

**University of Cincinnati
Counseling Program Assessment
2021-2022 Academic Year**

Prepared by:

Mandy La Guardia, Ph.D., Counseling Program and Assessment Coordinator
Rachel Saunders, 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
Michael Brubaker, Ph.D., Associate Director SHS, CACREP Liaison



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Overview/Narrative of the Counseling Program	3
Program Objectives and Key Performance Indicators	3
Overall Program Outcomes	7
Admissions and Enrollment Data	7
Table 4: Admissions Data	7
Table 5: Total Program Enrollment Data	7
Student Performance Review Data	8
Table 6: Student Performance Data (N = 373)	8
Table 7: Graduation Survey Data	9
Graduation Outcomes	10
Table 8: Graduate Outcome Data	10
Post-Graduation Outcomes	11
Table 9: Post Graduation Survey Data	11
Table 10: Post Graduation Supervisor Satisfaction with Alumni Skills	12
Table 11: Post Graduation Supervisor Rating of Alumni Dispositions	13
Doctoral Publication and Leadership Data	13
Table 12: Students and Recent Graduate Publications and Presentations	14
Table 10: Student Recognition and Service	15
Key Performance Indicators Assessment Report	16
Core Key Performance Indicators	16
Core KPI 1: Helping Relationship Orientation.	16
Core KPI 2: Ecological Systems of Counseling Practice.	17
Core KPI 3: Ethical Strategies for Competent Practice and Wellness	18
Core KPI 4: Group Practice from an Ecological Wellness Perspective.	19
Core KPI 5: Career Development and Planning.	19
Core KPI 6: Biopsychosocial Perspectives on Human Growth and Development.	20
Core KPI 7: Social Diversity and Cultural Humility.	21
Core KPI 8: Research and Program Evaluation for Evidence Based Practice.	22
Core KPI 9: Assessment Procedures for Treatment Planning and Outcome.	23
Clinical Mental Health Counseling (MA) Key Performance Indicators	25
Clinical Mental Health Summary	30
School MEd Key Performance Indicators: Summer 2021 – Spring 2022	31
School Track Summary	36
Report of Counselor Education & Supervision	37
Performance Summary	41
Summary of Changes	41

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 PhD 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
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.	<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
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.	<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
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.	<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 	
4. Students will communicate effectively in written and oral forms (e.g., class papers, case notes, reports, evaluations, presentations, group discussions).	<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
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.	<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
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.	<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
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.	<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

May 1, 2021 – April 30, 2022

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 program no longer requires the GRE among these criteria. The following admissions data indicate a solid recruiting season for all programs, with all programs enrolling quality students.

Table 4: Admissions Data

	Applications Received	Fall 2021 Offers	Fall 2021 Admissions	Mean GPA
Counselor Education	21	12	8	3.90
Mental Health Cnl. (MHC)	158	50	30	3.69
School Cnl. (SC)	41	27	16	3.52

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. Overall, the Counseling Program is comparable to other CACREP programs in terms of gender and African American/Black ethnicity/race, but is lower in terms of Asian American and Latino/a/x representation. Recruiting diverse candidates for the school counseling program is also a challenge. From these results, the faculty continue to identify a need to increase recruiting with Asian American, Latino/a/x, and African American/Black prospects. The following table provides demographic data for all students enrolled in the program during the evaluation period.

Table 5: Total Program Enrollment Data

	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	24	20	4	0	0	16	0	1	3	0
Mental Health Cnl. (MHC)	62	56	14	2	0	44	0	5	2	0

School Cnl. (SC)	24	25	2	0	0	27	0	1	0	0
-----------------------------	----	----	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---

Student Performance Review Data

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 2021-2022 academic year and by program. The overall mean rating for summer 2021 was 3.7 (SD=1), fall 2021 was 3.91 (SD=.68), and spring 2022 was 3.76 (SD=.67).

Table 6: Student Performance Data (N = 373)

Item	(1-below expectations; 2-slightly below; 3-meets expectations; 4-slightly above; 5-above expectations)							
	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	3.68	.88	3.48	.82	3.77	.76	3.60	.79
Coping and Self-Care	3.68	.63	3.56	.71	3.76	.69	3.66	.78
Openness	3.71	.78	3.70	.80	3.94	.68	3.78	.75
Cooperativeness	3.83	.81	3.71	.82	3.94	.74	3.82	.74
Moral Reasoning	3.75	.75	3.62	.78	3.99	.71	3.63	.79
Interpersonal Skills	3.68	.76	3.63	.87	3.93	.67	3.75	.76
Cultural Sensitivity	3.58	.65	3.51	.73	3.90	.75	3.63	.77
Self-Awareness	3.68	.80	3.47	.80	3.93	.69	3.71	.75
Emotional Stability	3.68	.73	3.62	.76	3.87	.68	3.60	.78
Ethical Behavior	3.80	.72	3.78	.84	3.96	.69	3.63	.79

The mean disposition ratings for both programs indicate overall very good performance, with average scores above 3.75 (approaching slightly above expectations). 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 and the newly created chapter of Counselors for Social Justice. There were no concerns in the mean performance ratings.

Table 7: Graduation Survey Data

Item (1 = very satisfied, 5 = very dissatisfied)	2021 Mean (n=23)	2022 Mean (n=40)
Overall program curriculum	1.70	1.68
Preparation for best practices in your discipline	1.61	1.63
Instruction by Program Faculty	2.17	1.60
Instruction by Program Adjuncts	1.83	1.68
Instructor's use of technology within courses	1.91	1.45
Opportunities for applied field experience for real world application	1.61	1.38
Supervision and university-level support for field experiences	1.83	1.30
Guidance and support by Program Faculty	2.65	1.80
Availability of Program Faculty	2.70	1.60
Responsiveness of Program Faculty	2.74	1.70
Respect and support of diverse individuals	1.74	1.35
Overall Program climate (professionalism, mutual respect)	1.87	1.50
Co-curricular experiences (e.g., student organizations, social activities)	2.43	2.27
Support of School of Human Services administrative staff	2.35	2.10
Overall satisfaction with decision to pursue an education within program of study	1.57	1.48

