

**University of Cincinnati
Counseling Program Assessment
2020-2021 Academic Year**

Prepared by:

Mandy La Guardia, Ph.D., Counseling Program and Assessment Coordinator
Jenna Alvarez, Ph.D., School Counseling Track Coordinator
Andrew Wood, Ph.D., Mental Health Counseling Track Coordinator
Mei Tang, Ph.D., Counselor Education and Supervision Track Coordinator



Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Overview/Narrative of the Counseling Program	4
Program Objectives and Key Performance Indicators	4
Overall Program Outcomes	9
Admissions and Enrollment Data	9
Student Performance Review Data (Summer 2016 – Spring 2017)	10
Graduation Survey Data	11
Doctoral Publication and Leadership Data	12
Graduation Outcomes	13
Key Performance Indicators Assessment Report	14
Core Key Performance Indicators	14
Core KPI 1: Helping Relationship Orientation	15
Core KPI 2: Ecological Systems of Counseling Practice	15
Core KPI 3: Ethical Strategies for Competent Practice and Wellness	15
Core KPI 4: Group Practice from an Ecological Wellness Perspective	16
Core KPI 5: Career Development and Planning	16
Core KPI 6: Biopsychosocial Perspectives on Human Growth and Development	17
Core KPI 7: Social Diversity and Cultural Humility	18
Core KPI 8: Research and Program Evaluation for Evidence Based Practice	18
Core KPI 9: Assessment Procedures for Treatment Planning and Outcome	18
Mental Health Counseling Key Performance Indicators	19
Mental Health KPI 1: Professional Advocacy in Mental Health Counseling	19
Mental Health KPI 2: Mental Health Services Delivery and Intervention	20
School Counseling Key Performance Indicators	21
School KPI 1: Developing as a Counselor in the Schools	21
School KPI 2: Performance within Educational Contexts	21
Counselor Education and Supervision Doctoral Key Performance Indicators	22
Doctoral KPI 1: Diversity Affirming Theoretical Decision Making	22
Doctoral KPI 2: Ecological Leadership and Advocacy	22
Doctoral KPI 3: Professionally Engaged Research and Scholarship	23
Doctoral KPI 4: Supervisory Role Identification and Culturally Inclusive Skill Development	23
Doctoral KPI 5: Counselor Educator Pedagogy and Assessment of Learning	24
Summary of Changes	25
Assessment Recommendations	26
Program Modifications Resulting from Program Assessment	28

Overview/Narrative of the Counseling Program

Counseling Mission Statement

The UC Counseling Program strives for national excellence in implementing an ecological counseling perspective through research and service with diverse populations, emphasizing underserved groups. As this vision is realized through faculty, staff, and student efforts, the program continues a tradition of national leadership.

The Counseling Program has three primary graduate programs including the MA in Mental Health Counseling, MEd in School Counseling, and EdD in Counselor Education. All three programs are accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Recognized as one of the longest running counseling programs in the nation, the Counseling Program has a long tradition of training quality practitioners to serve in school (K-12), community, and university settings.

The Counseling Program embraces ecological principles in counseling. Its programs emphasize ecological, systems-based counseling in training activities with an emphasis on prevention work. Master's degree students are trained in the delivery of culturally competent counseling services while doctoral students are trained in the research and leadership skills necessary to help shape the delivery of mental health care services, particularly among those who are traditionally underserved.

Program objectives are based upon three primary sources: (a) criteria established by those bodies accrediting the program (e.g., the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP], the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation [CAEP]), (b) relevant regulatory agencies (e.g., the Ohio Counselor, Social Worker, Marriage and Family Therapist Board [CSWMFT; for Mental Health Counselors] as well as the Ohio Department of Education [ODE; for School Counseling]) and (c) the overarching philosophy articulated through interactions among faculty, present students, alumni, and personnel in cooperating agencies and schools.

Program Objectives and Key Performance Indicators

In concert with 2016 CACREP Standards, the Counseling Program has developed Key Performance Indicators (KPI) that provide faculty the ability to assess our students' progress of selected CACREP Standards associated with their level of training and specialization. Tables 1-3 detail how each Program Objective aligns with the KPIs and other program level assessments. Details about each KPI are noted in Appendix A, including overall definitions as well as learning outcome definitions for respective knowledge and skills.

Table 1. Program Objective and Key Performance Indicator Crosswalk: Mental Health Counseling (MA) Program

Program Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Additional Program Level Assessments
<p>1. Students will demonstrate mastery of essential knowledge of intrapersonal, environmental, and interpersonal factors contributing to the development of or reduction in mental and emotional problems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KPI Core Area #4: Group Practice from an Ecological Wellness Perspective: Skill ● KPI Core Area #5: Career Development and Planning: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #6: Biopsychosocial Perspectives on Human Growth and Development: Skill ● KPI Core Area #1: Helping Relationship Orientation: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #2: Ecological Systems of Counseling Practice: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #6: Biopsychosocial Perspectives on Human Growth and Development: Knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty/Advisor evaluation of program performance
<p>2. Students will understand and apply efficient, effective and ethical counseling skills in individual and group mental health interventions to prevent and remediate mental and emotional concerns.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KPI Core Area #1: Helping Relationship Orientation: Skill ● KPI Core Area #2: Ecological Systems of Counseling Practice: Skill ● KPI Core Area #3: Ethical Strategies for Competent Practice and Wellness: Skill ● KPI Core Area #3: Ethical Strategies for Competent Practice and Wellness: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #4: Group Practice from an Ecological Wellness Perspective: Knowledge ● KPI CMHC #1: Professional Advocacy in Mental Health Counseling: Skill ● KPI CMHC #2: Mental Health Services Delivery and Intervention: Skill 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NCE/NMHCE results ● Supervisor evaluations
<p>3. Students will demonstrate effective use of a variety of information (e.g., direct observations, environmental knowledge, client self-expressions, current research) to analyze and integrate their clinical understanding of clients.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KPI Core Area #1: Helping Relationship Orientation: Skill ● KPI Core Area #2: Ecological Systems of Counseling Practice: Skill ● KPI Core Area #4: Group Practice from an Ecological Wellness Perspective: Skill ● KPI Core Area #7: Social Diversity and Cultural Humility: Skill ● KPI Core Area #8: Research and Program Evaluation for Evidence Based Practice: Skill ● KPI Core Area #9: Assessment Procedures for Treatment Planning and Outcome: Skill ● KPI Core Area #7: Social Diversity and Cultural Humility: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #9: Assessment Procedures for Treatment Planning and Outcome: Knowledge ● KPI CMHC #1: Professional Advocacy in Mental Health Counseling: Knowledge ● KPI CMHC #2: Mental Health Services Delivery and Intervention: Knowledge 	
<p>4. Students will communicate effectively in written and oral forms (e.g., class papers, case notes, reports, evaluations, presentations, group discussions).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KPI Core Area #1: Helping Relationship Orientation: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #3: Ethical Strategies for Competent Practice and Wellness: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #8: Research and Program Evaluation for Evidence Based Practice: Knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty/Advisor evaluation of program performance

Table 2. Program Objective and Key Performance Indicator Crosswalk: School Counseling (MEd) Program

