



Multnomah Campus of Jessup University

.....

Master's of Arts in Counseling (MAC)



Program Data Report

2022-2023

Prepared by Dr. Kristi Cash White
December, 2024

Mission and Values

JESSUP UNIVERSITY MISSION

In partnership with the Church, the purpose of Jessup University is to educate transformational leaders for the glory of God.

MULTNOMAH CAMPUS OF JESSUP UNIVERSITY MISSION

Compelled by the love of Christ, we integrate biblical wisdom with academic and professional excellence to engage humbly in God's redemptive work in the world.

MASTERS OF ARTS IN COUNSELING MISSION

The Masters of Arts in Counseling (MAC) program strive to create a Christ-centered Community where students can excel as professional counselors. To achieve this, we infuse the following core values through the program:

S spiritual integration
H healing presence
A advocacy & diversity
P professional identity
E educational excellence

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The MAC program seeks to:

- Integrate Christian theology and practice on conceptual, clinical, and personal levels throughout the coursework. (Spiritual integration)
- Emphasize the development of strong clinical skills, building from a Rogerian foundation and integrating additional models as skill develops. (Healing presence)
- Promote the understanding and awareness of diversity issues on theoretical, professional, and personal levels such that students can work in a culturally inclusive way. (Advocacy & diversity)
- Cultivate student dispositions such that they can interact ethically, professionally, competently, and comfortably in the counseling field. (Professional identity)
- Foster student learning around essential knowledge in the field, ranging from counseling theories to evidence-based practices to assessment tools. (Educational Excellence)

CACREP Vital Statistics 2022-2023

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED FOR THE 2022-23 SCHOOL YEAR

35

NUMBER OF GRADUATES FOR THE 2022-23 SCHOOL YEAR

MA Clinical Mental Health: 12

Pass Rate on Credentialing Exams

92%

COMPLETION RATES

(graduating within the expected timeframe)

90%

JOB PLACEMENT RATES

88%

Summary of Program Evaluation

The Master of Arts in Counseling (MAC) faculty at the Multnomah Campus of Jessup University (MCJU) employs a variety of methods to assess student-learning outcomes in the area of professional counseling core competencies. The purpose of this plan description is to highlight that variety and provide information on the organization and structure of assessment in the MAC Department.

The MAC major is a 60-credit program at MCJU designed for graduate students who desire to work with individuals, families, and groups to address and treat mental and emotional disorders and to promote good mental health. The professional counseling program employs theories and evidenced-based practices to evaluate a client's mental health in a holistic manner that includes physical, mental, and spiritual wellbeing. Courses emphasize critical reading, discussion, and analysis of theory and the process of diagnosis. Since research is the mainstay of evidenced-based practices in counseling, it is infused into each course. In addition, the program utilizes a practitioner/scholar model, which requires that all students complete course work and 700 hours of practicum and internship. As a result, those majoring in the MAC program are equipped for further graduate studies in counseling or liberal arts related fields.

Historical Perspective

The Master of Arts in Counseling program began in the fall of 2009 and has witnessed the granting of over 250 master's degrees in counseling. In any given semester, the MAC department provides academic advisement and curriculum programming to approximately 35 graduate level students.

From July 2013 – April 2017, the MAC department had several transitions in leadership and faculty, resulting in changes in staffing, student enrollment, evaluations, program objectives, measurements, and more. Due to these changes, student enrollment in the program dropped significantly. The program has since hired a full-time director, two full time faculty, and a part-time clinical training supervisor.

In the previous Assessment plan, updated in the summer of 2015, the plan included three Program Effectiveness Assessments that were not implemented (due to all the transitions) and will not be used going forward. These assessments were the following: Research Proposal, Worldview Paper, and Theoretical Orientation. In lieu of these assessments, the program is implementing additional assessment tools including the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE), the Training Progress Report (TPR), Mid-Program Evaluation, and various course specific capstone projects. These will be added to the previous assessment tool, the Oral Examination.

In Spring 2018, the MAC department established new program objectives to better reflect professional standards and the department mission and values. New measurements have been implemented to measure these objectives effectively. Because of the changes in program objectives and student learning outcomes, previously used measures will not be used in this program assessment.

In July 2022, MAC was awarded CACREP accreditation, demonstrating legitimacy and accountability of the program.

