group Work	.71	0.41[66]	0.52[70](1.83)	0.00[50](1.70)	0.32[63](1.40)
Assessment & Testing	.56	0.94[82]	1.09[87](1.72)	0.80[79](1.20)	0.54[70](1.30)
Research & Program Evaluation	.60	1.01[84]	1.10[87](1.67)	0.82[79](1.60)	0.60[73](1.50)
CPCE Total Score	.61	1.01[84]	1.17[87]	0.72[77]	0.63[74]
Comprehensive Oral Examination			(2.00)	(2.00)	(2.00)

Notes: *P* = National average item percentage passing; *d* = effect size reported as Cohen's *d*; *PR* = percentile rank of Vanderbilt students compared to the national average of all counseling students taking the CPCE as an exit exam in brackets []; *Mast* = Mastery proportion (2 = Mastery; 1 = Proficient; 0 = Nonmastery) in parentheses (); Total = all students combined; CMHC = clinical mental health counseling specialty students; SC-OC = school counseling specialty on-campus students; SCDL = school counseling specialty online students.

Table 5. National Counselor Exam (NCE) Results for 2021

	<i>P</i>	CMHC <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i> (<i>n</i> = 31)	School Counsel <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i> (<i>n</i> = 6)	Total Sample <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i> (<i>n</i> = 37)
Profess Coun Orientation & Ethical Practice	.72	0.61(73)	0.69(76)	0.62(74)
Social & Cultural Diversity	.70	0.80(79)	-0.30(38)	0.62(74)
Human Growth & Development	.68	0.40(66)	0.53(70)	0.42(66)
Career Development	.66	0.76(78)	0.71(76)	0.75(78)
Counseling & Helping Relationships	.70	0.58(72)	0.50(69)	0.57(72)
Group Counseling & Group Work	.70	1.20(88)	0.16(56)	1.03(85)
Assessment & Testing	.62	1.07(86)	1.43(93)	1.12(87)
Research & Program Evaluation	.68	1.26(90)	0.16(56)	1.08(86)
Professional Practice & Ethics	.60	0.81(79)	1.10(86)	0.86(81)
Intake, Assessment, & Diagnosis	.66	0.84(80)	1.01(84)	0.87(81)
Areas of Clinical Focus	.70	0.57(71)	0.74(77)	0.60(73)
Treatment Planning	.72	1.55(94)	0.26(61)	1.34(91)
Counseling Skills & Interventions	.69	0.58(72)	0.31(62)	0.54(70)
Core Counseling Attributes	.71	1.56(94)	0.34(63)	1.36(91)
Total NCE Score	.68	1.06(86)	0.75(78)	0.62(74)

Note: NCE results are presented as effect sizes (*d*) which are similar to a z-score interpretation, and in percentile ranks (*PR*) within parentheses. *P* = National proportion passing each item.

Disposition Assessment

Student dispositions were assessed in 2021-2022 using the HDC program Professional Performance Review (PPR) process. During Fall 2021, all students received a satisfactory rating of at least 1, except for one student who received a 0, did not respond to an action plan, and was dismissed from the program. In Spring 2022, all students received a satisfactory rating of at least 1, except for six students. Four of these six students responded satisfactorily to an action plan; two of the six did not and withdrew from the program.

Program Evaluation by Program Objectives

Objective A. To provide students with a thorough and comprehensive knowledge base in those areas of the social/behavioral sciences applicable to the helping profession. This includes a special emphasis on life-span human development.

Assessment of HDC Program Objective A was accomplished by collecting outcome data using the CPCE, NCE, Praxis, comprehensive oral examination, internship supervisor ratings, foundation course knowledge ratings, core course key performance indicators (KPIs), and employer, supervisor, and graduate survey ratings.

CPCE results for knowledge areas assessed are presented in Table 6. All areas were above the national average. Percentile ranks (in brackets []) ranged from 70-87 for CMHC graduates, 50-83 for school counseling on-campus graduates, and 55-79 for SCDL graduates. Total scores across all areas, which serve as the score upon which the pass/fail decision is made, indicate that after three years of study in HDC, the average CMHC graduate performs at the 87th percentile, after two years of study in HDC the average school counseling on-campus graduate performs at the 77th percentile, and the average school counseling on-line graduate performs at the 74th percentile of all counselors in the United States taking the CPCE as an exit exam. The scores for course KPI areas were transformed to conform to the rubric: Mastery (M) = 2; Proficient/Pass (P) = 1; and Fail (F) = 0. These results are also contained in Table 6 in parentheses (). In addition, the **comprehensive oral examination** comprised of a final case conceptualization conducted during the final internship semester was scored according to the same (2-1-0) rubric. All graduates from each program demonstrated mastery (2.00) during this culminating activity.

Table 6. HDC 2021 CPCE and Comprehensive Oral Exam Results to Support Program Objective A.

Area	<i>P</i>	Total (<i>n</i> = 55) <i>d</i> [<i>PR</i>]	CMHC (<i>n</i> = 33) <i>d</i> [<i>PR</i>](<i>Mast</i>)	SC-OC (<i>n</i> = 10) <i>d</i> [<i>PR</i>](<i>Mast</i>)	SCDL (<i>n</i> = 12) <i>d</i> [<i>PR</i>](<i>Mast</i>)
PC Orientation & Ethical Practice	.62	0.65[74]	0.79[79](2.00)	0.67[75](1.90)	0.14[55](1.70)
Social & Cultural Diversity	.54	0.74[77]	0.81[79](1.62)	0.48[68](1.30)	0.69[76](1.50)
Human Growth & Development	.61	0.54[70]	0.59[73](1.44)	0.54[70](1.40)	0.38[65](1.30)
Career Development	.59	1.05[85]	1.14[87](1.91)	0.96[83](2.00)	0.80[79](1.80)
Counseling & Helping Relations	.61	0.60[73]	0.84[80](1.56)	0.10[54](1.00)	0.26[61](1.20)
Group Counseling & Group Work	.71	0.41[66]	0.52[70](1.83)	0.00[50](1.70)	0.32[63](1.40)
Assessment & Testing	.56	0.94[82]	1.09[87](1.72)	0.80[79](1.20)	0.54[70](1.30)
Research & Program Eval	.60	1.01[84]	1.10[87](1.67)	0.82[79](1.60)	0.60[73](1.50)
CPCE Total Score	.61	1.01[84]	1.17[87]	0.72[77]	0.63[74]
Comprehensive Oral Examination			(2.00)	(2.00)	(2.00)

Notes: *P* = average item percentage passing; *d* = effect size reported as Cohen's *d*; *PR* = percentile rank of Vanderbilt students compared to the national average of all counseling students taking the CPCE as an exit exam;

*(Mast) = Mastery proportion (2 = Mastery; 1 = Proficiency; 0 = Nonmastery) in parentheses (); Total = all students combined; CMHC = clinical mental health counseling specialty students; SC-OC = school counseling specialty on-campus students; SC-OL = school counseling specialty online students.

NCE results for knowledge areas assessed are presented in Table 7. All but one school counseling area were above the national average and average percentile ranks ranged from 66-94 for CMHC graduates after three years of study in HDC and from 38-93 for school counseling graduates after two years of study in HDC.

Table 7. National Counselor Exam (NCE) Results for 2021 to Support Program Objective A.