Program Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Additional Program Level Assessments
<p>1. Students will master essential knowledge of intrapersonal, environmental, and interpersonal factors that contribute to the development of academic, personal, social, career success in K-12 settings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KPI Core Area #4: Group Practice from an Ecological Wellness Perspective: Skill ● KPI Core Area #5: Career Development and Planning: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #6: Biopsychosocial Perspectives on Human Growth and Development: Skill ● KPI Core Area #1: Helping Relationship Orientation: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #2: Ecological Systems of Counseling Practice: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #6: Biopsychosocial Perspectives on Human Growth and Development: Knowledge ● KPI School #1: Developing as a Counselor in the Schools: Knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Faculty/Advisor evaluation of program performance
<p>2. Students will master essential skills necessary to provide efficient, effective, and ethical interventions at individual, group, and whole-school level for development and enhancement of academic, personal, social, career success for all students in K-12 settings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KPI Core Area #1: Helping Relationship Orientation: Skill ● KPI Core Area #2: Ecological Systems of Counseling Practice: Skill ● KPI Core Area #3: Ethical Strategies for Competent Practice and Wellness: Skill ● KPI Core Area #3: Ethical Strategies for Competent Practice and Wellness: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #4: Group Practice from an Ecological Wellness Perspective: Knowledge ● KPI School #1: Developing as a Counselor in the Schools: Knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ohio Assessment for Educators (OAE) results ● Supervisor evaluations
<p>3. Students will master essential skills and attitudes necessary to carry out the professional school counselor's role with diverse stakeholders in an efficient, effective, and ethical manner.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KPI Core Area #1: Helping Relationship Orientation: Skill ● KPI Core Area #2: Ecological Systems of Counseling Practice: Skill ● KPI Core Area #4: Group Practice from an Ecological Wellness Perspective: Skill ● KPI Core Area #7: Social Diversity and Cultural Humility: Skill ● KPI Core Area #8: Research and Program Evaluation for Evidence Based Practice: Skill ● KPI Core Area #9: Assessment Procedures for Treatment Planning and Outcome: Skill ● KPI Core Area #7: Social Diversity and Cultural Humility: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #9: Assessment Procedures for Treatment Planning and Outcome: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #1: Helping Relationship Orientation: Knowledge ● KPI Core Area #3: Ethical Strategies for Competent Practice and Wellness: Knowledge 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● KPI Core Area #8: Research and Program Evaluation for Evidence Based Practice: Knowledge ● KPI School #1: Developing as a Counselor in the Schools: Skills ● KPI School #2: Performance within Educational Contexts: Knowledge 	
--	--	--

Table 3. Program Objective and Key Performance Indicator Crosswalk: Counselor Education (EdD) Program

Program Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Additional Program Level Assessments
1. Demonstrate competence in applying the ecological perspective as an integrative heuristic in counseling research, practice, and service	KPI #1: Diversity Affirming Theoretical Decision Making: Knowledge	
2. Demonstrate competence in research and grant writing in counseling and counselor education	KPI #3: Professionally Engaged Research and Scholarship: Skill	
3. Demonstrate competence as a skilled, creative counselor educator capable of training counselors to meet the service needs of a diverse clientele	KPI #1: Diversity Affirming Theoretical Decision Making: Knowledge KPI #2: Ecological Leadership and Advocacy: Knowledge KPI #3: Professionally Engaged Research and Scholarship: Skill KPI #4: Supervisory Role Identification and Culturally Inclusive Skill Development: Knowledge KPI #5: Counselor Educator Pedagogy and Assessment of Learning: Knowledge	
4. Demonstrate competence in assuming independent, multifaceted leadership roles in counselor education programs	KPI #2: Ecological Leadership and Advocacy: Knowledge KPI #3: Professionally Engaged Research and Scholarship: Skill KPI #4: Supervisory Role Identification and Culturally Inclusive Skill Development: Knowledge	Graduate Placement

Overall Program Outcomes

Admissions and Enrollment Data

Student admissions data is tracked across all programs as faculty seek to recruit high-quality, diverse students from the Tri-State Region and across the country. The admissions process is holistic in nature, with a variety of materials and interview criteria used to determine the best candidates. The following admissions data indicate a solid recruiting season for all programs, with all programs enrolling quality students.

Table 4: Admissions Data (June 1, 2020 – May 31, 2021)

	Applications Received	Fall Admission	Mean GPA	Mean GRE: Verbal	Mean GRE: Quant.
Counselor Education	20	9	3.90	148	145
Mental Health Cnl. (MHC)	167	31	3.62	155	151
School Cnl. (SC)	42	27	3.49	155	150

Student and faculty diversity remain important to the Counseling Program, which has been able to recruit a higher number of ethnic minority students in recent years. The Counseling Program is comparable to other CACREP programs in terms of gender and African American ethnicity, but is lower in terms of Asian American and Latino/a/x representation. From these results, the faculty identified a need to increase recruiting with Asian American and Latino/a/x prospects. The following table provides demographic data for all students currently enrolled in the program.

Table 5: Total Program Enrollment Data (Fall 2021)

	Total Current	Female	African American/ Black	Asian American	American Indian/ Native American	European American/ White	Hispanic/ Latinx	Multi-Racial	Inter-national	Not Reported
Doctoral: Counselor Education	26	84.6%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	69.2%	0.0%	3.8%	11.5%	0.0%
Mental Health Cnl. (MHC)	69	82.6%	20.3%	2.9%	1.4%	66.7%	0.0%	2.9%	4.3%	1.4%
School Cnl. (SC)	26	86.7%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	86.7%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%

Student Performance Review Data (Fall 2020 – Summer 2021)

In order to ensure the development of professional competencies and to evaluate satisfactory progress toward degree completion, the faculty continually monitors student performance. Instructors complete a review of each master's student in their class, which is used by faculty advisors to evaluate students on their professional dispositions as assessed by the Professional Dispositions Competency Assessment—Revised (PDCA-R) evaluating nine areas of professional competency. At a minimum, faculty advisors annually provide students a performance review, which is a summary evaluation encompassing faculty ratings across courses and field experiences, progress on professional behaviors, and progress in meeting overall program expectations. The overall mean ratings are listed overall for the 2020-2021 academic year and by program. The overall mean rating for summer 2020 was 3.91, fall 2020 was 3.61, and spring 2021 was 3.83.

Table 6: Student Performance Data (N = 373)

Item	MH Fall (n = 18)		School Fall (n = 20)		MH Spring (n = 322)		School Spring (n = 69)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Conscientiousness	3.47	.61	3.83	1.15	3.86	.90	3.75	.85
Coping and Self-Care	3.53	.51	3.57	.95	3.70	.80	3.65	.78
Openness	3.58	.51	3.74	1.05	3.99	.80	3.84	.70
Cooperativeness	3.58	.51	3.96	1.02	3.96	.82	3.88	.76
Moral Reasoning	3.63	.49	3.61	1.08	3.92	.82	3.83	.77
Interpersonal Skills	3.63	.49	3.91	.99	3.88	.76	3.83	.75
Cultural Sensitivity	3.47	.51	3.48	.73	3.64	.70	3.65	.68
Self-Awareness	3.63	.50	3.57	1.04	3.78	.73	3.65	.68
Emotional Stability	3.58	.51	3.70	1.06	3.83	.82	3.78	.78
Ethical Behavior	3.21	.42	3.43	1.16	3.88	.84	3.84	.82

Ratings Note: (1-below expectations; 2-slightly below; 3-meets expectations; 4-slightly above; 5-above expectations)

The mean disposition ratings for both programs indicate overall high performance in both programs, with average scores above 3.0 (good) in all cases. It should be noted that students tend to perform lower in their skills ratings in their first year and improve over the course of their program. This is also true in terms of initiative and leadership as students become more active in program, university and professional organizations, including Chi Sigma Iota, the local chapter of the counseling international professional and academic honor society. There were no concerns in the mean performance ratings.