In the summer of 2023, Multnomah University officially closed its doors and the Multnomah Campus of Jessup University was established. This merger of two historic schools provided Multnomah with the financial backing that was needed to continue its work in Portland, Oregon. As MAC is under the oversight and regulations of CACREP, no significant changes were made to the program.

Number of students completing the MAC degrees from 2011+

Year	Spring Graduates	Summer Graduates	Fall Graduates	Total
2011	0	0	13	13
2012	3	3	14	20
2013	13	6	13	32
2014	14	0	24	38
2015	11	0	18	29
2016	11	0	18	29

2017	8	0	8	16
2018	4	1	6	11
2019	4	1	6	11
2020	4	2	5	11
2021	1	2	7	10
2022	3	2	3	8
2023	0	0	12	12
2024	0	0	10	10

Professional Identity Data: Core Faculty 2022-23

Name	Terminal Degree	Professional Memberships	License	Program Roles
Mariah LeFeber	PhD in Leadership with a CES specialization	American Counseling Association Association for Counselor Education and Supervision	LPC; BC-DMT	Professor, Supervisor
Danielle Render Turmaud	CES PhD	Association for Counselor Education and Supervision	Professional Counselor Associate	CACREP Liaison, Professor, Supervisor
Kristen White	PsyD	American Counseling Association American Psychological Association	Psychologist	Director, Professor, Supervisor
Kristi Cash White	CES PhD	American Counseling Association ACA Counselors for Social Justice Association for Multicultural Counseling & Development Association for Counselor Education & Supervision	LPC	Professor, Supervisor

Demographic Data

In order to help facilitate the above program outcomes, the MAC program seeks to create a diverse, faith-based, learning community where all students can feel supported. One way this is assessed is via demographic and other factors of applicants, students, and graduates. In particular, the program is attentive to any groups who are under-represented or not successfully matriculating through the program.

Students in the 2022-23 school year:

	Male*	%	Female *	%	Total	Total %
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	0	0	1	2.9	1	2.9
Asian	1	2.9	3	8.6	4	11.4
Black	2	5.7	4	11.4	6	17.1
Hawaiian Native/ Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	2	5.7	1	2.9	3	8.6
Two or More	0	0	1	2.9	1	2.9
Unknown/ Other	1	2.9	1	2.9	2	5.7
White	4	11.4	14	40	18	51.4
Total	10	28.6	25	71.4	35	100
International Student	1	2.9	1	2.9	2	5.7
Active Duty Military	1	2.9	0	0	1	2.9
Veteran	0	0	1	2.9	1	2.9
With a Disability	0	0	4	11.4	4	11.4

*No current students openly identify as non-binary/ gender fluid.

It is worth noting that the racial demographics of the MAC program highlight greater diversity than is found in the general population for Portland, Oregon, whose population is comprised of 68.3% white, 9.57% Hispanic, 8.32% Asian, 5.7% black, and 0.6% Native American.

Supervisor Feedback

In 2023, surveys showed that supervisors rated students as having “advanced competency” in their professional skills and demeanor across a number of categories:

Program Outcome	Average Score for Practicum/Internship Students (out of 6)
Therapeutic Presence	5.28
Academic Skills	5.08
Professional Identity	5.49
Clinical Skills	5.14
Intercultural Knowledge & Proficiency	5.0
Ethical Knowledge & Understanding	5.17

Short-answer comments revealed strengths of building rapport with clients, engaging professionally, and integrating faith into practice in ethical and therapeutic ways with comments such as “wonderful addition to the field,” “thoughtful and responsive clinician,” and “wonderful at building rapport and connecting with clients.”

Specific Assessment Outcomes

As graduates of the MAC program, students demonstrate:

Spiritual Integration

- o S1. Articulate a view of human nature and transformation that integrates counseling theory and Christian theology, while recognizing the impact of these spiritual beliefs on the counselors’ worldview and engaging them in an ethical and professional manner.
- o S2. Practice spiritual assessment and clinical integration in an ethical and professional manner
- o S3. Pursue ongoing personal and spiritual development, demonstrating self-care strategies appropriate to the counselor role.