The FYE 2021 Graduation Survey data reflected a return to pre-pandemic rates, as campus-based courses were held in person and some program activities returned to pre-pandemic levels. All but two items were rated, on average, between very satisfied and somewhat satisfied. Co-curricular experiences were rated just below somewhat satisfied, as was support of School of Human Services administrative staff. Some of these effects may be pandemic related as well as the minimal contact with School staff. Items with the highest ratings included those related to supervision and field service activities as well as program climate/respect and support of diverse individuals. Qualitative responses were similarly positive, particularly related to each program track and the online adaptation of courses during the pandemic. One school counseling student reflected:

The school counseling cohort and faculty are amazing, having that connection was super important to my success in the program -I did not mind when we were online [during COVID], even though it wasn't ideal, I feel like the faculty made it a great experience and were technologically savvy -I feel like UC has a positive reputation and that I had professional development opportunities through additional programs.

A mental health counseling student shared:

The best aspects of UC's Mental Health Counseling program is that we are a cohort-oriented program. Having a sense of community is so helpful when you are going through such rigorous, yet challenging experiences. I've also found that the professors are amazing and incredibly qualified in [so] many realms of counseling.

There were also noted opportunities for improvements. Communication remained a concern for some students, especially related to taking the masters comprehensive exams, and preparing for graduation. We were pleased to see more positive feedback from School Counseling students in comparison to prior years; however, some had concerns about taking the national standardized Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam, as some exam items are less relevant to school counselors. School counselors advocated for more specialized sections in core courses, particular for assessment and research.

Overall, given the challenges of this year, we are very pleased with our overall ratings. Of the 40 students who completed the graduation survey, 25 (62.5%) indicated that they would recommend the program to another person, such as a friend or relative, and 12 (32.5%) stated maybe to this same question. Two students (5%) indicated they would not recommend the program such persons. These figures were an improvement over 2021. Furthermore, 39 (97.5%) out of 40 students stated they were somewhat (47.5%) or very well (50%) prepared for a future career in their discipline.

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. Full-time doctoral students are expected to complete in four years. The full-time and part-time rates are averaged for a total completion rate. NCE licensure exam pass rates for MHC are provided by the Counseling, Social Worker, and Marriage and Family Therapist Board. School Counselors take the Ohio Assessment for Educators (OAE) and rates are collected through the test provider, Pearson Education. Job placement rates, per CACREP definitions, are based on best available information. Students who do not report placement data are considered unplaced.

Table 8: Graduate Outcome Data

	Number of Graduates 2021-22	MHC NCE Pass Rate	MHC NCMHCE Pass Rate	On-Time Completion Rate	School Licensure Exam (OAE) Pass Rate	Job Placement Rate
Counselor Education	2	NA	NA	25%	NA	100%
Mental Health Counseling	32	96% (22/1)	91% (11/1)	97%	NA	84%

School Counseling	12	NA	NA	100%	89%	100%
--------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------------	------------	-------------

The graduation outcomes for 2021-22 continue to show very high on-time completion rates for Mental Health and School Counseling. Counselor Education on-time completion rates continue to fall below expectations, indicating that students in this program have delayed their dissertation completion beyond the expected time period. 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 very high in all programs.

Post-Graduation Outcomes

CACREP requires periodic follow-up studies of graduates and employers of program graduates. In 2022, the program surveyed graduates who completed the program between 2018-2020. A total of 50 alumni responded, including 37 Mental Health Counseling and 13 School Counseling graduates, completing the program in 2018 (28%), 2019 (44%), and 2020 (28%). Respondents rated their satisfaction with 16 items, mirroring the Graduation Survey with one added item concerning research opportunities. Results are shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Post Graduation Survey Data

Item (1 = very satisfied, 5 = very dissatisfied)	2018-2020 Cohort Mean (n=50)
Overall program curriculum	1.60
Preparation for best practices in your discipline	1.56
Instruction by Program Faculty	1.60
Instruction by Program Adjuncts	1.88
Instructor's use of technology within courses	1.56
Opportunities for applied field experience for real world application	1.50
Supervision and university-level support for field experiences	1.38
Guidance and support by Program Faculty	1.51
Availability of Program Faculty	1.52
Responsiveness of Program Faculty	1.50
Respect and support of diverse individuals	1.66
Overall Program climate (professionalism, mutual respect)	1.58
Co-curricular experiences (e.g., student organizations, social activities)	2.08
Research Opportunities (thesis, capstone projects, collaboration with faculty)	2.00
Support of School of Human Services administrative staff	2.02
Overall satisfaction with decision to pursue an education within program of study	1.36

Post-graduation survey results reflect similar trends with the 2022 Graduation survey, reflecting overall positive experiences in relation to the curriculum, instruction,

supervision, and field service activities. Students reflected upon their program climate similarly, showing overall consistency in the program. Co-curricular, administrative support, and research opportunity are rated at a somewhat satisfied level, which appears to indicate the lower numbers of students who engage with staff and participate in these activities. The overall satisfaction level with their decision to pursue a counseling degree at UC remains very high.

Alumni were also asked to provide supervisor contact information for the program to collect data regarding their supervisees preparation for practice and satisfaction with their counseling skills. Of the 50 graduates who completed the survey above, only 15 provided supervisor contact information. A total of 8 supervisors completed the survey, all of whom were in mental health counseling agency, university, or private practice settings. All indicated their supervisees were well-prepared professional practice. They were also asked to rate their satisfaction across 20 dimensions of professional practice (see Table 10).