	<i>P</i>	CMHC <i>d/PR</i> (<i>n</i> = 31)	School Counsel <i>d/PR</i> (<i>n</i> = 6)	Total Sample <i>d/PR</i> (<i>n</i> = 37)
Profess Coun Orientation & Ethical Practice	.72	0.61(73)	0.69(76)	0.62(74)
Social & Cultural Diversity	.70	0.80(79)	-0.30(38)	0.62(74)
Human Growth & Development	.68	0.40(66)	0.53(70)	0.42(66)
Career Development	.66	0.76(78)	0.71(76)	0.75(78)
Counseling & Helping Relationships	.70	0.58(72)	0.50(69)	0.57(72)
Group Counseling & Group Work	.70	1.20(88)	0.16(56)	1.03(85)
Assessment & Testing	.62	1.07(86)	1.43(93)	1.12(87)
<u>Research & Program Evaluation</u>	<u>.68</u>	<u>1.26(90)</u>	<u>0.16(56)</u>	<u>1.08(86)</u>
Professional Practice & Ethics	.60	0.81(79)	1.10(86)	0.86(81)
Intake, Assessment, & Diagnosis	.66	0.84(80)	1.01(84)	0.87(81)
Areas of Clinical Focus	.70	0.57(71)	0.74(77)	0.60(73)
Treatment Planning	.72	1.55(94)	0.26(61)	1.34(91)
Counseling Skills & Interventions	.69	0.58(72)	0.31(62)	0.54(70)
<u>Core Counseling Attributes</u>	<u>.71</u>	<u>1.56(94)</u>	<u>0.34(63)</u>	<u>1.36(91)</u>
Total NCE Score	.68	1.06(86)	0.75(78)	0.62(74)

Notes: NCE results are presented as effect sizes (*d*) which are similar to a *z*-score interpretation, and in percentile ranks (*PR*) within parentheses.

Total scores across all areas, which serve as the score upon which the pass/fail decision is made, indicate that after three years of study in HDC, the average CMHC graduate performs at the 86th percentile of all counselors in the United States taking the NCE, and after two years of study in HDC the average school counseling graduate performs at the 78th percentile of all counselors in the United States taking the NCE.

Internship supervisor ratings were collected at end of Internship I (formerly known as Practicum) and again at the end of the 600-hour concluding internship course (Internship II/III) to offer evidence of the application of knowledge in clinical practice. This score was assigned by the Vanderbilt University faculty supervisor in consultation with the site supervisor. The same rubric designations were applied: M = 2; P = 1; F = 0. In Internship I, the average supervisor rating for CMHC on-campus students was 0.97 (*n* = 37); for dual program on-campus student ratings it was 1.06 (*n* = 16); and for school counseling students it was 1.09 (*n* = 11). All but two students received a score of at least proficient. In Internship II/III, the average supervisor rating for CMHC on-campus students was 1.39 (*n* = 33) and for school counseling on-campus students was 1.70 (*n* = 20)

Knowledge in the school counseling specialty area was assessed when 20 school counseling graduates sat for the **Praxis School Counseling Examination**. The results are presented in Table 8 below. The average total score for the school counseling graduates was 178.8, which

transforms into an estimated effect size (d) of +1.04. This is a percentile rank of 85. This means that the average HDC school counseling graduate did better than 85% of school counseling graduates across the nation who took the Praxis School Counseling Examination.

Evidence of **knowledge in the CMHC specialty area** was provided through the foundational knowledge course grade in HDC6400 Foundations of Clinical Mental Health Counseling, achieving an average rubric rating of 1.91 ($n = 22$), where Mastery (M) = 2, Proficient/Pass (P) = 1, and Fail (F) = 0.

Table 8. Praxis School Counseling Examination Results for 2022 to Support Program Objective A.

Program	n	Areas				Total	$d(PR)$
		1	2	3	4		
School	20	91.8%	84.0%	83.6%	82.2%	178.8	+1.04(85)

Notes: Areas were: 1 = Foundations; 2 = Delivery of Services; 3 = Program Management; 4 = Accountability; Total = Total Praxis School Counseling exam. The total score may be presented as an effect size (d) which is similar to a z-score interpretation, which can be converted into percentile ranks (PR) within parentheses.

Additional evidence of **knowledge in the SC specialty area** was provided through classroom-based foundational knowledge grades in HDC6200 Foundations of Professional School Counseling. School counseling on-campus students achieved an average rubric rating of 1.79 ($n = 29$), where Mastery (M) = 2, Proficient/Pass (P) = 1, and Fail (F) = 0. Dual program students achieved an average rubric rating of 1.81 ($n = 16$), while the SCDL students achieved an average rubric rating of 1.77 ($n = 13$).

Employer, graduate, and supervisor surveys asked respondents to rate how well HDC met objective A on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither agree, nor disagree; 4 = agree; and 5 = strongly agree). These results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Survey Results to Support Program Objective A (3-year rolling average)

Objective	Total sample	CMHC On-campus	School Coun On-Campus	SCDL
Employers	4.78[78%]	4.64[64%]	4.83[83%]	5.00[100%]
Supervisors	4.67[68%]	4.56[68%]	4.39[51%]	4.22[42%]
Graduates	4.77[77%]	4.79[84%]	4.78[80%]	4.78[80%]

Notes: M[Proportion of Strongly Agree].

Objective B. To aid students in the acquisition of counseling and helping skills such as individual counseling, supervision, testing, consulting, group work, interviewing, diagnosis, and assessment.

Assessment of HDC Program Objective B was accomplished by collecting outcome data from the comprehensive oral case conceptualization, CPCE and NCE results, internship supervisor ratings, skills courses rubric ratings, core course KPI averages, and employer, graduate, and supervisor ratings.

CPCE results for skill/knowledge areas assessed are presented in Table 10 for helping skills, groupwork, and assessment. All areas were at or above the national average ($d \geq 0$) with percentile ranks (in brackets []). The core course grades for each area were subsequently transformed to conform to the rubric: Mastery (M) = 2; Proficient/Pass (P) = 1; and Fail (F) = 0. In addition, the **comprehensive oral examination**, comprised of a final case conceptualization conducted during the final internship semester, was also scored according to the same (2-1-0) rubric. All graduates from each program demonstrated mastery (2.00) during this culminating activity.

Table 10. HDC 2022 CPCE and Oral Exam Results to Support Program Objective B.

Area	<i>P</i>	Total (<i>n</i> = 55) <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i>	CMHC (<i>n</i> = 33) <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i> (<i>Mast</i>)	SC-OC (<i>n</i> = 10) <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i> (<i>Mast</i>)	SCDL (<i>n</i> = 12) <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i> (<i>Mast</i>)
Counseling & Helping Relations	.61	0.60[73]	0.84[80](1.56)	0.10[54](1.00)	0.26[61](1.20)
Group Counseling & Group Work	.71	0.41[66]	0.52[70](1.83)	0.00[50](1.70)	0.32[63](1.40)
Assessment & Testing	.56	0.94[82]	1.09[87](1.72)	0.80[79](1.20)	0.54[70](1.30)
Comprehensive Oral Examination			(2.00)	(2.00)	(2.00)

Notes: *d* = effect size reported as Cohen's *d*; *PR* = percentile rank of Vanderbilt students compared to the national average of all counseling students taking the CPCE as an exit exam; (*Mast*) = Mastery proportion (2 = Mastery; 1 = Proficiency; 0 = Nonmastery) in parentheses (); Total = all students combined; OC = on-campus students; *P* = proportion passing.

NCE results for acquisition of knowledge and skill areas assessed are presented in Table 11. All areas were well above the national average. Percentile ranks across the nine skill areas indicate that after three years of study in HDC, the average CMHC graduate performs within a percentile rank range of 71-94 of all counselors in the United States taking the NCE, and after two years of study in HDC the average school counseling graduate performs within a percentile rank range of 56-93 of all counselors in the United States taking the NCE.

Table 11. National Counselor Exam (NCE) Results for 2021 to Support Program Objective B.