Healing Presence

- o H1. Demonstrate essential interviewing and counseling skills, building from a Person-Centered model.
- o H2. Utilize a variety of techniques and interventions for the prevention and treatment of a broad range of mental disorders, stemming from a variety of modalities.
- o H3. Demonstrate appropriate procedures for assessing risk of aggression or danger to others, self-inflicted harm, or suicide.
- o H4. Apply clinical skills to facilitating client skill development for career, educational, and life-work planning and management.
- o H5. Identify and embody characteristics and functions of an effective group leader.

Advocacy & Diversity

- o A1. Understand and utilize multicultural counseling competencies, such as providing culturally inclusive services with people from diverse backgrounds.
- o A2. Understand differential diagnosis with sensitivity to clients' culture and diversity factors.
- o A3. Articulate strategies for advocating for diverse clients' career and educational development and employment opportunities.

Professional Identity

- o P1. Articulate and abide by ethical standards of the profession via the ACA code of ethics and applicable legal standards.
- o P2. Demonstrate professional dispositions consistent with the profession; see Appendix A for more detail.
- o P3. Articulate and make reasonable progress toward a plan for their professional career in terms of work setting(s), licensure (if desired), membership in professional organizations, ongoing training, etc.

Educational Excellence

- o E1. Articulate a variety of theories related to individual and family development across the lifespan and apply them to conceptualizing clients.
- o E2. Articulate multiple theories and models of counseling to create effective treatment plans for clients.
- o E3. Utilize research to identify evidence-based counseling practices for various diagnoses and disorders, and critically evaluate their application to actual clients.
- o E4. Identify assessments for diagnostic and intervention planning purposes.
- o E5. Articulate dynamics associated with group process and development.

Assessment Strategy

Assessment of the MAC department core requirements at Multnomah University is on-going to assure that the program meets professional standards. Assessments are disseminated in order to best meet professional standards including the use of formative, summative, and attitudinal assessments. Due to the nature of professional standards, students in the MAC department are evaluated in skill development as well as interpersonal growth based upon the general expectations of beginning counselors in the field. These evaluations assist with assessing student growth as well as program effectiveness.

Data Needed for Assessment, Methods, and Data Collection

Program Design Assessment

- Peer Faculty Review
- Student Satisfaction – course evaluation
- Student Satisfaction – alumni survey
- Student Satisfaction – graduating student survey
- Syllabus Analysis

Program Effectiveness Assessment

- Mid-Program Evaluation
This evaluation, completed at the end of students' first year in the Program, provides an initial assessment of students' professional dispositions as well as their readiness to start the practical application of the program—Practicum. Students complete a self-evaluation and then receive faculty feedback
- Assignment Rubrics
These are used for capstone assignments in key courses, including: Diversity, Human Growth & Development, Spiritual Formation, and Lifestyle & Career
- Oral Examination
This is a comprehensive written and oral presentation of a client including client information, presenting concern, symptomology, diagnosis, counseling theory and integration of faith. The Oral exam is completed near the end of a student's program.
- Training Progress Report
This is an evaluation completed by faculty and clinical supervisors throughout a student's development to assess their progress in areas such as therapeutic presence, academic knowledge, ethical considerations, intercultural proficiency, and spiritual integration.

Time for Data Collection

Annual Assessments

- Mid-Program Evaluation
- Assignment Rubrics (for key courses)
- Oral Examination
- Training Progress Report
- Student Satisfaction – course evaluation
- Student Satisfaction – graduating student survey
- Student Satisfaction – alumni survey

Periodic Assessment

- Peer Faculty Review – annually for new faculty; every five years for those on ongoing contracts
- Syllabus Analysis – as needed

Responsibility for the Use of Findings

The full cycle of the MAC assessment strategies call for information about assessment results to be shared with appropriate groups on campus (e.g, course instructors, the MAC Director, the VP of Academic Affairs, the Dean of the Department of Psychology, etc.) so that necessary changes can be considered in the context of overall Program needs and resources. The MAC Director is responsible for ensuring timely and systematic collection and analysis of data. Some of this information is disseminated as the data becomes available (e.g., course evaluations immediately after courses conclude); the rest is collected and reviewed annually, during the spring or summer, by the MAC Director. The Director also shares findings with the MAC team for review and discussion of relevant changes during ongoing team meetings.