Table 10: Post Graduation Supervisor Satisfaction with Alumni Skills

Item (1 = extremely satisfied, 5 = extremely dissatisfied)	2018-2020 Cohort Supervisor Mean (n=8)
Overall professional preparation	1.13
Openness to supervision	1.00
Awareness of gender issues	1.13
Ethical/professional behavior	1.00
Understanding of client/student dynamics	1.13
Assessment and diagnosis skills	1.38
Relationship skills with clients/students	1.13
Theoretical base for working with clients/students	1.38
Case conceptualization	1.25
Relationship skills with co-workers	1.00
Program development skills	1.71
Writing skills (including clinical notes)	1.29
Research and evaluation skills	1.33
Group counseling theory and methods	1.20
Family and couples counseling	1.33
Substance use counseling	1.29
Supervision skills	1.40
Testing and psychometrics	1.75
Client/student advocacy and social justice practices	1.14
Interprofessional collaboration	1.13

All items were rated highly by the supervisors, with consensus highest scores for supervisee openness to supervision, ethical/professional behavior, and relationship skills with co-workers. Scores approaching “somewhat satisfied,” a rating of 2, included program development skills and testing and psychometrics. Program development skills are taught in the School Counseling curriculum and not Mental Health Counseling, so it

is not surprising to see lower ratings for this item. Only four supervisors completed the testing and psychometric item, suggesting this item may be less applicable to some supervisee roles. However, this rating remained good.

Supervisors were also asked to rate the professional dispositions of their supervisees who graduates from UC on items including motivation, initiative, creativity, empathy, awareness, and responsibility. Responses are in Table 11.

Table 11: Post Graduation Supervisor Rating of Alumni Dispositions

Question: Please indicate how accurately each personal characteristic listed below describes your supervisee: (1 = extremely accurately, 5 = not accurately at all)	2018-2020 Cohort Supervisor Mean (n=8)
Motivated	1.25
Takes initiative	1.25
Creative	1.13
Empathic	1.13
Personally aware	1.25
Responsible	1.25

All supervisors rated their supervisees highly, with no rating below a 2 (very accurately), indicating graduates demonstrate positive dispositions. Open response items included feedback about the strengths of supervisees, including empathy building, crisis management, client motivation, and overall engagement. Suggested curricular improvements included more training in diagnostic skills and psychometrics, motivational interviewing, DBT, group, and couples/family interventions. Documenting to show medical necessity is another skills recommended by one respondent. Lastly, supervisors were asked their overall satisfaction with their supervisee. Responses indicated 100% were “very satisfied.” In total, graduates from the program demonstrate strong skills and positive dispositions, all of which are well received by their supervisors.

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 12: Students and Recent Graduate Publications and Presentations

Student publications and presentations with faculty indicated with an asterisk (*)

Publications

- *Bruns, K. M., La Guardia, A., Brubaker, M., Farrow, J., Cotton, S., & DelBello, M. (2021). Mindfulness Based Cognitive Therapy –Child (MBCT-C) Effectiveness with children who have a parent diagnosed with bipolar I disorder. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 43(1), 59-74. <https://doi.org/10.17744/mehc.43.1.0>
- *Hearn, B., Brubaker, M. D., & Richardson, G. B. (2022). Counselor attitudes towards psychedelics and their use in therapy. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 10. <https://doi.org/1002/jcad.12429>
- Richardson, G. B., & *McGee, N. D. (2022). Extending the two-component model of delusion to substance use disorder etiology and recovery. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 10. <https://doi.org/1016/j.newideapsych.2022.100935>
- Wood, A. W., La Guardia, A. C., & *Mott, A. (2022). Quality measures: A review of quality of life measurement for counselors. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21501378.2021.2018930>
- Wood, A. W., Martin, J. L., & *Bruns, K. (2021). Integrating a treatment approach to counseling African American couples with prostate cancer. *Adultspan*, 20(2), 97-110. <https://doi.org/10.1002/adsp.12113>
- Wood, A. W., Mott, A. *, & Gonzalez-Voller, J. (2022). Integrating psychosocial oncology into the counseling curriculum. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, 15(2). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/jcps/vol15/iss2/21/>

Selected Presentations

- Alvarez, J., Saunders, R., & *Sinclair, V. (2022, October). Effective strategies to prepare school counselor trainees to work with students with disabilities. Proposal accepted to North Central Association for Counselor Education & Supervision Conference, Omaha, NE
- Alvarez, J., Saunders, R., *Sinclair, V., & Wood, A. (2021, October). Effective strategies for counselor educators to help prepare school counselor trainees to work with students with disabilities. Presented at the Association for Counselor Education & Supervision Conference, Atlanta, GA
- *Hearn, B., Brubaker, M. D., & Richardson, G. B. Psychedelics and the counseling profession (virtual talk). Annual conference of the American Counseling Association. April 5 –30.
- Wood, A. W., & McClure, E. A. * (March, 2022). Prostate and testicular cancer: Understanding predictors for public stigma. American Psychosocial Oncology Society Annual Conference, Portland, OR
- Brubaker, M. D., Wood, A. W., Acquavita, S., & Bruns, K. * (October, 2021). Behavioral health smartphone applications: A bridge or barrier to care? Collaborative Family Healthcare Association Annual Conference, Madison, WI—Poster Award for Excellence in Research and Evaluation.

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
2022	Elizabeth McClure	President, Upsilon Chi Chi Chapter of Chi Sigma Iota
2022	Stephanie Merrilees	President, Counselors for Social Justice UC Chapter
2022	Vanessa Sinclair	ACES Emerging Leader

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.

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 2021 through spring of 2022. CPCE scores are reflective of three testing windows and one retake. In the 2021-22 evaluation period, three students (two school and one mental health) failed on their first attempt and tested again. One school counseling student failed a second time and passed on the third attempt. Failure occurs when a student scores more than 1.5 standard deviations below the national mean. CPCE percentage average is reported relative to the top possible score (100%) rather than being relative to the national mean in each area.

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 2021-2022, 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. KPI ratings reflect both CACREP standards and program standard assessment. This KPI's average rating is 77.6 when the CPCE is not included in the calculation. Knowledge scores include CPCE outcomes, which were at the national average at 66% (2020-21 result was 70%). Skills scores for this cycle were

improved over the last cycle, but still demonstrate an overall decrease from prior years. It may be that these scores are being influenced by broader concerns (abrupt move to telehealth and other COVID related issues), which are steadily improving. In this evaluation cycle, the skills assessment were 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 62%, 2F1g averaged 61%, and 2F1f received an average rating of 62% (N = 77, reviews by site and university individual supervisors, being 70% and 67% in the prior year). Techniques scores were similarly rated to practicum, with increases seen as the students progressed through internship (68%).