	<i>P</i>	CMHC <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i> (<i>n</i> = 31)	School Counsel <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i> (<i>n</i> = 6)	Total Sample <i>d</i> / <i>PR</i> (<i>n</i> = 37)
Counseling & Helping Relationships	.70	0.58(72)	0.50(69)	0.57(72)
Group Counseling & Group Work	.70	1.20(88)	0.16(56)	1.03(85)
Assessment & Testing	.62	1.07(86)	1.43(93)	1.12(87)
Professional Practice & Ethics	.60	0.81(79)	1.10(86)	0.86(81)
Intake, Assessment, & Diagnosis	.66	0.84(80)	1.01(84)	0.87(81)
Areas of Clinical Focus	.70	0.57(71)	0.74(77)	0.60(73)
Treatment Planning	.72	1.55(94)	0.26(61)	1.34(91)
Counseling Skills & Interventions	.69	0.58(72)	0.31(62)	0.54(70)
Core Counseling Attributes	.71	1.56(94)	0.34(63)	1.36(91)

Note: NCE results are presented as effect sizes (*d*) which are similar to a *z*-score interpretation, and in percentile ranks (*PR*) within parentheses.

Internship supervisor ratings were collected at end of Internship I (formerly known as Practicum) and the 600-hour concluding internship course (Internship II/III) to offer evidence of the application of knowledge to skills in clinical practice. This score was assigned by the Vanderbilt University faculty supervisor in consultation with the site supervisor. The same rubric designations were applied: M = 2; P = 1; F = 0. In Internship I, the average supervisor rating for CMHC on-campus students was 0.97 (*n* = 37); dual program on-campus students was 1.06 (*n* = 16); school counseling students was 1.09 (*n* =

11). All but two students received a score of at least proficient. In Internship II/III, the average supervisor rating for CMHC on-campus students was 1.39 ($n = 33$) and for school counseling on-campus students was 1.70 ($n = 20$)

Evidence of **skill in specialty areas** was provided through classroom-based skill application. All first semester students complete dyadic skill activities in HDC6330 Counseling Skills and Techniques and achieved an average rubric rating (on the 2-1-0 scale) of 1.22 for CMHC on-campus students, 1.20 for dual program on-campus students, and 1.15 for school counseling students. Likewise, in the second semester of the curriculum (or over the summer session), counselors complete a group work skill application activity in HDC6160 Group Counseling and achieved an average rubric rating of 1.65 for CMHC on-campus students, 1.60 for dual program on-campus students, and 1.61 for school counseling students.

Three-year rolling employer, graduate, and supervisor surveys asked respondents to rate the degree HDC met objective B on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither agree, nor disagree; 4 = agree; and 5 = strongly agree). These results are presented in Table 12 below.

Table 12. Three year rolling average survey results to support Program Objective B.

Sample	Total sample	CMHC On-campus	School On-Campus	SCDL
Employers	4.74[74%]	4.64[64%]	4.83[83%]	4.83[83%]
Supervisors	4.37[56%]	4.47[58%]	4.39[58%]	4.03[51%]
Graduates	4.52[60%]	4.47[54%]	4.49[55%]	4.69[70%]

Notes: $M(SD)$ [Proportion of Strongly Agree]{sample size}.

Objective C. To provide students with a knowledge of the organization and administration of human service agencies or schools as well as clarity regarding the personal/social, career, and academic role of the professional counselor in each of these settings.

Assessment of HDC Program Objective C was accomplished by collecting outcome data using foundation course knowledge ratings, Praxis scores for school counselors, internship supervisor ratings, and employer, supervisor, and graduate ratings.

Evidence of **knowledge in the CMHC specialty area** was provided through the foundational knowledge course grade in HDC6400 Foundations of Clinical Mental Health Counseling, achieving an average rubric rating of 1.91 ($n = 22$), where Mastery (M) = 2, Proficient/Pass (P) = 1, and Fail (F) = 0.

Knowledge in the school counseling specialty area was assessed when 20 school counseling graduates sat for the **Praxis School Counseling Examination**. The results are presented in Table 13 below. The average total score for the school counseling graduates was 178.8, which transforms into an estimated effect size (d) of +1.04. This is a percentile rank of 85. This means that the average HDC school counseling graduate did better than 85% of school counseling graduates across the nation who took the Praxis School Counseling Examination.

Table 13. Praxis School Counseling Examination Results for 2021 to Support Program Objective C.

Program	n	Areas				Total	d(PR)
		1	2	3	4		
School	20	91.8%	84.0%	83.6%	82.2%	178.8	+1.04(85)

Notes: Areas were: 1 = Foundations; 2 = Delivery of Services; 3 = Program Management; 4 = Accountability; Total = Total Praxis School Counseling exam. The total score may be presented as an effect sizes (*d*) which is similar to a z-score interpretation, which can be converted into percentile ranks (P) within parentheses. The Praxis total score average is about 170 (*SD* = 15).

Knowledge in the school counseling specialty area also was provided through classroom-based foundational knowledge grades in HDC6200 Foundations of Professional School Counseling. School counseling on-campus students achieved an average rubric rating of 1.79 (*n* = 29), where Mastery (M) = 2, Proficient/Pass (P) = 1, and Fail (F) = 0. Dual program students achieved an average rubric rating of 1.81 (*n* = 16), while the SC track students achieved an average rubric rating of 1.77 (*n* = 13).

Internship supervisor ratings were collected at the end of the Internship I (formerly known as Practicum) and the 600-hour concluding internship course (Internship II/III) to offer evidence of the application of knowledge in clinical practice. This score was assigned by the Vanderbilt University faculty supervisor in consultation with the site supervisor. The same rubric designations were applied: M = 2; P = 1; F = 0. In Internship I, the average supervisor rating for CMHC on-campus students was 0.97 (*n* = 37); dual program on-campus students was 1.06 (*n* = 16); school counseling students was 1.09 (*n* = 11). All but two students received a score of at least proficient. In Internship II/III, the average supervisor rating for CMHC on-campus students was 1.39 (*n* = 33) and for school counseling students was 1.70 (*n* = 20), and all were satisfactory or above.

Rolling employer, supervisor, and graduate surveys asked respondents to rate to what degree HDC met objective C on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither agree, nor disagree; 4 = agree; and 5 = strongly agree). Table 14 presents these results.

Table 14. Three-year rolling average survey results for employers, supervisors, and graduates to support Program Objective C.

Objective	Total sample	CMHC On-campus	School On-Campus	SCDL
Employers	4.52[61%]	4.18[36%]	5.00[100%]	4.67[67%]
Supervisors	4.27[50%]	4.34[60%]	4.29[48%]	4.03[41%]
Alumni	4.44[62%]	4.29[56%]	4.51[55%]	4.62[65%]

Notes: *M*[Proportion of Strongly Agree].

Objective D. To educate students in research/evaluation tools relevant to the delivery of helping services in either a community agency, school, or corporate setting.

Assessment of HDC Program Objective D was accomplished by collecting outcome data using CPCE, NCE, and Praxis results, internship supervisor ratings, core course KPI averages, and rolling employer, graduate, and supervisor ratings.

To measure understanding and use of research/evaluation tools, three core knowledge areas are operational: assessment, research, and career development. **CPCE results** for knowledge and skill areas assessed related to evaluation/research are presented in Table 15.

Table 15. HDC 2022 CPCE and oral exam results to support Program Objective D.

Area	<i>P</i>	Total (<i>n</i> = 55) <i>d</i> [<i>PR</i>]	CMHC (<i>n</i> = 33) <i>d</i> [<i>PR</i>](<i>Mast</i>)	SC-OC (<i>n</i> = 10) <i>d</i> [<i>PR</i>](<i>Mast</i>)	SCDL (<i>n</i> = 12) <i>d</i> [<i>PR</i>](<i>Mast</i>)
Career Development	.59	1.05[85]	1.14[87](1.91)	0.96[83](2.00)	0.80[79](1.80)
Assessment & Testing	.56	0.94[82]	1.09[87](1.72)	0.80[79](1.20)	0.54[70](1.30)
Research & Program Eval	.60	1.01[84]	1.10[87](1.67)	0.82[79](1.60)	0.60[73](1.50)

Notes: *P* = average item percentage passing; *d* = effect size reported as Cohen's *d*; *PR* = percentile rank of Vanderbilt students compared to the national average of all counseling students taking the CPCE as an exit exam; *Mast* = Mastery proportion (2 = Mastery; 1 = Proficiency; 0 = Nonmastery) in parentheses ().