Statement of Goals/Outcomes

Students who successfully complete the Master of Arts in Counseling Program will be able to demonstrate their knowledge outlined in the program objectives as evidenced by the following assessments:

Goal: (S1) Articulate a view of human nature and transformation that integrates counseling theory and Christian theology, while recognizing the impact of these spiritual beliefs on the counselors' worldview and engaging them in an ethical and professional manner.

Measurement Method 1

Students complete the Mid-Program Evaluation during the 3rd semester of the Program. Students are rated on how they exhibit different program objectives. Rating is on a scale of 1-6 with 1 being "unacceptable" and 6 being "exemplary."

Expected Results

Students will be rated on the S1 student learning objective, "Articulates a view of human nature and transformation that integrates counseling theory and Christian theology, while recognizing the impact of these spiritual beliefs on the counselors' worldview and engaging them in an ethical and professional manner." At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3, indicating that the student has reached initial competency.

Actual Results

The Mid-Program Evaluation was implemented in Fall 2018; two cohorts were given the evaluation in order to provide feedback to as many students near their mid-program as possible.

	Fall 2018		Summer 2019	Summer 2020	Summer 2021	Summer 2022	Summer 2022
	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 19	Cohort 20	Cohort 21	Cohort 22
Exceeding Standard	50%	33%	44%	64%	75%	67%	25%
Meeting Standard	50%	67%	56%	36%	25%	33%	67%
Below Standard	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%

Measurement Method 2

Students complete the Oral Examination near the end of the program. Until spring 2021, two criteria were used from the Oral Exam Rubric to measure students' knowledge of S1, including "Integration Understanding" and "Values and Belief." In summer 2021, these were combined into one criteria, titled "cognitive integration." Students are rated on each criterion on a scale of 1-3.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a combined score of 67% or more (i.e., 4 out of 6 until spring 2021 and 2 out of 3 with the updated rubric), indicating that the student is “developing: understanding of concepts/skills present with some minor errors.” To earn a score of 2 or more on the updated rubric, students would have to show the following:

- “Counselor conceptualizes counseling itself, their theory, the client, and/or other aspects of clinical work through a Biblical worldview. Counselor offers an integration of counseling theory and Christian theology for at least one of these areas. Conceptualization may be limited, missing any references/citations, or have some minor problems.”

Actual Results

The Oral Exam rubric was updated to include this information in summer 2019. Data is listed by year, as students are often taking the exam in very small groups.

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023		
Exceeding Standard	100%	100%	91%	89%	85%		
Meeting Standard	0%	0%	9%	11%	15%		
Below Standard	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		

GOAL: (S2) Practice spiritual assessment and clinical integration in an ethical and professional manner.

Measurement Method 1

Students are assessed using a rubric for their summative assignment in their Spiritual Integration course (COU 515). In this assignment, students are asked to discuss how the ACA ethics code and ASERVIC spiritual competencies create guidelines in working with spirituality in counseling, discuss specific assessment measures, and discuss actual spiritual interventions they would use for a given vignette—both if the client were Christian and more broadly “spiritual.” Four criteria are used from the assignment Rubric to measure students’ knowledge of S2, including: “Ethics,” “Spiritual Assessment,” “Clinical Interventions – Christian,” “Clinical Interventions – Spiritual.” Students are rated on each criterion on a scale of 1-5, for a total score of up to 20 points in this section of the rubric.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a combined score of 16 or more, indicating that the student is “accomplished” in their understanding and application of each area. To earn a 4 in each category, students would have to show the following:

- *Ethics (4)*: “Student addresses ethical implications of addressing spirituality and religion in counseling. He/she mentions at least 2 specific and relevant ethics ACA codes and/or ASERVIC competencies; descriptions may be limited.”

- *Spiritual Assessment (4)*: “Student clearly describes how they would further assess Jennifer’s spirituality, citing at least two specific measures or questions they would ask in professional language. He/she holds a clinical, nonjudgmental stance, even where client may differ from his/her own spiritual beliefs.”
- *Clinical Interventions - Christian (4)*: “Student is able to describe at least 2 specific interventions that may be tailored to the client’s *Christian* spirituality. He/she only marginally demonstrates a therapeutic stance toward these interventions. He/she also demonstrates some engagement with the class discussions and text.”
- *Clinical Interventions - Spiritual (4)*: “Student is able to describe at least 2 specific interventions that may be tailored to the client’s general spirituality. He/she only marginally demonstrates a therapeutic stance toward these interventions. He/she also demonstrates some engagement with the class discussions and text.”