Area	Average Rating (0-100)	# of Assessments	2020-21 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	74.8	4	73.2
<i>Skill</i>	64	1	60.1
2F1d	64.1	1	61.8
2F1g	63.3	1	60.8
2F1f	64.7	1	57.6
<i>Knowledge</i>	94.77	3	89.2
2F1a	93.33	1	87.1
2F1b	98.75	1	95
2F1e	90.42	1	90
2F5n	92.5	1	88.33
2F5a	97.46	2	94.6
2F5g	96.17	1	99.2
CPCE (Summary)	65.74	1	70.44

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 (2F5h) 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 including practicum and both internships. 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 exceeded expectations in this area for this evaluative year.

Outcomes remain effectively stable. Conceptualization skills increased by 22% between practicum and internship.

Area	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2020-2021 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	88.11	4	87.9
<i>Skill</i>	88.11	4	87.9
2F5b	92.25	4	93
2F5c	86.55	4	86.3
2F5d	80.35	4	86.85
2F5e	81.5	3	92.7
2F5f	95.7	3	86.5
2F5l	87.85	4	90.3
2F5k	87.3	4	87.5
2F5h	68.78	4	81.5
2F5i	92.4	3	83.9
2F5j	95.7	3	90.6

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 continual use as part of the CCSR internship assessment. Skill was also assessed in 7001 via a group-based ethical decision making exercise. Three knowledge assessments occurred with inclusion of 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, remaining above 85% with the exclusion of the CPCE. CPCE results were at 71%, at the national average as reported by NBCC (70.7%). Outcomes remain effectively stable.

Area	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2020-2021 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	83.64	7	90.3
<i>Skill</i>	88.2	3	92.3
2F1i	73.26	3	84.2
2F1k	95.8	1	96.4
2F1m	95.8	1	96.4
<i>Knowledge</i>	91.69	3	88.3
2F1i	94.8	2	94.25
2F1j	84.71	1	95.2
2F1l	95.55	1	99.1

CPCE – Ethics Summary	71.03	1	80.4
------------------------------	--------------	----------	-------------

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 2021-22, 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 second year the group skills assessment was implemented (2F6d). We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas. The knowledge average exceeded 85% at 82%, similar to last cycle. For 2021-22, knowledge scores were above threshold. Knowledge outcomes remain effectively stable in this area. The group skill rating was implemented in practicum/internship evaluations to improve tracking of skill growth (N=139). This KPI indicated performance below the threshold (76.3% when not including the CPCE), which was lower than the last evaluation cycle. CPCE summary scores across all offerings averaged at 67%, slightly below the national average during those administrations (69%). CPCE scores were calculated as part of the KPI relative to the top possible score rather than being relative to the national average.

Area	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2020-2021 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	73.3	6	76.2
Skill	70.2	2	70.4
2F6d	70.2	3	70.4
Knowledge	82.37	4	82
2F6a	85.69	2	91.4
2F6b	86.79	4	89.5
2F6c	88	1	94.3
2F6d	63.77	4	78.2
2F6e	90.79	2	87.2
2F6f	85.69	2	86.7
2F6g	75.86	2	84.3
Summary: CPCE – Group	67.35	1	76.5

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 summary evaluation results from the CPCE exam. CPCE career scale averages were slightly below the national mean (64%) with a percentage score of 60%. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in knowledge learning outcome areas. Student outcomes exceeded expectations (95) in course-based assessment and were below expectations when including the CPCE score relative to possible scoring rather than relative to the national average.

Area	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2020-2021 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI #5	77.5	4	83.1
KPI Knowledge	95.24	2	93
2F4a	93.2	1	94.6
2F4b	94.8	1	95.2
2F4c	100	1	100
2F4d	92.6	1	92.3
2F4f	92.3	3	93.9
2F4g	95	1	98
2F4h	94	1	92.4
2F4j	100	1	97.8
CPCE	59.85	1	73.2

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 2021-22, four assessments were used to assess this indicator, three course-based assessments were utilized to evaluate this indicator, occurring in CNSL 7011 and 8048. Scores for CNSL 8048 lacked variability during this assessment period. Both sections were taught by adjunct instructors, which may have contributed to this occurrence. CPCE performance (57%) was slightly below the national average (60%). 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 when excluding the CPCE. Outcomes remain

effectively stable in this area and exceed expectations when not including the CPCE (96).

Area	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2020-2021 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	83	4	81.5
<i>Skill</i>	92.3	1	93
2F3b	95	1	88.3
2F3a	95	1	91.5
2F3c	95	1	96
2F3h	84	1	96.3
<i>Knowledge</i>	99.5	3	92.3
2F3a	98	1	96.3
2F3h	100	1	100
2F5d	100	1	95.6
2F3g	100	1	97.3
2F3i	100	2	98.2
2F3f	100	3	99
2F3e	100	2	93.2
2F3c	97.8	1	NA
<i>Summary CPC – Development</i>	<i>57.35</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>59.12</i>

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. One course-based assessment was 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 at the national average (60%). A skills based assessment was added to internship to monitor implementation of multicultural competencies in practice and will be implemented in the 2022-23 evaluation period. This change occurred to better reflect student skill. Journaling was removed as a knowledge assessment. Due to this change, only one course-based assessment is apparent this period and thus course-based knowledge was not assessed for this KPI. Total assessment points will return to three in the next period. Outcomes are below threshold this period when

including the CPCE; however, exceeded expectations based solely on skills assessed in CNSL 7005 (94).

Area	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	76.7	2	80.6
<i>Skill</i>	94.4	1	91.1
2F2d	97.6	1	92.3
2F2a	96.7	1	89.9
2F2h	88.8	1	91.2
<i>Knowledge</i>		1	86.8
2F2b		1	93.2
2F2c		1	94.5
2F2e		1	92.3
2F2f		1	90
2F2g		1	86.8
CPCE – Diversity	59.12	1	64

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 2020-21, three course-based assessments were utilized to evaluate this indicator occurring in CNSL 7008. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas. Outcomes exceeded thresholds for this evaluative year (91; when not including the CPCE) and CPCE scores exceeded the national average reported at the time of testing (66%).