Scores across the three knowledge and skill areas indicate that after three years of study in HDC, the average CMHC on-campus graduate exceeds the performance of 87 percent of all counselors in the United States taking the CPCE, and after two years of study in HDC the average school counseling graduate exceeds the performance of 79-83 percent of all counselors in the United States taking the CPCE in the on-campus program and 70-79 percent in the SCDL program. The core course grade ratings are included in parentheses in Table 15.

NCE results for knowledge areas related to research and evaluation are presented in Table 16. All areas were above the national average and percentile ranks ranged from 78-90 CMHC graduates compared to all counselors in the United States taking the NCE. After two years of study in HDC the average school counseling graduate exceeded the performance of 56-93 percent of all counselors in the United States taking the NCE.

Table 16. National Counselor Exam (NCE) Results for 2021 to Support Program Objective D.

	<i>P</i>	CMHC (<i>n</i> = 31)	School Counseling (<i>n</i> = 6)	Total Sample (<i>n</i> = 37)
Career Development	.66	0.76(78)	0.71(76)	0.75(78)
Assessment & Testing	.62	1.07(86)	1.43(93)	1.12(87)
Research & Program Evaluation	.68	1.26(90)	0.16(56)	1.08(86)

Notes: NCE results are presented as effect sizes (*d*) which are similar to a *z*-score interpretation, and in percentile ranks within parentheses. *P* is percentage passing for the area.

Knowledge of research/evaluation in the school counseling specialty area was assessed when 20 school counseling graduates sat for the **Praxis School Counseling Examination**. The results are presented in Table 17 below. The average proportion of correct answers to the accountability MCQs was 85.5% and 83.9% for the on-campus and SCDL tracks, respectively. The average total score for the school counseling on-campus graduates was 178.8, which transforms into an estimated effect size (*d*) of +1.04. This is a percentile rank of 85. This means that the average HDC school counseling on-campus graduate did better than 85% of school counseling graduates across the nation who took the Praxis.

Table 17. Praxis School Counseling Accountability Area Examination Results for 2021 to Support Program Objective D.

Program	<i>n</i>	Areas				Total	<i>d</i> (<i>PR</i>)
		1	2	3	4		
School	20	91.8%	84.0%	83.6%	82.2%	178.8	+1.04(85)

Notes: Total = Total Praxis School Counseling exam. The total score may be presented as an effect sizes (d) which is similar to a z-score interpretation, which can be converted into percentile ranks (P) within parentheses. The Praxis total score average is about 170 ($SD = 15$).

Internship supervisor ratings were collected at end of the Internship I (formerly known as Practicum) and the 600-hour concluding internship course (Internship II/III) and assigned by the Vanderbilt University faculty supervisor in consultation with the site supervisor. The same rubric designations were applied: M = 2; P = 1; F = 0. In Internship I, the average supervisor rating for CMHC on-campus students was 0.97 ($n = 37$); dual program on-campus students was 1.06 ($n = 16$); school counseling students was 1.09 ($n = 11$). All but two students received a score of at least proficient. In Internship II/III, the average supervisor rating for CMHC on-campus students was 1.39 ($n = 33$) and for school counseling on-campus students was 1.70 ($n = 20$)

Annual employer, supervisor, and alumni surveys asked respondents to rate the degree HDC met objective D on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither agree, nor disagree; 4 = agree; and 5 = strongly agree). These results are presented in Table 18.

Table 18. 3-year rolling employer, supervisor, and graduate survey results to support Program Objective D.

Objective	Total sample	CMHC On-campus	School On-Campus	SCDL
Employer	4.61[70%]	4.36[55%]	4.83[83%]	4.83[83%]
Supervisor	4.23[45%]	4.24[48%]	4.26[47%]	4.06[29%]
Graduate	4.23[42%]	4.04[35%]	4.06[32%]	4.65[67%]

Notes: M[Proportion of Strongly Agree].

Objective E. To introduce students to the wide scope of diverse populations they will encounter in their work settings, examine their own biases, and provide students opportunities to work with diverse populations, building cultural competency to work ethically with all people they may encounter in their work settings.

Assessment of HDC Program Objective E was accomplished by collecting outcome data using the CPCE, comprehensive oral case conceptualization, NCE results, internship supervisor ratings, core course KPI averages, and rolling employer, supervisor, and alumni ratings.

To measure understanding and skill in counseling individuals from diverse cultures, the social and cultural diversity core knowledge area was assessed using the faculty developed course grade rubrics that yielded scores for this CACREP core area. These scores are presented in the Table 19 below. **CPCE results** for the diversity area are presented in the following table. Scores indicate that after three years of study in HDC, the average CMHC graduate exceeds the performance of 77 percent of all counselors in the United States taking the CPCE, and after two years of study in HDC the average school counseling graduate exceeds the performance of 68 percent of all counselors in the United States taking the CPCE in the on-campus program and 76 percent in the SCDL program. The core course grade ratings are included in parentheses in Table 19.

Table 19. HDC 2022 CPCE and Oral Exam Results to Support Program Objective E.

Area	P	Total (n = 55)	CMHC (n = 33)	SC-OC (n = 10)	SCDL (n = 12)
		d[PR]	d[PR](Mast)	d[PR](Mast)	d[PR](Mast)
Social & Cultural Diversity	.54	0.74[77]	0.81[79](1.62)	0.48[68](1.30)	0.69[76](1.50)

Notes: P = percentage passing; d = effect size reported as Cohen's d; PR = percentile rank of Vanderbilt students compared to the national average of all counseling students taking the CPCE as an exit exam; Mast = Mastery proportion (2 = Mastery; 1 = Proficiency; 0 = Nonmastery) in parentheses ().

NCE results for the knowledge area assessing Social and Cultural Diversity are presented in Table 20. Scores indicate that after three years of study in HDC, the average CMHC graduate performs better than 79% of all counselors in the United States taking the NCE, and after two years of study in HDC the average school counseling graduate also performs better than 38 percent of all counselors in the United States taking the NCE.

Table 20. National Counselor Exam (NCE) Results for 2022 to Support Program Objective E.

	P	CMHC	School Counsel	Total Sample
		d[PR](n = 31)	d[PR](n = 6)	d[PR](n = 37)
Social & Cultural Diversity	.70	0.80(79)	-0.30(38)	0.62(74)

Notes: NCE results are presented as effect sizes (d) which are similar to a z-score interpretation, and in percentile ranks (PR) within parentheses.

Internship supervisor ratings were collected at the end of the Internship I (formerly known as Practicum) and the 600-hour concluding internship course (Internship II/III) to offer evidence of the application of knowledge in clinical practice. This score was assigned by the Vanderbilt University faculty supervisor in consultation with the site supervisor. The same rubric designations were applied: M = 2; P = 1; F = 0. In Internship I, the average supervisor rating for CMHC on-campus students was 0.97 (n = 37); dual program on-campus students was 1.06 (n = 16); school counseling students was 1.09 (n = 11). All but two students received a score of at least proficient. In Internship II/III, the average supervisor rating for CMHC on-campus students was 1.39 (n = 33) and for school counseling on-campus students was 1.70 (n = 20), with all Internship III students achieving proficient or higher.