Actual Results

The assignment rubric was created in Spring 2020, and updated in Spring 2021.

	Spring 2020 (cohort 19)	Summer 2021 (cohort 20)	Summer 2022 (cohort 21)	Summer 2023 (cohort 22)			
<i>Exceeding Standard</i>	75%	86%	84%	55%			
<i>Meeting Standard</i>	8%	0%	8%	27%			
<i>Below Standard</i>	17%	14%	8%	18%			

Measurement Method 2

Students complete the Oral Examination near the end of the program. One criterion is used from the Oral exam Rubric to measure students’ knowledge of S2, called “Practical Integration.” Students are rated on each criterion on a scale of 1-3.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 2 or more indicating that the student is “developing: understanding of concepts/skills present with some minor errors.” To earn a score of 2 students would show the following: “Counselor uses appropriate, spiritual interventions and assessments in an ethical, professional, and therapeutic manner. While assessments and interventions are tailored to the constraints of the setting and desires of the client, counselor is also able to discuss clearly what this would have looked with a client who desired Christian integration. Description is clear but may be missing one of these elements, lack thoroughness, or have minor inconsistencies with case formulation.”

Actual Results

The Oral Exam rubric was updated to include this information in Summer 2019. Data is listed by year, as students are often taking the exam in very small groups.

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023		
Exceeding Standard	50%	56%	18%	56%	63%		
Meeting Standard	50%	33%	82%	44%	28%		
Below Standard	0%	11%	0%	0%	9%		

GOAL: (S3) Pursue ongoing personal and spiritual development, demonstrating self-care strategies appropriate to the counselor role.

Measurement Method 1

Students are assessed on the Training Progress Report during their final semester of internship. Question P.12 “Pursues ongoing development and demonstrates appropriate levels of personal development, self-awareness, and self-care” will be used for measurement and is rated on a scale from 1-6, with 1 being “unacceptable” and 6 being “exemplary.” As of Summer 2021, the program began using the Training Progress Report during course COU 645 instead of the final semester of internship to provide a better consistency in tracking and data.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 4 or more, indicating mid-level competency.

Actual Results

The Training Progress Report was implemented in Fall 2018. The evaluation is provided to all students who are completing their internship during that semester.

	Fall 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	
Exceeding Standard	85.7%	45.5%	27.3%	86%	29%	62%	
Meeting Standard	14.3%	54.5%	72.7%	7%	43%	23%	
Below Standard	0%	0%	0%	7%	28%	15%	

Measurement Method 2

Students complete the Mid-Program Evaluation during the 3rd semester of the program. Students are rated on how they exhibit different program objectives. Rating is on a scale of 1-6 with 1 being “unacceptable” and 6 being “exemplary.”

Expected Results

Students are rated on the S3 student learning objective, “Pursues ongoing personal and spiritual development, demonstrating self-care strategies appropriate to the

counselor role.” At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 indicating that the student has reached initial competency.

Actual Results

The Mid-Program Evaluation was implemented in Fall 2018; two cohorts were given the evaluation in order to provide feedback to as many students near their mid-program as possible; it should be noted that Cohort 16 was already in their 4th semester.

	Fall 2018		Summer 2019	Summer 2020	Summer 2021	Summer 2022	Summer 2023
	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 19	Cohort 20	Cohort 21	Cohort 22
<i>Exceeding Standard</i>	42%	50%	44%	91%	88%	73%	50%
<i>Meeting Standard</i>	50%	17%	33%	9%	12%	20%	42%
<i>Below Standard</i>	8%	33%	22%	0%	0%	7%	8%

Goal: (H1) Demonstrate essential interviewing and counseling skills, building from a Person-Centered model.

Measurement Method 1

Students complete the Mid-Program Evaluation during the 3rd semester of the program. Students are rated on how they exhibit different program objectives. Rating is on a scale of 1-6, with 1 being “unacceptable” and 6 being “exemplary.”

Expected Results

Students are rated on the H1 student learning objective, “Demonstrates essential interviewing and counseling skills, building from a Person-Centered model.” At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 indicating that the student has reached initial competency.