Area	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2020-2021 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	83.5	3	83
<i>Skill</i>	89.7	1	90.8
2F8f	89.3	1	90.2
2F8h	90.1	1	91.3
<i>Knowledge</i>	92.3	2	88.7
2F8j	91.25	1	94
2F8g	90.75	1	92.3
2F8i	92.7	1	93.3
2F8a	94.1	1	94.3

CPCE	68.4	1	69.6
------	------	---	------

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 2020-21, 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 meet expectations when the CPCE wasn't included. For this year, CPCE scores fell slightly below the national average, when including fails and retakes (54%). This KPI exceeded expectations for this evaluation cycle (90.6 when not accounting for the CPCE).

Area	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessment Points	2019-2020 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI	71.7	3	78.5
<i>Skill</i>	89.6	1	91.7
2F7h	90.5	1	94.7
2F7f	89.8	1	88.9
2F7g	81.2	1	88.2
2F7i	88.3	1	96.5
2F7a	96.1	1	95.6
2F8b	90.2	1	91.4
2F7m	91.5	1	89.6
2F7e	89	1	88.8
<i>Knowledge</i>	91.7	2	78.6
2F7b	96.22	1	94.2
2F7j	92.33	1	95.4
2F7k	93.37	1	98.9
2F7l	91.86	1	90.2
2F7d	90.7	1	85.2
2F7c	85.12	1	88.6
2F7e	92.64	1	90.3
CPCE – Assessment	52.65	1	65.3

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

Core KPI Assessment Timeline for MA and MEd Programs						
Admissions	KPI	Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 3	Semester 4	Semester 5
PDCA	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

Clinical Mental Health Counseling (MA) 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. Of note for this reporting period is that it started in Summer 2021, which captures the last year of online-only education at UC and our MHC program, as well as the transition back to campus in Fall 2022, and the online start to the in-person Spring 2022 semester. Although there were many transitions during this period, our program and students performed, overall, above of thresholds for our KPIs this year.

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 2021-2022, four course-based assessments were used to measure KPI #1, found in CNSL 8031, CNSL 7050, and CNSL 7060. CNSL 7060 is taken twice by students and is their internship course. The other data point for KPI #1 is found in comprehensive examinations taken during the last semester of their program, wherein one part is a written case analysis and the second part is a recorded skills demonstration. Places where there is one or two data points occur in either CNSL 8031 and/or in comprehensive examinations. Greyed out blocks do not have specific assessments tied to them but are covered in courses (see syllabi for specific coverage). In total, there are 5 assessment points for KPI #1.

We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in combined assessment of both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas. For this academic year, students performed overall above expectations, but is slightly lower than last year's performance. Compared to 2020-2021 data, some areas exceeded this year and some fell below. Of most importance are the two areas that fell below the 85% threshold, C.2.j (84.72) and C.2.l (81.85). Looking more closely at these standards, C.2.j addresses "cultural factors relevant to clinical mental health counseling" and C.2.l addresses "legal and ethical considerations specific to clinical mental health counseling." The initial assessments for these courses was lower than the next three, potentially indicative of adapting to a learning curve while students work with their first clients. The first data point occurs during students' Practicum semester, wherein they are also taking Multicultural counseling and Legal, Ethical, and Professional Issues in Counseling. However, regardless, being below the 85% threshold requires a remediation plan.

Part of the work that the Counseling program can do to increase scores in the C.2.j area have started with the Counseling faculty engaging in in-depth discussion around the multicultural and social justice mission of the program. We have worked to redefine our mission statement in this area and are soliciting feedback from students, many of whom are in their first semester of classes, a semester prior to that first data

point. We hope that this community-focus in developing this definition heightens the awareness and knowledge of these concerns in counseling and that the integration of this in students' case conceptualization becomes a natural part of this process, rather than an addendum. During the CNSL 8031 course, during the Fall semester, students will also be introduced into case conceptualization further from a multicultural lens via a case documentation and treatment planning assignment. We expect these numbers to increase back to the 85% threshold by the next reporting period.

In regards to C.2.i, one way the program is working on rectifying this concern is partially in line with the C.2.j. remediation, and that is to further explain law and ethics from a social justice perspective, allowing students to gain buy-in to how law and ethics are actively effecting the individuals and groups they work with, which is in line with the program's ecological focus. It should be noted that the initial assessment point was somewhat of an outlier at 48.07% whereas the remaining assessment points were at 86.95%, 98.91%, and 93.49%, but it also points out that the main area to focus on will be initial applications during the Practicum course in the upcoming semester.

Outside of areas falling below the threshold, areas C.1.c, C.2.i, C.3.d, and C.3.e fell below the prior reporting period's average. Looking more closely at these areas, C.1.c addresses "principles, models, and documentation formats of biopsychosocial case conceptualization and treatment planning," which can use some improvement over the four semesters it is addressed. This area will be emphasized in the CNSL 7050 course to reiterate the importance of case conceptualization and treatment planning in real-world counseling scenarios. To further encourage this area, the CNSL 8031 course will focus further and more detail on initial practice on this, prior to it being measured in CNSL 7050. C.2.i and C.3.e go together in addressing "legislation and government policy relevant to clinical mental health counseling," and "strategies to advocate for persons with mental health issues," respectively. These two standards can also connect with C.2.i which already has stated remediation goals. In emphasizing our focus on social justice, the faculty will work to make sure this is focused on at times when it is not the main focus of an assignment. For example, the C.3.e data points occur during the first and the last semester. In the first semester, the assignment is geared totally on advocacy, whereas in the last semester, it is part of a larger case conceptualization. Focusing further on continued development will touch on how we can encourage students to advocate for their clients via understanding legislation and government policy further, along with legal and ethical issues. Finally, area C.3.d addresses "strategies for interfacing with integrated behavioral health care professionals," which is a large focus of our fellowship programs, to the point where we have a 1-credit course required for those in fellowship options. This topic is touched on in the first semester, though not assessed. We can work harder to emphasize interprofessional collaboration through integrating this area further into a standard like C.1.c that focuses on more thorough case conceptualization. Understanding the interprofessional collaboration needed to fully understand a case is a focus for some students, but not all. As such, we can work towards making sure this is a focus for all students, regardless of fellowship experience.