Employer, graduate, and supervisor surveys asked respondents to rate how well HDC met Program Objective E on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither agree, nor disagree; 4 = agree; and 5 = strongly agree). These results are presented in Table 21 below.

Table 21. Employer, Supervisor, and Alumni Survey Results to Support Program Objective E (3-year Rolling Average).

Objective	Total sample	CMHC On-campus	School On-Campus	SCDL
Employer	4.52[70%]	4.09[46%]	5.00[100%]	4.83[83%]
Supervisor	4.45[45%]	4.58[65%]	4.45[55%]	4.08[32%]
Alumni	4.36[60%]	4.08[45%]	4.29[58%]	4.80[80%]

Notes: M[Proportion of Strongly Agree].

2022 PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENTS AND SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES

Program Announcements and Changes

In the 2020-2021 U.S. News and World, Peabody was ranked #4 in the nation as a college of education, and Vanderbilt University was ranked #14 in the United States and #53 in the world university rankings. The HDC program was ranked #15 in the national rankings for counseling and personnel services (CAPS) programs (<https://www.usnews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-education-schools/student-counseling-rankings>). Importantly, HDC is the only program ranked in the top 30 without a counseling doctoral program, so this national ranking is due solely to the strength of the master's programs.

CACREP conducted a virtual site visit in early August 2021 and the University received the team report in mid-September. At the January 2022 meeting, the CACREP Board extended our accreditation of all programs through March 31, 2030, without conditions. The faculty wishes to thank all students, alumni, supervisors, and administration for participation and support throughout this re-accreditation process. CACREP is finalizing the 2024 standards and faculty will begin aligning syllabi to those standards.

We are pleased to announce the 2022 HDC Awards decision. LeeAnn Wills won the Aubrey "North Star" Award for outstanding HDC graduate. She is now a counselor education doctoral student at the University of Tennessee – Knoxville.

Dr. Jessica Tyler was hired into the faculty of the practice position and will join HDC faculty in January 2023. Dr. Andy Finch became the new chapter faculty advisor for the Eta Delta Chi chapter of CSI, the international counseling honorary society.

A student suggested a student be appointed as faculty liaison to raise issues and concerns from students to faculty using a more formal process. After discussion over several months, HDC faculty added these responsibilities to the HDC graduate assistants moving forward. Time is available at the beginning of monthly faculty meetings for important student issues to be raised to the attention of faculty.

A robust discussion of student feedback from the townhall was held. The Action Plan was approved and distributed to faculty and students. Stemming from feedback at the March 2021 town hall meeting, faculty added fall orientation meetings for all tracks and all years to prepare them for the major events and outcomes for that academic year. Drs. Cobb and Frieden conducted the third-year orientations, Drs. Cobb and Erford conducted the second-year orientations, and all faculty conducted the first-year orientation. All of these orientations were completed within the first few weeks of the fall semester.

The HDC Social Media Advisory Committee, comprised of Karen Enyedy, Kerry Hare, Maggie Ratley, and Daniel In, presented language for a revised appendix for the handbook. The revised language follows and was placed in the student handbook for 2022-2023

Appendix D: Social Media Policy of the HDC Program Revised February 2022

In light of the prominence of social media and its use in both professional and personal realms, this policy is to clarify the use of social media in relation to the Human Development Counseling (HDC) program at Vanderbilt University. The information pertains to all unmoderated social media platforms (e.g., Facebook, TikTok, Twitter, Instagram, GroupMe, etc.). This policy was established in 2016 and is reviewed annually.

Intent

Many students have a desire to communicate with a broad audience and social media may be considered useful and desirable. We do not intend to imply that students cannot communicate in this way. We do want to make clear, however, relevant policies regarding the use of proprietary Vanderbilt naming conventions and which information is official and not official HDC program information.

Just as important, and regardless of the social media used, the Vanderbilt University HDC program expects responsible, ethical, and professional communication and places that responsibility upon the participants. We want HDC students to understand the legal and ethical parameters around the use of social media as students and future counselors, and to critically examine the benefits and consequences of use and consult with HDC faculty with questions and concerns.

HDC Social Media Advisory Committee

A Social Media Advisory Committee, comprised of student and faculty representatives, was created in 2016. This committee is expected to meet a minimum of once a year to address any issues or concerns that may occur with any social media platforms and make modifications in policies or content as needed. In addition, this committee will meet with any student about whom there may be concern over the use of social media and best practices regarding responsible and ethical use of all social media platforms. Alternatively, or in combination with the Social Media Committee, social media use is included as information that may warrant Professional Performance Review (PPR).

Vanderbilt University Social Media Policies

Many students in the HDC program are also employees of the university (eg, TAs, GAs, and other VU jobs) and are expected to abide by all Vanderbilt University and Peabody College policies as well as policies of the HDC program. For more information on Vanderbilt University policies, consult the Vanderbilt Social Media Handbook at the following link: [Social Media Handbook](#)

Ethical Codes

All students in the HDC program should be aware of and abide by the ethical codes of their discipline. We have included the relevant items here:

The ACA Code of Ethics (2014, p. 18) says the following about Social Media:

H.6. Social Media

H.6.a. Virtual Professional Presence

In cases where counselors wish to maintain a professional and personal presence for social media use, separate professional and personal web pages and profiles are created to clearly distinguish between the two kinds of virtual presence.

H.6.b. Social Media as Part of Informed Consent

Counselors clearly explain to their clients, as part of the informed consent procedure, the benefits, limitations, and boundaries of the use of social media.

H.6.c. Client Virtual Presence

Counselors respect the privacy of their clients' presence on social media unless given consent to view such information.

H.6.d. Use of Public Social Media

Counselors take precautions to avoid disclosing confidential information through public social media.

And the ASCA (2016) Ethical Standards for School Counselors states:

A.5. Dual Relationships and Managing Boundaries

School counselors:

d. Do not use personal social media, personal e-mail accounts or personal texts to interact with students unless specifically encouraged and sanctioned by the school district. School counselors adhere to professional boundaries and legal, ethical and school district guidelines when using technology with students, parents/guardians or school staff. The technology utilized, including, but not limited to, social networking sites or apps, should be endorsed by the school district and used for professional communication and the distribution of vital information (p.3)

A.14. Technical and Digital Citizenship

School counselors:

b. Take appropriate and reasonable measures for maintaining confidentiality of student information and educational records stored or transmitted through the use of computers, social media, facsimile machines, telephones, voicemail, answering machines and other electronic technology (p. 6)

Moderated Communication Platforms

Occasionally, HDC faculty will use chat or discussion features (eg, Brightspace discussions, Slack, Padlet) as part of an academic course. In those instances, faculty are moderating discussions as part of the course content.

Unmoderated Social Media Platforms

Please note – the communication channels/social media platforms discussed below are **not** moderated by HDC faculty.

GroupMe, slack channels, text messages

Many students have organized communication among groups of students in the program using group text applications such as GroupMe. Students are encouraged to examine the benefits and consequences of such use (e.g., benefits may include rapid communication and connection; consequences may include higher stimulation resulting in anxiety or other emotions; erroneous information communicated; risk of ethical breaches). We encourage students to assess their own comfort level with the use of these communication channels and to feel free to join and leave these groups at their own discretion.

Student-Led Individual Cohort and Track Group Facebook Pages

These pages are created by students, if they so choose. They are private pages, with access determined by those who create them. In the past, cohort pages have been utilized by students for student events and other relevant information for cohorts.