Table 7: Graduation Survey Data

Item	2020 Mean (n=21)	2021 Mean (n=23)
Overall program curriculum	1.52	1.70
Preparation for best practices in your discipline	1.48	1.61

Instruction by Program Faculty	1.71	2.17
Instruction by Program Adjuncts	2.10	1.83
Instructor's use of technology within courses	1.57	1.91
Opportunities for applied field experience for real world application	1.14	1.61
Supervision and university-level support for field experiences	1.24	1.83
Guidance and support by Program Faculty	1.29	2.65
Availability of Program Faculty	1.81	2.70
Responsiveness of Program Faculty	2.15	2.74
Respect and support of diverse individuals	1.38	1.74
Overall Program climate (professionalism, mutual respect)	1.33	1.87
Co-curricular experiences (e.g., student organizations, social activities)	1.62	2.43
Support of School of Human Services administrative staff	1.48	2.35
Overall satisfaction with decision to pursue an education within program of study	1.24	1.57

The FYE 2020 Graduation Survey data reflected a consistent decline across all categories, largely due to challenges related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Even with these challenges, students remarked positively on the period prior to the pandemic, the faculty's interest in improving the program, the use of the cohort model, and field service experiences. One student reflected:

I loved the cohort model and the depth to which many of our classes went to. I value above all the ability to think freely and openly and felt that it was very much encouraged in our program.

Another student shared:

The cohort model offered an excellent opportunity to form peer connections. Especially experiencing this program essentially as an online student, it helped to have that relationship foundation in the first semester and a half.... The level of experience you get with the program is excellent. You are in schools from the beginning and throughout the program. It is intense but it helps you graduate quicker and prepare for your career more effectively.

There were also noted opportunities for improvements. Communication remained a concern for some students, points exacerbated by the pandemic and transition of all coursework and initial field services experiences online. The increased demands on faculty and students together with other COVID-19 related modifications caused delays in email communication and some confusion. One student summarized their experience and recommendations for improvement as follows:

Better and more timely communication. This wasn't an issue at all until COVID happened. I felt like there were times where I was confused about what I needed to be doing to complete the program and some emails would be answered after a long delay

or not even answered at all. The switch to online classes was hard on everyone, faculty and students. Just a suggestion for the future.

Overall, given the challenges of this year, we are very pleased with our overall ratings. Of the 23 students who completed the graduation survey, 10 (43.5%) indicated that they would recommend the program to another person, such as a friend or relative, and 12 (52.2%) stated maybe to this same question. One student (4.4%) indicated they would not recommend the program such persons. These figures were lower than 2020, but comparable to 2019. We expect student satisfaction to return to 2020 levels as we emerge from the pandemic and as the latest cohort has transitioned back to in-person activities.

Graduation Outcomes

Being CACREP Accredited, the Counseling Program reports vital statistics each year on the number of graduates, completion rates, exam rates, and job placement rates. Completion rates are calculated by obtaining the percentage of students who complete the program within the expected period of time, 2 years for full-time students and 4 years for part-time students. The full-time and part-time rates are averaged for a total completion rate. Licensure exam pass rates for MHC are provided by the Counseling, Social Worker, and Marriage and Family Therapist Board, combining both the National Counselor Exam (NCE) and National Clinical Mental Health Counseling Examination (NCMHCE). School Counselors take the Ohio Assessment for Educators. Job placement rates, per CACREP definitions, are based on best available information.

Table 8: Graduate Outcome Data

	Number of Graduates 2020-21	On-Time Completion Rate	Licensure/School Licensure Exam Pass Rate	Job Placement Rate
Counselor Education	2	25%	NA	100%
Mental Health Counseling	26	91%	96%	92%
School Counseling	4	50%	100%	100%

On-time completion rates are calculated by the percent of students who complete within the expected time for their degree. Full and part-time masters students are expected to complete in two and four years respectively. Doctoral students are expected to complete in four years. The graduation outcomes for 2020-21 show very high on-time completion rates for Mental Health, moderate rates for School counseling and very low rates for Counselor Education, indicating that students in this program have delayed their dissertation completion beyond the expected time period. As the School Counseling cohort starting in Fall 2019 was small (n = 6), on-time completion rates were

greatly affected by students requiring additional time due to personal reasons and decisions to enroll in additional coursework. The faculty makes a concerted effort to encourage students to graduate on-time and will maintain this focus in the coming year, identifying and helping students overcome barriers that may impede their progress. Job placement rates were exceptionally high in all programs.

Doctoral Publication and Leadership Data

Between 2020 and 2021, Counseling students and recent graduates (2 years or less out of program) published nine peer-reviewed journal articles with faculty in a variety of counseling related journals and texts. As faculty have increased their focus on supporting students in their scholarship and preparing them for counselor education positions, we have seen this scholarship trends improve. Students presented at a number of conferences on their own and with faculty, with a selection of presentations represented below.

Table 9: Students and Recent Graduate Publications and Presentations

Student publications and presentations indicated with an asterisk (~)

Publications

1. ~Albert, G., Richardson, G. B., Arnocky, S., ~Senveli, Z., Hodges-Simeon, C. R. (2021). The development and psychometric evaluation of a new Mating Effort Questionnaire. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 50, 511–530. 10.1007/s10508-020-01799-4
2. ~Bruns, K., La Guardia, A., Brubaker, M., Farrow, J., Cotton, S., & DelBello, M. (2021). Effectiveness of mindfulness-based cognitive therapy–Child with youth who have a parent diagnosed with Bipolar I disorder. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 43(1), 59–74. <https://doi.org/10.17744/mehc.43.1.0433>.
3. ~Emir-Öksüz, E., & Brubaker, M. D. (2020). Deconstructing disability training in counseling: A critical examination and call to the profession. *Journal of Counselor Leadership & Advocacy*, 7(2), 163-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2326716X.2020.1820407>
4. ~Hanson-Cook, B. S., & Richardson G. B. (2020). Social ecology of mental health in children with internalizing disorders. *Early Child Development and Care*. 10.1080/03004430.2020.1774570
5. Richardson, G. B., Acquavita, S., ~Lowe, L., & Smith, R. (2020). Structure and longitudinal invariance of the Short Alcohol and Alcohol Problems Perception Questionnaire. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*. 10.1016/j.jsat.2020.108041
6. Tang, M., Montgomery, M., ~Collins, B., & ~Jenkins, K. (2021). Integrating Career and Mental Health Counseling: Necessity and Strategies. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 58, 23-35. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joec.12155>
7. Tang, M., ~Coaston, S. C., Pibbbs, C., Dalila, N., Milholland, L., & Kathy, M. (2020). Utility of the Scientist-Practitioner Inventory in Counselor Education. *The Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, 13(4). Retrieved from <https://repository.wcsu.edu/jcps/vol13/iss4/6>

8. Gu, X., Tang, M., ~Chen, S., & Montgomery, M. (2020). Effects of Career Course on Chinese High-School Student Career Decision-Making Readiness, *Career Development Quarterly*, 68, 222-237. doi.org/10.1002/cdq.12233

Selected Presentations

1. Alvarez, J. & ~Neubauer, E. (2021, March). *Selecting Evidenced-Based Interventions to Support Students Who Have Experienced Trauma*. Presentation accepted at the Evidence-Based School Counseling Conference, Columbus, OH.
2. ~Bruns, K., Wood, A. W., Tang, M. (2021, February). Ethical issues of teaching and supervision for counselor educators in the digital age. Counselor Education Distance Learning Conference, Online
3. ~Hearn, B., Brubaker, M. D., & Richardson, G. B. (2021, March). Psychedelics & the Counseling Profession: Ethical Responsibilities and Dilemmas [Conference Session]. 2021 American Counseling Association Conference & Expo –Virtual.
4. Wood, A. W., Blount, A. J., & ~Bates, D. (2020, September). Posting and Protest: Understanding the Psychosocial Effects of Engaging with Activism. Association for Assessment and Research in Counseling Annual Conference, Online

We are also pleased to see our doctoral and master’s students being recognized for their professional efforts in teaching, research, and service. Students are receiving a wide range of awards and service positions nationally, in Ohio, and at the University of Cincinnati. We are very proud of our students and their accomplishments and have made a concerted effort to have them actively participate in these awards and service positions.