With some of these deficits, it should also be noted that some areas increased since the previous reporting area. For example, C.1.b increased above the 85% threshold and addresses "theories and models related to clinical mental health

counseling.” C.2.k addresses “professional organizations, preparation standards, and credentials relevant to the practice of clinical mental health counseling” and helps us to understand that we are preparing students well to enter the field and understand what they need in order to become licensed, which falls in line with job training and is a major reason why people are in our program. This standard also falls in line with C.2.m which addresses “record keeping, third party reimbursement, and other practice and management issues in clinical mental health counseling” which was not assessed in the previous reporting period, but is above the 85% threshold this year.

Area	21-22 Average Rating (0-100)	# of Assessments	2020-2021 Average / #
KPI CMHC #1	89.04	5	92.9
C.1.a			
C.1.b	90.88	1	83.3
C.1.c	89.22	4	96.25
C.2.i	94.82	1	100
C.2.j	84.72	4	92.8
C.2.k	98.62	1	96.6
C.2.l	81.85	4	88.8
C.2.m	86.72	1	Not Assessed
C.3.c			
C.3.d (Skill)	87.78	4	96.9
C.3.e (Skill)	86.82	2	91.6

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 2021-2022, two course-based assessments were used to measure KPI #2, found in CNSL 7031 and CNSL 8034. The other data point for KPI #1 is found in comprehensive examinations taken during the last semester of their program, wherein one part is a written case analysis and the second part is a recorded skills demonstration. Greyed out blocks do not have specific assessments tied to them but are covered in courses (see syllabi for specific coverage). In total, there are 4 assessment points for KPI #2

Greyed out blocks do not have specific assessments tied to them but are covered in courses (see syllabi for specific coverage). We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in combined assessment of both skill and knowledge learning outcome areas. For this academic year, students performed overall above expectations, but is slightly lower than last year’s performance. Compared to 2020-2021 data, some areas exceeded this year and some fell below. Of most importance are the two areas

that fell below the 85% threshold, C.2.g (84.37) and C.3.a (83.48). These data were not reported in the previous report and both standards are assessed through the comprehensive examination. C.2.g addresses the “impact of biological and neurological mechanisms on mental health,” and C.3.a addresses “intake interview, mental status evaluation, biopsychosocial history, mental health history, and psychological assessment for treatment planning and caseload management.”

For a remediation plan for C.2.g, the importance of addressing topics such as psychopharmacology and consultation will be reinforced in student meetings for orientation to the comprehensive examination process. All students take a course in psychopharmacology, so the information is available to them, but the application in their comprehensive examination may currently be confusing. Directions to directly address these concerns will be highlighted and case studies provided for the examination will be reviewed so that all highlight a client’s biological and/or neurological concerns in regard to their mental health concerns.

In regards to C.3.a, this is evaluated in the recorded skills demonstration based on the case study provided for the comprehensive exam. In order to better facilitate demonstration of this skill, which is practiced early in their programs, students will be instructed to spend an appropriate amount of time going over intake or assessment related items found within the case study, in a way to take information from the case study and apply it during the recorded skills demonstration.

Given these points of remediation, it is expected that our report will show satisfactory scores in all areas, not just the overall average in the next reporting period. As we have expanded the areas assessed (e.g., C.2.a, C.2.b, C.2.g, and C.3.a), we see early areas of strength and growth that the faculty will focus on to increase the application of these skills with these new counselors entering the field.

Of note for KPI #2 this year is that two standards were increased past the 85% threshold that they fell under in the last reporting period. Specifically, C.1.e which addresses “psychological tests and assessments specific to clinical mental health counseling” and C.2.f which addresses “impact of crisis and trauma on individuals with mental health diagnoses.” These were completed in part by ensuring that our courses cover crisis and trauma to some extent rather than having a specified course, and that the use of assessment and understanding of assessment has achieved more meaning for students.

Area	21-22 Average Rating (0-100)	# of Assessments	2020-2021 Average / #
KPI CMHC #2	89.69	4	90.1
C.1.d	94.91	1	94
C.1.e	95.29	2	81
C.2.a	89.45	1	Not assessed
C.2.b	89.45	1	Not assessed
C.2.c	93.63	2	92
C.2.d	90.63	2	91.5

C.2.e			
C.2.f	85.98	2	83
C.2.g	84.37	1	Not assessed
C.2.h			
C.3.a (Skill)	83.48	1	Not assessed
C.3.b (Skill)	89.79	2	91.9

Clinical Mental Health Track Summary

Each semester contains at least one KPI assessment. Assessment begins in Semester 1 with the Introduction to Clinical Mental Health Counseling (CNSL 8031), with KPI #1, assessing specialty CACREP areas C.2.i, C.2.k, and C.3.e. Assessment continues in Practicum (CNSL 7050) with KPI #1, assessing specialty CACREP areas C.1.c, C.2.j, C.2.l, and C.3.d. KPI #1's assessment continues with Internship I (CNSL 7060) in Semester 3 and Internship II (CNSL 7060) in Semester 4, both assessing specialty CACREP areas C.1.c, C.2.j, C.2.l, and C.3.d. Assessment for KPI #1 finishes in Semester 5 with the comprehensive examination.

KPI #2's assessment begins in Semester 3 with Assessment in Counseling (CNSL 7031), with assessment of CACREP standards C.1.d., C.2.c, and C.3.b. KPI #2 continues in Semester 5 with the Mental Health & Substance Assessment (CNSL 8034) and CACREP specialty standards, C.1.e, C.2.d, and C.2.f. Similar to KPI #1, KPI #2's assessment ends in Semester 5 with the comprehensive examination. One specialty area that does not currently have any assessment is in the area of diagnosis and the faculty will be discussing potentially adding an additional KPI to aid in more evaluation of certain standards (e.g., C.2.d. and C.3.a)

Clinical Mental Health Summary

Changes made between May 1, 2021 and May 1, 2022:

- No KPI data were changed.

