

The 2018-2019 Mental Health Counseling Program Evaluation demonstrates predominantly above average performance by program students at each of the four evaluation points. The Annual Program Evaluation examines student performance at four separate points: the conclusion of a first semester course, Counseling Theory & Principles (COUN 223); the conclusion of the students' first field experience, Mental Health Counseling Practicum (COUN 253); the conclusion of the first semester of the Mental Health Counseling Internship (COUN 298) and second semester of the Mental Health Counseling Internship (COUN 299); and the completion of the Comprehensive Examination or National Counselor Exam that are administered during the students' final semesters in the Program.

Predominantly above average performance was seen at all four assessment points. For the first assessment point, students averaged a score of 38 (out of 40) on the COUN 223 (Counseling Theory & Practice) final group assignment. This assignment entailed developing a "Final Case Conceptualization & Treatment Plan" group presentation utilizing counseling skills and theory. A detailed assignment rubric provided data across 13 separate factors for all 26 students enrolled in COUN 223 during fall 2018 and spring 2019 semesters. Students did quite well and demonstrated mastery on most factors for this group presentation, scoring at the higher levels. Students universally scored at the highest level on factor 6 (effective technology mechanics) and factor 10 (class engagement) suggesting a solid sense of technology skills across all students as well as a solid ability to engage the presentation audience through innovative and creative methods. The lowest scores were found for factor 1 (follows syllabus requirements) and factor 9 (effective presentation skills). A low score on factor 1 reflected some errors in applying APA format and is an area that will be addressed in future semesters (additional requirement for new students to participate in training to develop APA format proficiency). A low score on factor 9 underscores the importance of group collaboration and advanced practice of assigned tasks, which will be addressed through open dialogue among students regarding personal accountability and follow-through when working groups.

For the second assessment point (the first field experience – COUN 253), data were collected from 16 students enrolled in both fall 2018 and spring 2019 sections. The ratings assigned by clinical supervisors for student performance during the practicum fieldwork required in COUN 253 were utilized for this point. The mean rating assigned for "Overall Evaluation" (defined as overall evaluation on the basis of above-related factors) for all students was 4.5 (on a scale of 1-5). For all 44 factors of assessment, no average for any factors fell below 4.0. The factor that received a 4.0 rating related to understanding the structure and functions of the agency which can be addressed in student's initial orientation and within the practicum seminar. Based on the aforementioned averages, it was determined that students were keeping with the anticipated level of development based on program design. All students who participated in the MHC practicum field experience during the 2018-2019 academic year were recommended to continue on to an internship placement.

At the third assessment point, data were collected from 15 students enrolled in three sections of internship – fall 2018, spring 2019, and summer 2019. The ratings assigned by clinical supervisors for student performance during the internship fieldwork required in COUN 298/COUN 299 were utilized for this point. The mean rating for all 19 factors was 4.4 (on a scale of 1-5). The highest mean scores were seen on items regarding accepting responsibilities (4.7),

being non-defensive (4.7), ethics (4.6), demonstrates seriousness (4.6), and having positive regard towards clients (4.5). All ratings represent satisfactory to high performance on all items (ratings at or exceed 4.0), however, there is room for growth in areas such as ability to understand records (4.0), effective strategies for client understanding (4.0), and use of principles and practices diagnostically (4.0).

For the fourth assessment point, the Comprehensive Examination (administered to six students during their final semester of the program) and the National Counselor Exam (taken by 12 students in the semester before they graduated) were used. High scores for the comprehensive multiple-choice exam ranged between 96-98 and lower scores ranged between 91-94, demonstrating impressive mastery of the CACREP core areas assessed on the exam. All twelve students who took the National Counselor Exam passed (100% pass rate on the first time), also demonstrating a solid understanding of the core areas of counseling assessed by NBCC on the NCE).

While the majority of the scores and ratings indicated above-average performance and knowledge, there were a few areas in which scores and ratings indicated deficits. At the first assessment point, COUN 223, while students did very well across all items, there seemed consistent challenges with factor 1 (following syllabus instruction/adhering to APA) and factor 9 (effective presentation skills). This indicates the need for greater clarification/reinforcement of syllabus expectations to better ensure student compliance as well as discussing the importance of shared responsibility of group tasks to ensure all group members are prepared for their assigned parts. At the second assessment point, COUN 253, a suggested focus on improvement includes understanding the structure and functions of the agency. At the third assessment point, COUN 298/COUN 299, areas for improvement included factors related to student ability to understand records, use effective strategies for client understanding, and use principles and practices diagnostically

At the fourth assessment point, no student score fell below 91 on the Comprehensive Examination, and all 12 students passed the National Counselor Exam (100%) pass rate; therefore, no areas for improvement were identified at this point by these methods of assessment. As such, all students were recommended for graduation.

In short, it can be said that the students were found to perform above average on all assessment points. While still indicating solid performance, the skills that have been identified as needing further development and improvement will be addressed throughout the Program curriculum. Program faculty will review and discuss the assessment results as a team during upcoming faculty meetings to incorporate them into future Program development plans and activities. The findings will also be shared in our Professional Advisory Board meeting.