Table 10: Student Recognition and Service

Year Received	Student	Award, Honor, and Service Activities
2021	Kaitlyn Bruns	<i>Fellow</i> , Assc for Counselor Education and Supervision
2021	Sara Picket	<i>Dissertation Fellow</i> , CECH Dean’s Award
2021	Vanessa Sinclair	President, Upsilon Chi Chi Chapter of Chi Sigma Iota

Key Performance Indicators Assessment Report

This section will include outcome information specific to the assessment of *Key Performance Indicators* (KPI) for the counseling programs. Core indicators are associated with shared learning outcomes between both the mental health and school counseling specialties. Two *Student Learning Outcomes* (SLO) are associated with each indicator, with the goal of having one focusing on skill and the other on knowledge development. However, some KPIs currently have two or more SLOs focused on measuring knowledge only. Aggregate data for skill and knowledge outcomes will be presented along with an average of both skill and knowledge assessment for general evaluation of each performance indicator. Data collection for current *Key Performance Indicators* began in the summer of 2016, thus discussion of data may reflect outcome monitoring since that time and tables will reflect a one year comparison. Modifications made to assessments for student learning outcomes associated with each indicator will be discussed at the conclusion of this section. For full definitions of each Student Learning Outcome, assessment descriptions, and assessment performance thresholds, please see Appendix.

Core Key Performance Indicators

Currently, the clinical mental health and school counseling programs are assessed together, in part, using common core key performance indicators associated with CACREP standards 2.F.1 through 8. These “eight common core areas represent the foundational knowledge required of *all* entry-level counselor education graduates” (CACREP, 2016, p. 10) and are thus reflected throughout common curriculum courses. This section will focus on evaluating assessment outcomes associated with SLOs linked to common standards or core KPIs. Numbers reflect assessment results from summer 2020 through spring of 2021.

Core KPI 1: Helping Relationship Orientation. Faculty in the counseling program will create learning environments to increase student knowledge about effective counseling interventions, particularly with underserved populations, and explore ways to improve the lives of diverse persons with special physical and mental health needs in schools and other community settings through orientation to developmentally and ecologically-based ethical practice and skill development. In 2020-2021, one programmatic assessment was implemented (CPCE – Theory) and three course-based assessments were utilized to evaluate this indicator, occurring in the following: CNSL 7021 and 7023. Two knowledge assessments occur in CNSL 7023 and one knowledge assessment occurred at the end of the program through the CPCE (N=27). We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas. In 2016-18 students were performing above 90%, prior to the inclusion of the CPCE. Overall, KPI ratings reflect both CACREP standards and program standard assessment. Knowledge scores include CPCE outcomes, which were above the national average at 70.44% (2019-20 result was 68%); however, this result brought the overall average down. Without it, the KPI rating would have been 88%. A slight decrease was noted in skills scores for this evaluation cycle, likely due to supervisor assessment training. In the next evaluation cycle, the skills assessment will be standardized to match practicum and internship, using the CCSR Part A (Flynn & Hays, 2015). The CCSR is rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from superior to

unacceptable. These scores are tracked throughout the program, from techniques through internship. Techniques scores (taken during the first semester) are reflected in this KPI. Scores are expected to increase as a student progresses towards graduation. For example, in practicum, 2F1d averaged 69.8%, 2F1g averaged 67%, and 2F1f received an average rating of 65.4% (N = 78, reviews by site and university individual supervisors). An additional skill assessment will be added through case conceptualization in the next year.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	# of Assessments	2019-20 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	74.7	4	76.87
Skill	60.1	1	69
2F1d	61.8	1	61.8
2F1g	60.8	1	74.3
2F1f	57.6	1	75
Knowledge	89.2	3	83.12
2F1a	87.1	1	94.7
2F1b	95	1	Not Assessed
2F1e	90	1	96.3
2F5n	88.33	1	97.3
2F5a	94.6	2	95
2F5g	99.2	1	93
<i>CPCE (Summary)</i>	<i>70.44</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>68</i>

Note: 2.F.1 Professional Orientation/Ethics (a-h) & 2.F.5 Helping Relationships (a,g,n)

Core KPI 2: Ecological Systems of Counseling Practice. Faculty in the counseling program will help students develop an understanding of and ability to demonstrate their professional role as they engage diverse clients' familial, social, and vocational systems and will demonstrate consideration of ecological influences on the presentation of clinical concerns. Four course-based assessments were utilized to evaluate this indicator, occurring in the following: CNSL 7050 and 7060 over three semesters using the CCSR Part B and case conceptualizations. Course 7060 occurred over two semesters (internships one and two) with both mental health and school counseling students. We report results from two skills assessments over three time points. Knowledge assessments were determined to be a poor fit for this indicator and are in the process of being re-evaluated. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas. Outcomes in years 2016-18 were above 90% overall and exceeded 85% in subsequent years. Student outcomes marginally exceeded expectations in this area for this evaluative year. Outcomes remain effectively stable. Some data was missing from internship case conceptualizations, so not all student scores are reflected due to a shift in collection management during COVID.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	87.9	4	87.35
Skill	87.9	4	87.35
2F5b	93	4	89.93
2F5c	86.3	4	88.9
2F5d	86.85	4	89.9
2F5e	92.7	3	87.67
2F5f	86.5	3	82.333
2F5l	90.3	4	91.547
2F5k	87.5	4	88
2F5h	81.5	4	86.31
2F5i	83.9	3	82.9
2F5j	90.6	3	87.25

Note: 2.F.1 Professional Orientation/Ethics (b-d) & 2.F.5 Helping Relationships (b-f, h-l)

Core KPI 3: Ethical Strategies for Competent Practice and Wellness. Faculty in the counseling program will facilitate activities and discussions that orient students to the ethical and legal requirements of competent professional practice in diverse school and mental health settings while emphasizing the need for personal and professional development self-evaluation and self-care strategies to prevent burnout and compassion fatigue. In 2020, a specific ethical scale was developed for use in 2020-2021 and beyond (Part D) with data initially gathered in internship two (7060; N=40). Skill was also assessed in 7001 via a group-based ethical decision making exercise. Three knowledge assessments occurred through the ethics section of the CPCE and two written assignments in 7001. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas. Student outcomes in this area have consistently been above 85%. Student outcomes were as expected for this evaluative year. CPCE results were at 80.4%, above the national average as reported by NBCC (74.9%). Outcomes remain effectively stable.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	90.3	7	85
Skill	92.3	3	83.2
2F1i	84.2	3	100
2F1k	96.4	1	Not Measured
2F1m	96.4	1	Not Measured
Knowledge	88.3	3	87
2F1i	94.25	2	95.8
2F1j	95.2	1	89.4
2F1l	99.1	1	100
CPCE – Ethics Summary	80.4	1	77

Note: 2.F.1 Professional Orientation/Ethics (f-j, l)

Core KPI 4: Group Practice from an Ecological Wellness Perspective.