- These pages are not created by, moderated by, or endorsed by HDC faculty or the department or college. As such, per Vanderbilt policy, the names of these pages, within Facebook, cannot contain the word “Vanderbilt,” “HDC,” “Human Development Counseling”, or any other specific references to “Vanderbilt branding” and must indicate that they are not for official university business. Newly created pages will conform to these same policies, using a naming convention that does not include Vanderbilt branding or trademark. At no time should a student upload or post any course or department-related materials to social media, such as course syllabi, course schedules, assignments, etc.
- We recognize that many students have a desire to communicate privately and that the use of private Facebook pages may be considered useful and desirable. We do not intend to imply that students cannot communicate in this way. We do want to make clear, however, relevant policies regarding the use of proprietary Vanderbilt naming conventions and that the information posted is not official program information. More importantly, regardless of the names of these pages, the Vanderbilt University HDC program expects responsible and professional communication and places that responsibility solely upon the participants.
- Students should not post any audio or video recordings of any class sessions, client sessions, or private university or department meetings.

Other Social Media Platforms (eg, TikTok, Instagram, Twitter, etc)

- At no time should a student upload or post any course or department-related materials to social media, such as course syllabi, course schedules, assignments, etc.
- Students should not post any audio or video recordings of any class sessions, client sessions, or private university or department meetings.

LinkedIn

LinkedIn can be a helpful tool for students and professionals. If you do choose to have your own LinkedIn account, please be sure to follow the University’s policies on branding: [Social Media Icons](#).

It is critical to present yourself on LinkedIn with the appropriate titles/credentials you hold and to not portray yourself as a licensed or credentialed professional until you are one. Moreover,

while LinkedIn does have a place for “testimonials”, HDC students should keep in mind the ACA ethics codes related to advertising and testimonials, for example:

C.3. Advertising and Soliciting Clients

C.3.a. Accurate Advertising

When advertising or otherwise representing their services to the public, counselors identify their credentials in an accurate manner that is not false, misleading, deceptive, or fraudulent.

C.3.b. Testimonials

Counselors who use testimonials do not solicit them from current clients, former clients, or any other persons who may be vulnerable to undue influence.

Counselors discuss with clients the implications of and obtain permission for the use of any testimonial.

C.3.c. Statements by Others

When feasible, counselors make reasonable efforts to ensure that statements made by others about them or about the counseling profession are accurate.

Internship Sites’ Social Media Platforms

Some of your internship sites might have a social media presence, such as LinkedIn, Facebook, Webpages, etc. that might include your name and likeness. HDC students should view their internship sites’ social media platforms to be sure that any information posted about you as a student is in compliance with the HDC Social Media Policy and policies of Vanderbilt University. Should you have any questions or concerns, please bring these to your Internship Faculty Supervisor, HDC Academic Advisor, and/or the HDC Program Director. We are here to help you navigate these types of situations.

If you are concerned about social media postings by a student in the HDC program

- As our ethics codes state, informal resolution is often a good first step. If you are comfortable doing so, you should discuss your concern with your peer.
- However, if you do not feel comfortable doing so, and/or the social media post is concerning to you, you should consult with a HDC faculty member.

HDC Program Curricular Announcements and Changes

Several curriculum changes were made as we prepare for the school counseling program to move to a 60-credit hour required curriculum in July 2023 as per CACREP, and as we fine-tune our alignment with state licensure requirements. The Advanced Developmental Counseling course (HDC 6440) received a new course title and catalog description:

HDC 6440 Advanced Developmental Counseling and Psychopathology

Catalog Description: This course is designed to integrate concepts learned in Developmental Counseling Psychology with appropriate methods and interventions laying the groundwork for a broad understanding of developmental counseling practice. It assumes familiarity with basic developmental constructs. Additionally, this class will focus on psychopathology including transdiagnostic interventions that can be applied to a range of disorders and underlying patterns and processes. Students will gain practice in synthesizing, writing and presenting an organized theoretical framework for conceptualizing clinical cases.

CMHC catalog changes were completed to align internship terminology across tracks. Beginning fall 2022 and spring 2023, Internship II CMHC (6 credits) will become Internship II & III (3 credits each).

The faculty determined that all required courses will no longer be available to non-HDC students beginning immediately. Non-HDC student may continue to register for electives if prerequisites are met and space is available.

At the request of the Dean's office, faculty addressed a curricular challenge with summer CMHC internship by deciding that at least ten interns must register for and complete 3-credit internships during the summer semester for the section to run.

Changes were made to the programs of study for school counseling, CMHC, and dual tracks, effective with the incoming class of fall 2023. The new programs of study follow on the next three pages.

CLINICAL MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELING PROGRAM OF STUDIES (60 credits)

Three electives must be added to your program of study. Electives may be taken in summer, spring or fall semesters. Also note that you must take three classes each semester to remain a full-time student. Dropping below nine credit hours may affect your financial aid, student insurance or other assistance. Please see your advisor for assistance in completing your POS.

1 st Year CMHC	2 nd Year CMHC	3 rd Year CMHC
FALL Development Counseling Psych Theories of Counseling Counseling Skill & Techniques	FALL Diagnosis and Treatment Using DSM Counseling Diverse Populations Appraisal & Assessment	FALL Addictions Internship in CMHC II
SPRING Foundations of CMHC Group Counseling (or Summer) Research in Counseling	SPRING Social, Legal Ethical Issues Career Development Trauma: Impact & Intervention Internship I	SPRING Advanced Dev Coun Psych Internship in CMHC III

Name: _____			
Adviser: _____			
COURSE #	COURSE TITLE	CR	SEMESTER
HDC 6130	Developmental Counseling Psychology	3	FA 1 st YR
HDC 6010	Theories of Counseling	3	FA 1 st YR
HDC 6330	Counseling Skills and Techniques	3	FA 1 st YR
HDC 6400	Foundations of CMHC	3	SP 1 st YR
HDC 7810	Research in Counseling	3	SP 1 st YR
HDC 6160	Group Counseling	3	SP or SU 1 st YR
HDC 6150	Counseling Diverse Populations	3	FA 2 nd YR
HDC 6110	Appraisal & Assessment	3	FA 2 nd YR
HDC 6430	Diagnosis & Treatment Using the DSM	3	FA 2 nd YR
Elective	Elective 1	3	
HDC 6120	Social, Legal and Ethical Issues in Counseling	3	SP 2 nd YR
HDC 6440	Advanced Developmental Counseling	3	SP 2 nd YR
HDC 6420	Trauma: Impact and Intervention	3	SP 2 nd YR
HDC 7950	Internship in CMHC I	3	SP 2 nd YR
HDC 7980	Internship in CMHC II	3	FA 3 rd YR
HDC 6340	Addictions	3	FA 3 rd YR
Elective	Elective 2	3	
HDC 6100	Career Development	3	SP 3 rd YR
HDC 7980	Internship in CMHC III	3	SP 3 rd YR
Elective	Elective 3	3	
Total: 60			

SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM OF STUDIES (60 credit hours)

Three electives must be added to your program of study. Electives may be taken in summer, spring or fall semesters. Also note that you must take three classes each semester to remain a full-time student. Dropping below nine credit hours may affect your financial aid, student insurance or other assistance. Please see your advisor for assistance in completing your POS.