Assessment recommendations for review:

- In Summer 2022, additional KPI will be investigated for inclusion in CNSL 8038, Diagnosis and Abnormal Behavior from an Ecological Perspective (Semester 2)

Mental Health KPI Assessment Timeline					
KPI	Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 3	Semester 4	Semester 5
1	CNSL 8031	CNSL 7050	CNSL 7060	CNSL 7060	Comprehensive Exam
2			CNSL 7031		CNSL 8034, Comprehensive Exam

School MEd Key Performance Indicators: Summer 2021 – Spring 2022

The School Counseling program prepares future school counselors to support students to succeed in areas of academic achievement, career preparation, and social and emotional development. The faculty is committed to train school counselors to become social justice leaders capable of assessing and implementing data-driven programs that provide equitable services for all. Students will be equipped with individual and group counseling skills and effective at collaboration with teachers, caregivers, and other stakeholders. The program prepares graduate students to be culturally responsive and work as change agents to help close the opportunity gaps in their schools and communities.

Key performance indicators and student learning outcomes (knowledge and skill) 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.

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. 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. We plan to continue to edit KPIs and standards as new knowledge emerges within the school counseling profession.

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. School KPI 1 is assessed through student learning outcomes (SLO) of both skills and knowledge.

SLO Skill Definition: *Students will 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.*

In 2021-2022, two course-based skill assessments were utilized to evaluate **School KPI 1, SLO Skill**. The first assessment, *Comprehensive School Counseling Program* (CSCP) was assessed at two time points: once in CSNL 8010 (Introduction to School Counseling and again in CNSL 8012 (SC Leadership and Advocacy). Students developed a group simulated CSCP in CNSL 8010 (time point 1) and completed an individual CSCP connected to their internship site in CNSL 8012 (time point 2). 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.

The second assessment to evaluate **School KPI 1, SLO Skill** is the *Case Conceptualization*, in which 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 throughout the program, once in each of the following courses, CNSL 7050 (Practicum; time point 1), CNSL 7060 (Internship 1; time point 2) and CNSL 7060 (Internship 2; time point 3). In the spring of 2021, the rubric for this KPI assessment was overhauled to better reflect the role of the school counselor. We are now able to compare last year's data with this academic year.

Overall, our students performed similarly to last year's data. We do see a slight drop in the overall Skill average, with this year being a 91 and last year being a 95.1. This could be because the 2022 graduating class of school counselors had one full year of remote learning, with one year of mixed remote and in-person. We also saw a decrease in performance for CACREP standard 5.G.2.n., which focuses on legal and ethical considerations. We will make sure this is a focus next year.

SLO Knowledge Definition: *Students will be able to 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.* Students will select a case from three different case studies to develop their intervention plan.

To measure this knowledge-based assessment of School KPI 1, we evaluate students using the *PreK-12 Intervention Plan* assignment. 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. We assess our trainees twice during the program, once in CNSL 8014 (Children and Adolescents; time point 1) and CNSL 8016 (Special Needs; time point 2)

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. With the impacts of COVID-19, our department now rotates CNSL 8014 and CNSL 8016 each academic year. This academic year (2021-2022), the assessment was conducted for both first- and second-year students in CNSL 8014 and the assessment will be conducted in CNSL 8016 in the 2022-2023 academic year. Thus, comparison data between academic years is unavailable.

Area	2021-2022 Average Rating (0-100)	# of Assessments	2020-2021 Average Rating (0-100)
KPI School #1	91.5		95.4
Skill	91		95.1
5.G.3.a	99	2	85.5
5.G.2.l	90	2	93.5
5.G.3.n	89.5	2	91.75
5.G.3.b	100	1	100
5.G.3.o	99	1	100
5.G.2.n	75.7	1	100
5.G.1.e	100	1	N/A
5.G.2.i	90.8	3	86.25
5.G.3.h	92	3	85.6
5.G.3.f	89	3	78
5.G.2.n	75.7	3	70
Knowledge	92		95.8
5.G.3.e	93	1	92
5.G.3.g	88	1	97
5.G.3.k	93	1	83
5.G.3.o	92	1	96
5.G.2.b	92	1	90
5.G.3.c	94	1	95

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 CAEP and 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. School KPI 2 is assessed through student learning outcomes (SLO) of both skills and knowledge using two different assessments.

SLO Knowledge Definition: *Students will demonstrate an understanding of their role and responsibilities as a school counselor through engagement with professional school counselors and administrators in order to develop an understanding of an effective evidence-based comprehensive school counseling program (CSCP) which provides services and advocates for students and families.*

In the 2021-2022 academic year, one assessment was utilized at two time points to assess this **SC KPI 2, SLO Knowledge**. The purpose of this assignment, *the Professional Identity and Advocacy: School Counselor and Administrator Interviews*, is 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. Students were assessed in CNSL 8010 (time point 1) by interviewing a professional school counselor interview. Students were then assessed in CSNL 8012 (time point 2) by interviewing an administrator. 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 an overall average performance rating of 88.1%. Students did score a few points lower than the previous academic average of 92.92%. CACREP Standard 5.2.2.I did have an average of 69.3%, which falls below the overall average we expected for this outcome. This standard requires students to identify areas of personal growth and development in relation to the interview, current understanding of the role of a professional school counselor connected the ASCA mindsets and behaviors. Our goal for next year is to continue to highlight this standard in their assessment and encourage student self-reflection during and after the interviews.

SLO Skill Definition: *Students will 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) in order to create a culture of advocacy with key stakeholders. Additionally, students will examine and analyze data related to the meetings attended.*

The second assessment to assess SC KPI 2, SLO Skill, *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) in order to create a culture of advocacy with key stakeholders. Students will 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 assignment 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; time point 1) and CNSL 7060 (Internship 2; time point 2). 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 an overall average of 94.8%, which compares similarly to the overall skill average from the previous academic year (94.75). Students scored lowest on CACREP 5.G.1.d, with an overall average of 89.2, but this is still above our expected average of 85%. Overall, our students seemed to do exceedingly well within the KPI #1, Skill domain.