Students will design and conduct an ecologically valid group addressing the counseling needs of a specific population using ethical, culturally appropriate evidence-based practices. In 2019-20, six assessments were used to track outcomes, with four course-based assessments occurring in CNSL 7025 and CNSL 7060. The CPCE was used as an additional knowledge measure. This year was the first year the group skills assessment was implemented in 7060 (2F6d). We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas. The knowledge average exceeded 85% (87.4) when not including the CPCE. For 2019-20, knowledge scores were above threshold. Knowledge outcomes remain effectively stable in this area. The group skill rating will be implemented in practicum/internship evaluations in the coming year to improve tracking of skill growth, with internship reflected this year (N=3). Skill scores are intended to improve over time and due to low response rates and the new use of the CCSR group rating, skill scores are likely not reflective of actual learner skill in group settings at this time. This KPI indicated performance approaching the threshold (79% when not including the CPCE), which was higher than last year's score which was and is reported without the CPCE group summary score for knowledge.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	76.2	6	77.7
Skill	70.4	2	71.15
2F6d	70.4	3	71.6
Knowledge	82	4	87.68
2F6a	91.4	2	95.75
2F6b	89.5	4	89.6
2F6c	94.3	1	91.7
2F6d	78.2	4	88.2
2F6e	87.2	2	92.4
2F6f	86.7	2	92.7
2F6g	84.3	2	91.7
Summary: CPCE – Group	76.5	1	--

Note: 2.F.6 Group Work (a-h)

Core KPI 5: Career Development and Planning. Counseling faculty will facilitate an understanding of career development theories and decision-making models. Students will demonstrate their understanding of career information systems and labor market information, career development programming, interrelationships among work, family, and other life roles, assessment instruments and techniques relevant to career planning and decision making, as well as career counseling processes, strategies, and evaluation applicable to diverse populations in a global economy from an ecological perspective. No skill assessments are currently associated with this performance indicator. Thus, the program evaluation of this indicator is based on three knowledge

assessments, two of which are course based (CNSL 7015) and one results from the CPCE exam, career scale (N=27; 65% national average). We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in knowledge learning outcome areas. Student outcomes exceeded expectations.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI Knowledge	93	3	83.89
2F4a	94.6	1	--
2F4b	95.2	1	--
2F4c	100	1	--
2F4d	92.3	1	--
2F4f	93.9	3	--
2F4g	98	1	--
2F4h	92.4	1	--
2F4j	97.8	1	--
CPCE	73.2	1	65.9

Note: 2.F.4 Career Development (a-j)

Core KPI 6: Biopsychosocial Perspectives on Human Growth and Development. Faculty will provide students with an overview of theories, issues, and counseling strategies useful in facilitating healthy growth over the lifespan. The ecological counseling perspective serves as a foundation for understanding developmental processes as they relate to counseling practice with diverse populations. Students will learn what constitutes typical, atypical, and optimal behavior patterns over the lifespan as well as the role of family systems and other contextual factors that may influence cognitive and behavioral change over time. Emphasis is placed on strategies that counselors can use with diverse individuals and families to facilitate ethical and optimal development and wellness over the lifespan. In 2019-20, four assessments were used to assess this indicator, three course-based assessments were utilized to evaluate this indicator, occurring in CNSL 7011 and 8048. The CPCE was added as an assessment point in 2019. CPCE performance (59%) was above the national average (57.5%). We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas, having met and exceeded expectations since 2016. Outcomes remain effectively stable in this area, with CPCE scores above the national average.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	92.7	4	86.4
Skill	93	1	91.38
2F3b	88.3	1	87
2F3a	91.5	1	92
2F3c	96	1	95
2F3h	96.3	1	95
Knowledge	92.3	3	93.97
2F3a	96.3	1	96
2F3h	100	1	99
2F5b	95.6	1	94.25
2F3g	97.3	1	97
2F3i	98.2	2	99.5
2F3f	99	3	98.25
2F3e	93.2	2	94.38
Summary CPC – Development	59.12	1	--

Note: 2.F.3 Human Growth and Development (a-i)

Core KPI 7: Social Diversity and Cultural Humility. The program faculty will create an atmosphere for students to critically evaluate their own attitudes, beliefs, and values regarding all aspects of diversity so as to enhance their competency as an ecologically-oriented professional counselor in a pluralistic society. Students will be asked to review and understand theories of multicultural counseling, the counselor’s role in developing cultural self-awareness and competencies in the promotion of social justice. Two course-based assessments were utilized to evaluate this indicator occurring in CNSL 7005. The CPCE was also included as a knowledge measure. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas. Student outcomes met expectations in this area for this evaluative year and CPCE scores were above the national average. Outcomes are improved in this area.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	89	3	79.45
Skill	91.1	1	82.5
2F2d	92.3	1	99
2F2a	89.9	1	99.7
2F2h	91.2	1	76.7

Knowledge	86.8	2	76.4
2F2b	93.2	1	92.3
2F2c	94.5	1	90.6
2F2e	92.3	1	98.1
2F2f	90	1	99
2F2g	86.8	1	93.2
CPCE – Diversity	64	1	--

Note: 2.F.2 Social/Cultural Diversity (a-h)

Core KPI 8: Research and Program Evaluation for Evidence Based Practice.

Faculty in the counseling program will utilize a scholar-practitioner model to increase student knowledge about counseling research and evaluation, particularly with underserved populations, and explore ways to become informed consumers of research. Students will develop critical thinking skills related to the implementation of evidence-based practices through development of ecologically aligned program evaluation procedures. In 2019-20, three course-based assessments were utilized to evaluate this indicator occurring in CNSL 7008. The CPCE research subject area was added as a knowledge measure in 2019. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas. Student outcomes were difficult to assess in 2019-20 due to loss of the program LMS, which held data for all of our courses. Outcomes exceeded thresholds for this evaluative year and CPCE scores exceeded the national average reported at the time of testing (66.3%).

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	89.8	3	55.5
<i>Skill</i>	90.8	1	--
2F8f	90.2	1	missing
2F8h	91.3	1	missing
<i>Knowledge</i>	88.7	2	55.5
2F8j	94	1	missing
2F8g	92.3	1	missing
2F8i	93.3	1	missing
2F8a	94.3	1	missing
CPCE	69.6	1	55.5

Note: 2.F.8 Research and Program Evaluation (a-j)

Core KPI 9: Assessment Procedures for Treatment Planning and Outcome.

Faculty will facilitate learning experiences that ensure that students understand ecologically grounded approaches to gathering and interpreting assessment data for counseling purposes and apply information in a culturally appropriate and ethically sound manner. Students will communicate foundational information about the principles of measurement and assessment in school and mental health settings. In 2017-2018, two course-based assessments were utilized to evaluate this indicator occurring in CNSL 7031. The CPCE was used as a knowledge measure. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas. Last year, outcomes approached expectations. Outcomes in this area remained somewhat stable, meeting expectations and exceeding when the CPCE isn't included (91.8% for Knowledge).