Actual Results

The Mid-Program Evaluation was implemented in Fall 2018; two cohorts were given the evaluation in order to provide feedback to as many students near their mid-program as possible; it should be noted that Cohort 16 was already in their 4th semester.

	Fall 2018		Summer 2019	Summer 2020	Summer 2021	Summer 2022	Summer 2023
	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 19	Cohort 20	Cohort 21	Cohort 22
<i>Exceeding Standard</i>	25%	17%	56%	55%	63%	40%	25%
<i>Meeting Standard</i>	67%	17%	33%	45%	38%	53%	67%

Below Standard	8%	66%	11%	0%	0%	7%	8%
----------------	----	-----	-----	----	----	----	----

Measurement Method 2

Students complete the Oral Examination near the end of the program. One criterion is used from the Oral exam Rubric to measure students' knowledge of H1, called "Counseling Relationship." Students are rated on a scale of 1-3.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 2 or more, indicating that the student is "developing: understanding of concepts/skills present with some minor errors."

To earn a score of 2 students would show the following: "Counselor demonstrates an ability to develop and deepen the counseling relationship with the client by displaying positive regard, respect, warmth, non-judgmental attitude, empathy, authenticity, and congruence through a Person-Centered lens."

Actual Results

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023		
Exceeding Standard	25%	67%	73%	56%	85%		
Meeting Standard	75%	33%	27%	44%	15%		
Below Standard	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		

GOAL: (H2) Utilize a variety of techniques and interventions for the prevention and treatment of a broad range of mental disorders, stemming from a variety of modalities.

Measurement Method 1

Students are assessed on the Training Progress Report during the Practicum Course, which is typically in the 4th semester of the program. Question C.1 "Uses a variety of techniques and interventions for a broad range of mental health disorders, including practicing active listening, open ended questions and demonstrating other person-centered skills" will be used for measurement and is rated on a scale from 1-6, with 1 being "unacceptable" and 6 being "exemplary."

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more indicating initial competency.

Actual Results

The Training Progress Report was implemented in Fall 2018. The evaluation is provided to all students at the end of the Practicum Course.

	Fall 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	
--	-----------	------	------	------	------	------	--

Exceeding Standard	0%	0.0%	50.0%	60%	100%	27%	
Meeting Standard	100%	100.0%	50.0%	40%	0%	64%	
Below Standard	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	0%	9%	

Measurement Method 2

Students complete the Oral Examination near the end of the program. One criterion is used from the Oral exam Rubric to measure students' knowledge of H2, called "Comprehensive Use of Skills." Students are rated on a scale of 1-3.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 2 or more, indicating that the student is "developing: understanding of concepts/skills present with some minor errors."

To earn a score of 2 students would show the following: "Counselor demonstrates the use of a range of counseling skills such as open-ended questions, summarization, clarification reflecting content/ feeling, etc. Skills go slightly beyond a Person-Centered model (e.g., CBT, DBT, ACT) and hint at student's chosen theory and stated treatment plan."

Actual Results

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023		
Exceeding Standard	37.5%	33%	9%	22%	29%		
Meeting Standard	50%	44%	73%	78%	62%		
Below Standard	12.5%	22%	18%	0%	9%		

GOAL: (H3) Demonstrate appropriate procedures for assessing risk of aggression or danger to others, self-inflicted harm, or suicide.

Measurement Method 1

Students are assessed on the Training Progress Report during the Practicum Course, which is typically in the 4th semester of the program. Question C.2 "Applies appropriate procedures for assessing risk" will be used for measurement and is rated on a scale from 1-6, with 1 being "unacceptable" and 6 being "exemplary."

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating initial competency.

Actual Results

The Training Progress Report was implemented in Fall 2018. The evaluation is provided to all students at the end of the Practicum Course.

	Fall 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	
Exceeding Standard	0%	83.3%	30.0%	50%	92%	27%	
Meeting Standard	100%	16.7%	70.0%	50%	8%	73%	
Below Standard	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	0%	0%	

Measurement Method 2

Students complete the Oral Examination near the end of the program. One criterion is used from the Oral exam Rubric to measure students' knowledge of H3, called "Precipitating Event and Presenting Concern." Students are rated on a scale of 1-5.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating that the student has "mastered basic skills at developmental level." To earn a score of 3, students would show the following: "Includes summary of key recent and past events, risk assessment and traumas. Includes basic description of problem for client."