1 st Year SC	2 nd Year SC	3rd Year SC
FALL Developmental Counseling Psychology Theories of Counseling Counseling Skills and Techniques Foundations of Professional SC	FALL Appraisal & Assessment Counseling Diverse Populations Counseling for College Access, Adm...	FALL Addiction and the Human Services Prof Internship II
SPRING Social, Legal, & Ethical Issues in SC Group Counseling (or Summer) Research in Counseling	SPRING Exceptional Education & the DSM Career Development Counseling for Loss, Trauma, and Crisis Internship I	SPRING Internship III

Name: _____			
Adviser: _____			
COURSE #	COURSE TITLE	CR	SEMESTER
HDC 6200	Foundations of Professional SC & Guidance	3	FA 1 st YR
HDC 6130	Developmental Counseling Psychology	3	FA 1 st YR
HDC 6010	Theories of Counseling	3	FA 1 st YR
HDC 6330	Counseling Skills and Techniques	3	FA 1 ST YR
HDC 6120	Social, Legal and Ethical Issues in Counseling	3	SP 1 st YR
HDC 7810	Research in Counseling	3	SP 1 st YR
HDC 6160	Group Counseling	3	SP or SU 1 st YR
HDC 6150	Counseling Diverse Populations	3	FA 2 nd YR
HDC 6110	Appraisal & Assessment	3	FA 2 nd YR
HDC 6220	Counseling for College Access, Admissions, & Completion	3	FA 2 nd
	Elective 1	3	FA 2 nd , SP 1 st /3 rd
HDC 6230	Exceptional Education and the DSM for School Counsel	3	SP 2 nd YR
HDC 6100	Career Development	3	SP 2 nd YR
HDC 7951	Internship in School Counseling I	3	SP 2nd YR
HDC 6360	Counseling for Loss, Trauma, and Crisis	3	SP 2 nd YR
	Elective 2	3	FA 3rd YR
HDC 7981	Internship in School Counseling II	3	FA 3 rd YR
HDC 6340	Addiction and the Human Services Professional	3	FA 3 rd YR
HDC 7981	Internship in School Counseling III	3	SP 3rd YR
	Elective 3	3	SP 3rd YR
Total:		60	

DUAL TRACK: CMHC PROGRAM OF STUDIES (66 credit hours)

You must take three classes each semester to remain a full-time student. Dropping below nine credit hours may affect your financial aid, student insurance or other assistance. Please see your advisor for assistance in completing your POS.

1 st Year Dual	2 nd Year Dual	3 rd Year Dual
FALL Developmental Counseling Psy Theories of Counseling Counseling Skills and Techniques Foundations of PSC	FALL Appraisal & Assessment Counseling Diverse Populations Counseling for College Access, Ad Internship in SC II	FALL Diagnosis & Treatment DSM Addictions Internship in CMHC II
SPRING Social, Legal, & Ethical Iss SC Research in Counseling Counseling for Loss, Trauma, & Crisis Internship I Group Counseling (Must Be Summer)	SPRING Exceptional Education & DSM Foundations of CMHC Career Development Internship in SC III Soc/Leg/Eth Issues CMHC [audit]	SPRING Adv Develop Coun Psych Internship in CMHC III

Name: _____			
Adviser: _____			
COURSE #	COURSE TITLE	CR	SEMESTER
HDC 6200	Foundations of Professional SC & Guidance	3	FALL 1st YR
HDC 6130	Developmental Counseling Psychology	3	FALL 1st YR
HDC 6010	Theories of Counseling	3	FALL 1st YR
HDC 6330	Counseling Skills and Techniques	3	FALL 1ST YR
HDC 6120	Social, Legal and Ethical Issues in Counseling - SC	3	SPRING 1st YR
HDC 7810	Research in Counseling	3	SPRING 1st YR
HDC 7951	Internship in School Counseling I	3	SPRING 1st YR
HDC 6160	Group Counseling	3	SUM 1st YR
HDC 6150	Counseling Diverse Populations	3	FALL 2nd YR
HDC 7981	Internship in School Counseling II	3	FALL 2nd YR
HDC 6430	Diagnosis & Treatment Using the DSM	3	FALL 2 nd YR
HDC 6400	Foundations of CMHC	3	SPRING 2nd YR
HDC 6120	Social, Legal and Ethical Issues in Counseling – CMHC	Audit	SPRING 2nd YR
HDC 6100	Career Development	3	SPRING 2nd YR
HDC 7981	Internship in School Counseling III	3	SPRING 2nd YR
HDC 6110	Appraisal & Assessment	3	FALL 3rd YR
HDC 6340	Addictions	3	FALL 3rd YR
HDC 7980	Internship in CMHC II	3	FALL 3rd YR
HDC 6230	Exceptional Education and the DSM for School	3	SPRING 3rd YR
HDC 6440	Advanced Developmental Counseling	3	SPRING 3rd YR
HDC 6220	Counseling for College Access, Admissions, & Completion	3	FA 2 nd
HDC 6360	Counseling for Loss, Trauma, and Crisis	3	SPRING 2 nd YR
HDC 7980	Internship in CMHC II	3	SPRING 3rd YR
			Total: 66

Changes were made to the PPR Student Assessment Areas to move from a 5-point rubric to a 3-point rubric (0-1-2) to align precisely with the current KPI system required by CACREP. Henceforth, any disposition of 0 will be discussed by faculty during the semi-annual PPR meeting, or at another time when a major concern arises.

2 = Outstanding: demonstration beyond expected professional developmental level

1 = Satisfactory: demonstration at expected professional developmental level

0 = Unsatisfactory: Remediation is needed for satisfactory performance

1. Openness to new ideas rated from Closed [0 - unsatisfactory] to Open [2 - outstanding] with examples of demonstrated behavior:

0 - Unsatisfactory	1 - Satisfactory	2 - Outstanding
Is dogmatic about own perspective and ideas and does not discuss others' perspectives.	Is amenable to discussion of perspectives other than own.	Solicits others' opinions and perspectives about own work.
Blocks or challenges others from speaking when others have a different opinion.	Listens to others' ideas/opinions.	Asks questions about others ideas/opinions.

2. Flexibility rated from Inflexible [0 - unsatisfactory] to Flexible [2 - outstanding] with examples of demonstrated behavior:

0 – Unsatisfactory	1 - Satisfactory	2 - Outstanding
Shows no effort to recognize changing demands in the professional and interpersonal environment.	Effort to recognize changing demands in the professional & interpersonal environment evident but not consistently accurate.	Shows accurate effort to recognize changing demands in the professional & interpersonal environment.
Shows no effort to flex own response to changing environmental demands.	Effort to flex own response to new environmental demands is evident but not consistently accurate.	Shows accurate effort to flex own response to changing environmental demands as needed.
Exhibits negative reaction (e.g., anger, resentment) when faced with unforeseeable or necessary changes in established schedule or protocol.	Attempts to understand the need for changes in established schedule or protocol and can adjust without extreme reactions.	Exhibits maturity and professionalism when faced with unforeseeable or necessary changes in established schedule or protocol.

3. Cooperativeness with others rated from Uncooperative [0 - unsatisfactory] to Cooperative [2 - outstanding] with examples of demonstrated behavior:

0 – Unsatisfactory	1 - Satisfactory	2 - Outstanding
Shows little engagement in collaborative activities.	Engages in collaborative activities when requested.	Initiates collaborative activities even when not requested to do so.
Undermines goal achievement in collaborative activities.	Shows willingness to initiate compromise to reach group consensus.	Is a diplomatic member of collaborative activities and negotiates professionally.
Does not compromise in collaborative activities.	Shows willingness to compromise in collaborative activities.	Works actively toward reaching consensus in collaborative activities.

4. Willingness to accept and use feedback rated from Unwilling [0 - unsatisfactory] to Willing [2 - outstanding] with examples of demonstrated behavior:

0 – Unsatisfactory	1 - Satisfactory	2 - Outstanding
Shows no evidence of incorporating constructive feedback received to change own behavior.	Shows evidence of incorporating supervisory feedback into own views and behaviors.	Shows strong evidence of incorporation of feedback received to change own behavior.
Discourages feedback from others through defensiveness and anger.	Exhibits an open and non-defensive stance to others' feedback.	Invites feedback by direct request and positive acknowledgement when received.
Takes feedback contrary to own position as a personal affront.	Listens to feedback and did not take feedback personally.	Takes feedback as a professional growth opportunity and does not take feedback personally.
Demonstrates greater willingness to give feedback than receive it.	Is willing to both receive and give feedback in a balanced manner.	Actively engages in asking for feedback and providing feedback to others.