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	85.1	3	82.2
<i>Skill</i>	91.7	1	89.5
2F7h	94.7	1	94
2F7f	88.9	1	87
2F7g	88.2	1	88
2F7i	96.5	1	97
2F7a	95.6	1	95
2F8b	91.4	1	91.6
2F7m	89.6	1	84
2F7e	88.8	1	90
<i>Knowledge</i>	78.6	2	73.78
2F7b	94.2	1	93
2F7j	95.4	1	97
2F7k	98.9	1	99
2F7l	90.2	1	90
2F7d	85.2	1	77
2F7c	88.6	1	73
2F7e	90.3	1	89
CPCE – Assessment	65.3	1	--

Note: 2.F.7 Assessment and Testing (a-m)

Core KPI Assessment Timeline for MA and MEd Programs

KPI	Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 3	Semester 4	Semester 5
1	CNSL 7021 CNSL 7023	CNSL 7050			CPCE
2		CNSL 7050	CNSL 7060	CNSL 7060	CNSL 8048
3		CNSL 7001 CNSL 7050		CNSL 7060	CPCE
4	CNSL 7025		CNSL 7060		CPCE
5				CNSL 7015	CPCE
6			CNSL 7001		CNSL 8048
7		CNSL 7005			CPCE
8			CNSL 7008		CPCE
9			CNSL 7031		CPCE

Mental Health Counseling Key Performance Indicators

Key performance indicators, skill and knowledge student learning outcomes associated with the mental health counseling program are design to assess student preparation regarding foundational knowledge, contextual dimensions, and practice of mental health counseling. These indicators align with CACREP (2016) specialty standards outlined in section 5.C. Refer to the assessment timeline at the end of this section for specific information related to the placement of learning outcome assessments associated with each mental health counseling performance indicator.

Mental Health KPI 1: Professional Advocacy in Mental Health Counseling. Faculty will provide educational opportunities for students to demonstrate an ability to develop and implement strategies for client advocacy within integrated mental health environments while attending to a holistic understanding of both systemic mental health treatment factors and diverse client needs. In 2019-2020, four course-based assessments were utilized to evaluate this indicator occurring in CNSL 7050, 7060 and 8030. Two comprehensive assessments were utilized to evaluate knowledge outcomes, one course-based and one as part of the specialty exit exam. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in combined assessment of both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas. Skills were assessed at 92.8% across two semesters (two internships; practicum data were missing) using the case conceptualization assignment, with noted increases from one semester to the next demonstrating student growth. Skill was also assessed using a rated skills video as an exit exam. Knowledge was assessed at 93% from a combination of the advocacy project and comprehensive exit exam. Outcomes in this area exceed minimum performance expectations.

Overall KPI and Standards

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI MHC #1	92.9	5	91.15
<i>C1b</i>	83.3	2	96.63
<i>C1c</i>	96.25	3	98.75
<i>(Skill) C3d</i>	96.9	3	91.25
<i>(Skill) C3c</i>	89.9	1	<i>Not Assessed</i>
<i>C2j</i>	92.8	3	87.75
<i>C2l</i>	88.8	3	91.67
<i>C2k</i>	96.6	1	85
<i>(Skill) C3e</i>	91.6	1	100
<i>C2i</i>	100	1	100

Mental Health KPI 2: Mental Health Services Delivery and Intervention.

Counselors-in-training will apply clinical techniques and interventions for the treatment of mental health issues in a mental health counseling setting through the appropriate evaluation of client needs and diagnostic factors through collaboration with other mental health professionals. In 2017-2018, three course-based assessments were utilized to evaluate this indicator occurring in CNSL 7031, 7060 and 8034. One comprehensive assessment was utilized to assess skill as part of the exit exam skill demonstration. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in combined assessment of both skill (91.9%) and knowledge (88.3%) learning outcome areas exceeded expectations. For this academic year, students performed above expectations.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI MHC #2	90.1	4	95
<i>C2d</i>	91.5	2	90.8
<i>C2f</i>	83	1	77.65
<i>C1e</i>	81	1	88.15
<i>C2c</i>	92	1	93.2
<i>C1d</i>	94	1	90
<i>(Skill) C3b</i>	91.9	2	91.7

Mental Health Assessment Timeline

KPI	Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 3	Semester 4	Semester 5
1	CNSL 8030	CNSL 7050	CNSL 7060		Comprehensive Exit Exam
2			CNSL 7031	CNSL 8034	Comprehensive Exit Exam

School MEd Key Performance Indicators: Summer 2020 – Spring 2021

Key performance indicators, skill and knowledge student learning outcomes associated with the school counseling program are designed to assess student preparation regarding foundational knowledge, contextual dimensions, and practice of school counseling “necessary to promote the academic, career, and personal/social development of all P–12 students through data-informed school counseling programs” (CACREP, 2016, p. 33). These indicators align with CACREP (2016) specialty standards outlined in section 5.G. Refer to the assessment timeline at the end of this section for specific information related to the placement of learning outcome assessments associated with each school counseling performance indicator.

School KPI 1: Developing as a Counselor in the Schools

In the school counseling program students will be prepared to work with P-12 students using data-informed school counseling programs by learning and applying foundational models of student assessment, career development, and collaborative care from an integrated clinical-educator perspective. In 2020-2021, two course-based assessments were utilized to evaluate student occurring in CNSL 8010 and 8012. Students were required to use their knowledge of school counseling program development models to demonstrate professional skills through case study and community engagement to promote the academic, career, and personal/social development of students from a data-informed perspective. Students developed a group simulated comprehensive school counseling program (CSCP) in CNSL 8010 (time point 1) and in CNSL 8012, students did an individual CSCP that as connected to their internship site.

The second assessment, case conceptualization, is where school counseling trainees developed a case conceptualization of a K-12 student they are working with to demonstrate how they obtain, organize, and understand information about their student and how that information guides their session goals, interventions, plans, and collaborative efforts. The purpose of a case conceptualization is to guide counseling sessions by identifying how school counselors understand the nature of students' concerns, how and why the problems developed, and the type of counseling interventions through a theoretical lens. Our trainees, complete this assignment three times, once in each of the following course, CNSL 7050 (practicum), CNSL 7060 (internship 1) and CNSL 7060 (internship 2). In the spring of 2021, the rubric for this KPI assessment was overhauled to better reflect the role of the school counselor. Thus, it makes it difficult to assess comparatively from 2019-2020 as well as from the previous fall semester.

In the 2019-2020, academic year, our complete KPI #1 was restructured with the addition of a third assessment to be collected at two different time points, in CNSL 8014 and CNSL 8016. These changes are consistent with on-boarding of new school counseling faculty members in both the 2019-2020 and the 2020-2021 academic years, which make up the complete specialty faculty for the school counseling program. In this assessment, students analyze the usefulness of models associated with the implementation of effective and evidence-based school counseling programs to include a focus on career development, ecological systems assessment, and collaboration so

they can develop data-driven plans that fit student needs. The purpose of this assignment is to create a counseling intervention that addresses the unique needs of students with disabilities in the areas of academic development, career development, or personal/social development. With the impacts of COVID-19, our department now rotates CNSL 8014 and CNSL 8016 each academic year. This academic year (2020-2021), the assessment was conducted for both first- and second-year student in CNSL 8016 and the assessment will be conducted in CNSL 8014 in the 2021-2022 academic year. Thus, comparison data between academic years is unavailable.