Actual Results

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023		
Exceeding Standard	37.5%	67%	55%	67%	37%		
Meeting Standard	50%	22%	45%	33%	63%		
Below Standard	12.5%	11%	0%	0%	0%		

GOAL: (H4) Apply clinical skills to facilitating client skill development for career, educational, and life-work planning, and management.

Measurement Method 1

Students are assessed on the Training Progress Report throughout Practicum and Internship. This assessment evaluation is being moved from Practicum to the second semester of Internship COU 645 in 2021, in order to collect a larger sample size (as students have not typically led a group by the end of Practicum, so the question was often left blank). Question C.9 "Applies skills to client development in career, education, and life-work management" will continue to be used for measurement; this question is rated on a scale from 1-6, with 1 being "unacceptable" and 6 being "exemplary."

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating initial competency.

Actual Results

The Training Progress Report was implemented in Fall 2018. The data was originally taken from the end of Practicum, but switched to Internship in 2021 for more meaningful data.

	Fall 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	
<i>Exceeding Standard</i>	0%	66.7%	10.0%	100%	60%	33%	
<i>Meeting Standard</i>	100%	33.3%	90.0%	0%	40%	67%	
<i>Below Standard</i>	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	0%	0%	

Measurement Method 2

Students will be assessed using a rubric for their summative assignment in their Lifestyle & Career course (COU 680). The assignment asks students to “research and present their findings on providing career counseling to a selected cultural population.” The assignment rubric then rates students on a 4-point scale from “beginning” to “exemplary” for a number of items, including “Clinical Skills,” which is used for measurement here.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating that the student “articulates how clinical skills can be applied to facilitate client skill development for career, education, and/or life-work planning/ management in the population, describing at least 2 specific applications.”

Actual Results

The Lifestyle & Career rubric was implemented in Fall 2020.

	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023			
<i>Exceeding Standard</i>	100%	100%	100%	100%			
<i>Meeting Standard</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%			
<i>Below Standard</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%			

GOAL: (H5) Identify and embody characteristics and functions of an effective group leader.

Measurement Method 1

Students will be assessed using a rubric for their summative assignment in their Group Dynamics & Counseling course (COU 640). The assignment asks students to practice being a group leader for an initial session of a group they create. The professor then rates all students on rubric with a 4-point scale from “beginning” to “exemplary” for their skill as a group leader.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating initial competency.

Actual Results

The rubric was implemented in Spring 2019.

	Spring 2019 (Cohort 17)	Fall 2019 (Cohort 18)	Fall 2020 (Cohort 19)	Fall 2021 (Cohort 20)	Fall 2022 (Cohort 21)	Fall 2023 (Cohort 22)
<i>Exceeding Standard</i>	60%	86%	82%	67%	95%	100%
<i>Meeting Standard</i>	40%	14%	18%	22%	5%	100%
<i>Below Standard</i>	0%	0%	0%	11%	0%	100%

Measurement Method 2

Students are assessed on the Training Progress Report during their final semester of internship. Question C.8 “Embodies characteristics of an effective group leader” will be used for measurement and is rated on a scale from 1-6, with 1 being “unacceptable” and 6 being “exemplary.” As of Summer 2021, the program began using the Training Progress Report during course COU 645 instead of the final semester of internship to provide a better consistency in tracking and data.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 4 or more, indicating mid-level competency.

Actual Results

The Training Progress Report was implemented in Fall 2018. The evaluation is provided to all students who are completing their internship during that semester.

	Fall 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
<i>Exceeding Standard</i>	28.6%	11.1%	0%	86%	50%	0%
<i>Meeting Standard</i>	57.1%	88.9%	100%	14%	0%	100%
<i>Below Standard</i>	14.3%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%

GOAL: (A1) Understand and utilize multicultural counseling competencies, such as providing culturally inclusive services with people from diverse backgrounds.