5. Awareness of own impact on others rated from Unaware [0 - unsatisfactory] to Aware [2 - outstanding] with examples of demonstrated behavior:

0 – Unsatisfactory	1 - Satisfactory	2 - Outstanding
Words and actions reflect little concern for how others are impacted by them.	Makes efforts toward recognizing how own words and actions impact others.	Independently recognizes how own words and actions impact others and seeks to ameliorate harm.
Misconstrues supervisory feedback about how words and actions were negatively impacting others.	Accepts, but does not typically initiate, feedback from others regarding how their words and actions impact others.	Initiates feedback from others regarding impact of own words and behaviors.
Routinely makes dishonest, contradictory statements.	Seeks clarification and feedback and takes responsibility for conflicting statements.	Clear communication and demonstrated awareness and ability to take responsibility for conflicting statements.
Lacking psychological boundaries; verbal disclosures include ethical/ legal violations for the context or carry the risk of harming others.	Exhibits psychological boundaries such that verbal disclosures only include details appropriate to the environment or situation.	Exhibits skilled awareness and use of psychological boundaries in a variety of contexts.

6. Ability to deal with conflict rated from Unable [0 - unsatisfactory] to Able [2 - outstanding] with examples of demonstrated behavior:

0 – Unsatisfactory	1 - Satisfactory	2 - Outstanding
Is unable or unwilling to consider others' points of view when dealing with conflict.	Listens to others' points of view when dealing with conflict.	When dealing with conflict, actively seeks out others' points of view.
Does not examine own role in a conflict.	With assistance from others, examines own role in a conflict.	Very willing to examine own role in a conflict and willing to take responsibility as needed.

Ignores supervisory advisement if not in agreement with own position during conflict.	Is consistently open to supervisory critique about own role in a conflict.	Seeks out and incorporates supervisory critique about own role in a conflict.
Shows no effort at problem solving.	Is willing to engage in problem solving efforts during conflicts.	Initiates problem-solving efforts in conflicts.
Displays hostility.	Participates in problem-solving efforts to reduce conflict.	Actively participates in problem-solving efforts to reduce conflict.

7. Ability to accept personal responsibility rated from Unable [0 - unsatisfactory] to Able [2 - outstanding] with examples of demonstrated behavior:

0 – Unsatisfactory	1 - Satisfactory	2 - Outstanding
Does not admit mistakes or examine own contribution to problems.	Is willing to examine own role in problems when informed of the need to do so.	Monitors own level of responsibility in professional performance.
Lies, minimizes, or embellishes the truth.	Is accurate and honest in describing own and others' roles in problems.	Invites constructive critique from others and applies it toward professional growth.
Consistently blames others for problems without self-examination.	Shows openness to self-examination about own role in problems.	Accepts own mistakes and responds to them as opportunity for self-improvement.

8. Ability to express and acknowledge feelings effectively and appropriately rated from Unable [0 - unsatisfactory] to Able [2 - outstanding] with examples of demonstrated behavior:

0 – Unsatisfactory	1 - Satisfactory	2 - Outstanding
Inappropriate emotional reactions or highly impulsive behaviors.	Appropriate expression of emotions conducive to the environment.	Skilled and balanced expression of emotions given normative or non-normative circumstances.
Shows little willingness and ability to articulate own feelings.	Shows willingness and ability to articulate own feelings.	Was consistently willing and able to articulate the full range of own feelings.
Shows no evidence of willingness or ability to recognize and acknowledge the feelings of others.	Shows evidence of willingness and accurate ability to acknowledge others' feelings.	Consistently and accurately acknowledges others' feelings.
Acts out negative feelings/ behaviors rather than articulate them.	Expression of own feelings is appropriate to the setting.	Expresses own feelings in a professional way and at appropriate times.
Resists discussion of feelings or interpersonal reactions in supervision.	Open to discussion of own feelings and interpersonal reactions in supervision.	Initiated discussion of own feelings and interpersonal reactions in supervision.

9. Attention and adherence to ethical and legal considerations rated from Inattentive [0 - unsatisfactory] to Attentive [2 - outstanding] with examples of demonstrated behavior:

0 - Unsatisfactory	1 - Satisfactory	2 - Outstanding
Engaged in inappropriate relationships with clients and in conflict with ACA or ASCA codes of ethics.	Maintains clear personal-professional boundaries with clients.	Actively seeks clarification and affirmation in supervision for clear personal-professional boundaries with clients.

Acted with prejudice toward those with different diversity factors than self and in conflict with ACA or ASCA codes of ethics.	Demonstrates sensitivity to diversity.	Demonstrates sensitivity to diversity and actively seeks continuous education to hone sensitivity to diversity.
Engaged in behaviors that placed client wellbeing at risk (e.g., did not follow up on behavioral emergencies, did not recognize “red flag” issues/ danger signs, did not seek immediate supervision during potentially harmful client situations).	Satisfactorily ensures client safety and wellbeing, recognizes clinical emergencies, and seeks out supervision.	Proactively assesses for client safety and wellbeing, recognizes clinical emergencies, and seeks out supervision.
Knowingly breached established rules for protecting client confidentiality.	Appropriately safeguards the confidentiality of clients.	Appropriately safeguards the confidentiality of clients.
Knowingly breached established rules/policies of their internship site.	Followed the policies and procedures of the internship site.	Followed the policies and procedures of the internship site.

10. Thorough and timely completion of required coursework, paperwork, and milestones for matriculation and consistent full attendance rated from Missed Deadlines/Lack of Thoroughness [0 - unsatisfactory] to Met Deadlines/Was Thorough [2 - outstanding] with examples of demonstrated behavior:

0 - Unsatisfactory	1 - Satisfactory	2 - Outstanding
Missed more than maximum allowed missed classes.	Attends all class meetings and participates adequately.	Attends all class meetings with excellent participation.
Missed deadlines for application to internship, even after reminders.	Met deadlines for application to internship with reminders.	Independently meets deadlines for application to internship.
Failed to meet minimal expectations in assignments.	Meets expectations in assigned work.	Exceeds expectations in assigned work.
Did not follow through on faculty, department, or university communication of concerns related to program coursework, paperwork, or milestones.	Completes program coursework, paperwork, or milestones with minimal prompts.	Demonstrates self-direction in completion of program coursework, paperwork, or milestones.

11. Professionalism rated from Unprofessional [0 - unsatisfactory] to Professional [2 - outstanding] with examples of demonstrated behavior:

0 - Unsatisfactory	1 - Satisfactory	2 - Outstanding
Displays unprofessional behavior in academic settings (e.g., responds to non-emergency phone calls/texts; uses technology in class not related to the course content; arrives late/leaves early often, falls asleep).	Regularly demonstrates professional behaviors in academic settings (is attentive, timely, and engaged).	Demonstrates high level of maturity and professionalism in academic settings.
Does not appear motivated to learn or engage respectfully with others.	Is dependable and responsive to others. Is generally prepared and ready to learn.	Exhibits excellent rapport with peers and instructors.

Displays unprofessional behavior at internship site (e.g., misses deadlines, submits incomplete/ inaccurate paperwork, arrives late/ leaves early).	Demonstrates good levels of maturity and professionalism at internship site and is dependable and responsive to colleagues, peers, and supervisors. Is generally prepared and ready to learn.	Demonstrates high levels of maturity and professionalism in work setting. Exhibits excellent rapport with colleagues, peers, and supervisors.
Displays poor professional communication at internship site (e.g., frequently interrupts other; ignores others and/or walks away from conversations; makes demeaning comments to or about others; uses racist or stereotyped words).	Displays appropriate professional communication at internship site.	Displays excellent professional communication at internship site.
Received at least one (1) score of zero (0) on the internship KPI.	All professionalism issues scores on the internship KPI met the minimum standard.	Many professionalism issues scores on the internship KPI exceeded the minimum standard.