In 2020-2021, the program experienced the onboarding of a new faculty member, which was a carryover of transitions from the previous academic year in the school counseling program. Thus, there was some missing data from the previous academic year, making it difficult to fully assess total student growth. Additionally, KPI's were adjusted and more standards were added for assessment monitoring. However, we expect that students will perform at 85% or better in all the combined assessment of both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	# of Assessments	2019-2020 Average / #
KPI School #1	95.4		
Skill	95.1		
5.G.3.a	85.5	2	Not Assessed
5.G.2.f	93.5	2	Not Assessed
5.G.3.n	91.75	2	98.5
5.G.3.b	100	1	Not Assessed
5.G.2.o	100	1	100
5.G.2.n	100	1	Not Assessed
Knowledge	95.8		
5.G.3.e	92	1	Not Assessed
5.G.3.g	97	1	Not Assessed
5.G.3.k	83	1	Not Assessed
5.G.3.o	96	1	100
5.G.2.b	90	1	Not Assessed
5.G.3.c	95	1	Not Assessed
5.G.3.n	85.6	2	Not Assessed
5.G.2.i	86.25	2	Not Assessed
5.G.3.h	85.6	2	Not Assessed
5.G.3.f	78	2	Not Assessed
5.G.2.n	70	2	Not Assessed

School KPI 2: Performance within Educational Contexts

In the school counseling program students will master the scope and practice of a professional school counselor and demonstrate the disposition of a change agent by attending to CACREP standards as well as the ASCA Standards for School Counselor Preparation. All of which outline the school counselor's role in leadership, advocacy, and collaboration with children, adolescents, and key stakeholders. In the 2020-2021 academic year, two assessments were utilized, each having two time points to evaluate students in CNSL 8010, CNSL 8012, CNSL 7060 (internship 1), and CNSL 7060 (internship 2).

In the first assessment, *Professional Identity and Advocacy: School Counselor and Administrator Interview*, students were asked to demonstrate an understanding of their role and responsibilities as a school counselor through engagement with professional school counselors and administrators to develop an understanding of an effective evidence-based comprehensive school counseling program (CSCP) which provides services and advocates for students and families. The purpose of this assignment was to provide students with an opportunity to gain insight on how school counselors work to advocate for systemic change and the impact administration can have on CSCPs. Students will interview a school counselor and administrator from the same school district to examine the role the school counselor and how administrators can or do impact the work of the professional school counselor as aligned with the ASCA national model. Students will reflect on the impacts of professional identity and role confusion. This assessment occurs over two time points in CNSL 8010 and CNSL 8012. Given the aforementioned faculty transitions, data is missing from the 2019-2020 to 2020-2021 academic year. Within this current academic year, minor word and CACREP standard changes were made to the rubrics, which is consistent with the onboarding on new faculty. We expect that students will perform at 85% of better or better in assessment of the knowledge learning outcomes. This year students performed above expectations this academic year, with the lowest average at an 89.5%.

In the second assessment, *Closing the Gap Through Advocacy Work and Data*, students were asked to demonstrate an understanding of how professional school counselors work to close gaps for marginalized students through engagement in either an MTSS (internship 1) and 504 or IEP meetings (internship 2) to create a culture of advocacy with key stakeholders. Additionally, students will examine and analyze data related to the meetings attended. The purpose of this assignment was to provide students with an opportunity to demonstrate, through reflection and evaluation of data, how they advocated for the needs of students by attending and actively participating in MTSS (IAT/RTI), 504 and/or IEP meetings. Counselor trainees will be required to document participation within at least 4 total meetings and active engagement in collaboration with key stakeholders (two meetings for each time point). The purpose of this assignments is to also engage school counselor trainees in analyzing and interpreting the data. This assessment occurs over two time points in CNSL 7060 (internship 1) and CNSL 7060 (internship 2). The assessments were drafted in early spring semester of 2020, where the CNSL 7060 (internship 2) assessment was piloted with students. Through this pilot, feedback was gathered and minor changes to both rubrics, including wording and CACREP standards, were made in early fall 2020. We expect that students will perform at 85% of better or better in assessment of the knowledge learning outcomes. This year students performed above expectations this

academic year, with the lowest average at an 88%. Updates in the KPI resulted in addition of standards not previously assessed.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	# of Assessments	2019-2020 Average / #
KPI School #2	93.8		89.9
<i>Knowledge</i>	92.92		
5.G.2.b	92	2	<i>Not Assessed</i>
5.G.2.j	90.5	2	<i>Not Assessed</i>
5.G.2.a	96.6	2	80.95
5.G.2.d	96	2	66.67
5.G.2.l	89.5		76.19
Skill	94.75		
5.G.2.d	88	2	66.67
5.G.2.a	100	2	80.95
5.G.1.d	89.5	2	<i>Not Assessed</i>
5.G.1.b	98	2	<i>Not Assessed</i>
5.G.3.d	98	2	<i>Not Assessed</i>
5.G.3.l	95	2	<i>Not Assessed</i>

School Track Summary

Below review a summarization of the timeline for each KPI in terms of when assessment occurs during the program.

Changes made between May 1, 2020, and May 1, 2021:

- KPI # 1; Assessment 2; revised to reflect the role of the school counselor
- KPI # 1; Assessment 3; recreated for CNSL 8016
- KPI # 1; Assessment 3; drafted for CNSL 8014; under review for implementation in the 2021-2022 academic year
- KPI # 2; Assessment 2; finalized and approved for CNSL 7060 (Internship 1)

Assessment recommendations for review:

- Review of portfolio assessment rubric
- Add portfolio as a time point in either KPI # 1 or KPI # 2

KPI	Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 3	Semester 4	Semester 5
1	CNSL 8010	CNSL 7050 CNSL 8016		CNSL 8012 CNSL 7060	CNSL 7060 CNSL 8014
2	CNSL 8010			CNSL 8012 CNSL 7060	CNSL 7060 Portfolio

Counselor Education & Supervision Doctoral Key Performance Indicators

Key performance indicators, skill and knowledge student learning outcomes associated with the counselor education and supervision doctoral counseling program “are intended to prepare graduates to work as counselor educators, supervisors, researchers, and practitioners in academic and clinical settings” (CACREP, 2016, p. 38). These indicators align with CACREP (2016) specialty standards outlined in section 6.B and relate to doctoral student preparation for counseling, supervision, teaching, research and scholarship, as well as leadership and advocacy. Refer to the assessment timeline at the end of this section for specific information related to the placement of learning outcome assessments associated with each school counseling performance indicator.

Doctoral KPI 1: Diversity Affirming Theoretical Decision Making. Counselor education doctoral students will be instructed on ethical and ecologically-oriented conceptualization of clients from multiple theoretical perspectives while considering evidence-based counseling practices in multiple settings. Doctoral students will be expected to communicate the process of conceptualization to others so they may practice and grow as professional leaders. In 2020-2021, one course-based assessment was utilized to evaluate students are evaluated using the theories portion of the doctoral qualifying exam. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in assessment of the knowledge learning outcomes. For this academic year, students performed at expectations, which is equal to last year’s performance.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI CED #1	84.13	2	85.00/2
6B1a	88.51	2	91.25
6B1b	86.44	2	92.50
6B1f	86.44	2	96.25
6B1c	93.2	2	75.00
6B1d	81.75	2	67.50
6B1e	86.95	2	82.50

Doctoral KPI 2: Ecological Leadership and Advocacy. Students will be able to synthesize and apply research-based counseling leadership and advocacy to current professional counseling concerns. Students will be prompted to explore and develop their area of scholarly interests that promote advocacy with diverse populations through collaboration with the counseling program faculty. In 2020-2021, one course-based assessment was utilized to evaluate knowledge associated with this indicator occurring

in CNSL 9001. Additionally, knowledge was evaluated using the leadership and advocacy qualifying exam. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in assessment of the knowledge learning outcomes. For this academic year, students performed slightly below expectations, similar to last year.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI CED #2	82.20	2	83.14/ 2
6B5a	81.94	2	76.75/2
6B5d	84.75	1	95
6B5h	87.77	1	85/2
6B5i	80.50	1	82.5
6B5j	80.00	2	94
6B5k	78.26	1	81/2