Area	2021-2022 Average Rating (0-100)	# of Assessments	2020-2021 Average Rating (0-100)
KPI School #2	91.5		93.8
Knowledge	88.1		92.92
5.G.2.b	95.5	2	92
5.G.2.j	88.8	2	90.5
5.G.2.a	90	2	96.6
5.G.2.d	97.2	2	96
5.G.2.l	69.3		89.5
Skill	94.8		94.75
5.G.2.d	98.3	2	88
5.G.2.a	99.2	2	100
5.G.1.d	89.2	2	89.5
5.G.1.b	97.1	2	98
5.G.3.d	94.9	2	98
5.G.3.l	90.1	2	95

School Track Summary

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

Changes made between May 1, 2021, and May 1, 2022:

- 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; approved for CNSL 8014 for implementation in the 2021-2022 academic year

Assessment recommendations for review:

- Implement the standards used in the portfolio into our KPI 1 and 2 assessments.
- We will no longer use the Portfolio to assess SC students.
- We plan on reviewing SC KPI 1 and continuing to make adjustments.

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

Report of Counselor Education & Supervision

Doctoral Key Performance Indicators (2021-2022)

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 2021-2022, a new course Advanced Counseling Theories was offered for the first time. The KPI assessment for CED6B1 was through two times: one course-based assessment in the Advanced Counseling Theories class, and one was Counseling part 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	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2020-2021 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI CED #1	86.02	2	84.13
6B1a	83.5	2	88.51
6B1b	86.96	1	86.44
6B1f	83.29	2	86.44
6B1c	84.6	2	93.2
6B1d	81.96	2	81.75
6B1e	81.18	2	86.95

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 2021-2022, 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	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2020-2021 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI CED #2	85.03	2	82.02
6B5h	93.23	2	88.13
6B5a	79.13	2	81.23
6B5i	83.46	2	80
6B5k	82.25	2	77
6B5d	79.17	1	79

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 2021-2022, since the Advanced Counseling Research was not offered, the course-based assessment was not available. Knowledge was evaluated through 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, the lower than expected scores could be due to circumstances related to the two students who took the qualifying exam and raters. We will review the questions and rubrics to ensure the assessment criteria are consistent to the actual learning experiences of students. *A second assessment point will be reflected in the next cycle.

Area	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2020-2021 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI CED #3	75.45	1*	83.46
4g	66.67	1	82.12

4a	68.06	1	83.33
4b	80.21	1	73.09
4c	77.60	1	N/A
4i	77.83	1	80.21
4h	89.58	1	92.71

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 2021-2022, 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. As the result of continuous improvement, a skills-based learning outcome was developed and used in 2021-2022. The indicator occurred in CNSL 9011. Additionally, knowledge was evaluated using the supervision 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 and improved from last year.

Area	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2020-2021 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI CED #4	84.7	3	82
B2a	89.58	1	91.67
B2b	90.1	3	85.11
B2d	84.38	3	77.22
B2c	83.99	3	90
B2e	87.5	3	90.83
3f	77.19	2	76.17
3g	84.64	3	74.17
2h	72.92	1	89.6
2i	77.08	2	74
2j	91.15	3	85
2k	81.25	1	77.08

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 2021-2022, the course-based assessment that was utilized to evaluate skill associated with this indicator occurring in SPSY 8070 was not available. Knowledge was evaluated using the pedagogy portion of the doctoral qualifying exam. We expect that students will perform at 85% or better in assessment of knowledge learning outcomes. For this academic year, students performed below. The counseling faculty has been continually working on developing doctoral student 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 this year. *A second assessment point will be reflected in the next evaluation cycle.

Area	Average Rating (0-100)	Number of Assessments	2020-2021 Average Rating / # Assessments
KPI CED #5	76.23	1*	87.9
<i>B3b</i>	<i>81.25</i>	1	<i>91.69</i>
<i>B3a</i>	<i>67.71</i>	1	<i>88.81</i>
<i>B3c</i>	<i>78.13</i>	1	<i>91.69</i>
<i>B3d</i>	<i>71.88</i>	1	<i>87.29</i>
<i>B3e</i>	<i>81.25</i>	1	<i>86.46</i>
<i>B3g</i>	<i>69.79</i>	1	<i>80.88</i>
<i>B3h</i>	<i>77.08</i>	1	<i>83.75</i>

Doctoral Program							
KPI	Admissions	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 3	Sem. 4	Sem. 5	Sem. 6+
1		CNSL 9003				Qualifying Exams	
2		CNSL 9001					
3					CNSL 9020		Dissertation
4		CNSL 8040	CNSL 9011				
5				CNSL 9060	SPSY 8070		

In Development

Performance Summary

Similar to last year, six Entry-Level (masters) core key performance indicators exceed expectations for 2017-2018 while two fell slightly below expectations and one met expectations. 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, no significant changes were made during this evaluation period. An additional multicultural skill assessment has been approved and will be implemented for the first time during the next evaluation cycle.

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 related to interprofessional work and diagnosis. Faculty completed integration of crisis counseling concepts for both school and mental health across the core and specialty curriculum, with modules appearing in techniques, practicum, internship and the intro courses. School counseling has decided to remove the portfolio as an assessment point and is currently working to integrate the covered areas into assessments in courses currently addressing those standards. School counseling will also be working to update KPI to reflect this change. Updates are detailed within the school counseling reporting section. In the doctoral program, curriculum updates were made to include an advanced research course and the development of assessments for research and teaching, which were piloted during this evaluation cycle but not implemented as a formal assessment point.

Faculty are diligently working to ensure our courses are responsive to the needs of our community and society by attending to diversity, standards, and student interests. Faculty engage in mediated discussions over this evaluative period focused on updating our commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion and identifying areas for curricular and extra-curricular improvement. We will continue to use our formal assessments to inform program growth.

Table 13: 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>