Doctoral KPI 3: Professionally Engaged Research and Scholarship. Doctoral students will be introduced to major research issues and methodologies in the counseling profession, historically and today. Through reviewing published research from an ecological perspective, students will learn to analyze counseling research in terms of validity, style, theoretical meaningfulness, and implications for counseling practice. In 2020-2021, one course-based assessment was utilized to evaluate skill associated with this indicator occurring in CNSL 9021. In addition, knowledge was evaluated using the research doctoral qualifying exam. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in assessment of the knowledge learning outcomes. For this academic year, students performed below expectations; however, performance improved over last year.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI CED #3	83.46	2*	77.08/ 2*
4g	82.12	2	82.50
4a	83.33	2	75.00
4b	73.09	2	75.00
4c	missing	1	82.50
4i	80.21	2	55.00

4h	92.71	2	87.50
----	-------	---	-------

Doctoral KPI 4: Supervisory Role Identification and Culturally Inclusive Skill Development. Students will engage in conceptual and experiential development of supervision skills. Issues relating to the process of supervising counselors will be addressed theoretically and practically in a manner that is culturally inclusive and respectful of contextual factors that influence professional development. In 2020-2021, one course-based assessment was utilized to evaluate knowledge associated with this indicator occurring in CNSL 8040. Knowledge was also evaluated using the supervision qualifying exam. In the spirit of continuous improvement, a skills-based learning outcome was developed and be used in 2020-2. The indicator occurred in CNSL 9011. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in assessment of the knowledge learning outcomes. For this academic year, students performed slightly below expectations.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI CED #4	82	3	85.58
B2a	91.67	1	91.67
B2b	85.11	3	91.67
B2d	77.22	3	79.17
B2c	90	3	70.83
B2e	90.83	3	79.17
3f	76.17	2	50.00
3g	74.17	3	83.33
2h	89.6	1	83.33
2i	74	2	87.50
2j	85	3	95.83
2k	77.08	1	75.00

Doctoral KPI 5: Counselor Educator Pedagogy and Assessment of Learning. Students will develop, implement, and critically evaluate a graduate-level counselor education learning module effectively using best-practices, student-centered models of adult learning, ethical and culturally inclusive methods, and technology. In 2020-2021, one course-based assessment was utilized to evaluate skill associated with this indicator occurring in SPSY 8070. Knowledge was also evaluated using the

pedagogy portion of the doctoral qualifying exam. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in assessment of both knowledge learning outcomes. For this academic year, students performed above expectations and significantly improved from last year. The counseling faculty has been continually working on developing doctoral students; teaching skills via course work, internship experiences, and mentoring. A teaching skills assessment was developed and is being utilized in the doctoral internship course as pilot testing in the year of 2020-2021.

Area	2020-21 Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI CED #5	87.9	2*	73.44
<i>B3b</i>	91.69	2	75.00
<i>B3a</i>	88.81	2	77.08
<i>B3c</i>	91.69	2	75.00
<i>B3d</i>	87.29	2	75.00
<i>B3e</i>	86.46	2	72.92
<i>B3g</i>	80.88	2	64.48
<i>B3h</i>	83.75	2	64.58

KPI	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 3	Sem. 4	Sem. 5	Sem. 6+
1	CNSL 9003				Qualifying Exams	
2	CNSL 9001					
3				CNSL 9020 (9021)		Dissertation
4	CNSL 8040	CNSL 9011				
5			CNSL 9060	SPSY 8070		

Performance Summary

Similar to last year, seven Entry-Level (masters) core key performance indicators exceed expectations for 2017-2018 while two fell slightly below expectations (KPIs 4 and 9). Within the Mental Health Counseling program both KPIs exceeded expectations, similar to last year. Within the School Counseling program, both KPI's exceeded expectations with a resolution of missing data. Within the Counselor Education doctoral program, two of the five KPI areas exceeded expectations, similar to last year. Underperforming areas were reviewed to determine potential causes for low outcomes, including influences of the COVID-19 pandemic, as all courses were shifted online in a traditionally face-to-face program mid-Fall semester. Changes were made for some assessment processes in order to improve evaluation of student learning and responsiveness to student educational needs.

Summary of Changes

For the core assessments, two updates are noted. The PDCA was added to review student dispositions across the program and the CCSR was updated to include an ethics and group assessment. Additionally, a group-based skills assessment was implemented within the group counseling course. These additional group assessments are intended to allow us to track skill associated with group work more consistently throughout the program. The PDCA was instituted to better monitor student dispositional needs using a validated, widely used scale. Ethics and dispositional assessments were added to track ethics skills, in practice, as evaluated by individual supervisors within the program and at our partnering sites.

Within the specialty programs, mental health had no substantive changes. However, faculty will be reviewing performance indicators to determine if additional areas are needed to better reflect program goals, specifically with regard to skill assessment. Faculty are currently considering integration of crisis counseling concepts for both school and mental health across the core and specialty curriculum. When this occurs, a performance indicator in both specialty areas will likely be added to reflect our focus on crisis response preparation and trauma-informed care education. School counseling made substantial updates to both KPI's resulting in more CACREP standards coverage aligned with the mission of the program. Those updates are detailed within the school counseling reporting section. School counseling KPI's are not expected to need additional updates in the coming years, as well will be focused on monitoring trends.

In the doctoral program, curriculum updates were made to include an advanced theories course as well as a quantitative design course specific for counseling. Addition of KPI assessments in these courses will be reviewed in the coming year along with potential updates to monitoring of outcomes associated with existing KPI's.

Table 11: CACREP Standards Coverage

Core Standards	Key Performance Indicator
2.F.1 Professional Orientation/Ethics (a-h)	KPI 1
2.F.1 Professional Orientation/Ethics (i-m)	KPI 3
2.F.1 Professional Orientation/Ethics (c-e)	KPI 2
2.F.2 Social/Cultural Diversity (a-h)	KPI 7
2.F.3 Human Growth and Development (a-i)	KPI 6
2.F.4 Career Development (a-j)	KPI 5
2.F.5 Helping Relationships (a,g,n)	KPI 1
2.F.5 Helping Relationships (b-f, h-l)	KPI 2
2.F.6 Group Work (a-h)	KPI 4
2.F.7 Assessment and Testing (a-m)	KPI 9
2.F.8 Research and Program Evaluation (a-j)	KPI 8
Clinical Mental Health Standards	
5.C.1 Foundations (a-c)	MHC KPI 1
5.C.1 Foundations (d-e)	MHC KPI 2
5.C.2 Contextual (a-h)	MHC KPI 2
5.C.2 Contextual (i-m)	MHC KPI 1
5.C.3 Practice (a-b)	MHC KPI 2
5.C.3 Practice (c-e)	MHC KPI 1
School Standards	
5.G.1 Foundations (a-e)	School KPI 1
5.G.2 Contextual (a-n)	School KPI 2
5.G.3 Practice (a-o)	School KPI 2
Counselor Education & Supervision Standards	
6.B.1 Counseling (a-d,f)	CED KPI 1
6.B.1 Counseling (e)	CED KPI 5
6.B.2 Supervision (a-k)	CED KPI 4
6.B.3 Teaching (a-i)	CED KPI 5
6.B.4 Research and Scholarship (a-l)	CED KPI 3
6.B.5 Leadership and Advocacy (a-l)	CED KPI 2

References

- Flynn, S. V., & Hays, D. G. (2015). The development and validation of the Comprehensive Counseling Skills Rubric. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 6*(2), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2150137815592216>