Measurement Method 1

Students are assessed using a rubric for a major assignment in their Social & Cultural Diversity course (COU 643). The assignment asks students to explore diversity factors and practical multicultural counseling competencies related to a deidentified client or another figure of their choosing (e.g., literary or public figure). One aspect of the rubric provides

students up to 50 points for describing “appropriate multicultural counselor competencies related to the diversity considerations.”

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 40 or more, indicating that the student described multicultural counselor competencies at a minimum of a B level.

	2020 (Cohort 19)	2021 (Cohort 20)	2022 (Cohort 21)	2023 (Cohort 22)			
Exceeding Standard	100%	63%	83%	100			
Meeting Standard	0%	25%	17%	20%			
Below Standard	0%	12%	0%	30%			

Measurement Method 2

Students complete the Oral Examination near the end of the program. One criterion is used from the Oral exam Rubric to measure students’ knowledge of A1, called “Diversity Considerations.” Students are rated on a scale of 1-5.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating that the student has “mastered basic skills at developmental level.” To earn a score of 3, students would show the following: “Demonstrates the use of multicultural counseling, such as providing culturally inclusive services, with some minor issues. Identifies several cultural and social discourse issues and outlines how these impact the counseling process, with some elements missing.”

Actual Results

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023		
Exceeding Standard	12.5%	67%	36%	56%	38%		
Meeting Standard	75%	11%	46%	44%	38%		
Below Standard	12.5%	22%	18%	0%	24%		

GOAL: (A2) Understand differential diagnosis with sensitivity to clients’ culture and diversity factors.

Measurement Method 1

Students are assessed on the Training Progress Report during the Practicum Course, which is typically in the 4th semester of the program. Question I.6 “Understands and demonstrates competence in differential diagnosis with consideration of client’s culture and diversity

factors” will be used for measurement and is rated on a scale from 1-6, with 1 being “unacceptable” and 6 being “exemplary.”

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating initial competency.

Actual Results

The Training Progress Report was implemented in Fall 2018. The evaluation is provided to all students at the end of the Practicum Course.

	Fall 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	
Exceeding Standard	0%	25.0%	27.3%	33%	92%	18%	
Meeting Standard	100%	75.0%	72.7%	67%	8%	73%	
Below Standard	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	0%	9%	

Measurement Method 2

Students complete the Oral Examination near the end of the program. One criterion is used from the Oral exam Rubric to measure students’ knowledge of A2, called “Diagnosis.” Students are rated on a scale of 1-5.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating that the student has “mastered basic skills at developmental level.” To earn a score of 3, students would show the following: “Uses diagnostic tools to describe symptoms. May not differentiate between diagnosis and other reactions, crisis, and/or culture.”

Actual Results

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023		
Exceeding Standard	25%	11%	36%	44%	63%		
Meeting Standard	50%	67%	36%	45%	28%		
Below Standard	25%	22%	27%	11%	9%		

GOAL: (A3) Articulate strategies for advocating for diverse clients’ career and educational development and employment opportunities.

Measurement Method 1

Students took the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam in the last semester of their program through Fall 2020. Student scores for the core area of “Career Development” were used for this measurement.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will score within (or above) one standard deviation of the national mean in the section on Career Development. The national mean differs for each version of the exam and is taken into account for the scores below.

Actual Results

	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2018	2019*	2020
	Cohort 13	Cohort 14	Cohort 15	N/A	N/A
Exceeding Standard	71%	100%	90%	92%	100%
Meeting Standard	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Below Standard	29%	0%	10%	8%	0%

*Data condensed to a year at a time, due to low numbers of students taking the exam each semester.

Measurement Method 2

The CPCE discontinued in 2021, as noted in the 2020 program assessment and notes above. In lieu of the CPCE measure, students will be assessed using a rubric for their summative assignment in their Advocacy course (COU 675). The assignment asks students to “pick a group of people who may be marginalized in our culture to research and assemble a portfolio/paper” that includes “what it might look like to advocate for this client on individual, community and public/policy levels.” This includes counseling suggestions, referral ideas, and more.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 320 or more (out of 400), indicating that the student described advocacy strategies at a minimum of a B level.

Actual Results

	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023			
Exceeding Standard	100%	100%	100%			
Meeting Standard	0%	0%	0%			
Below Standard	0%	0%	0%			

Measurement Method 3

Students are assessed using a rubric for their summative assignment in their Lifestyle & Career course (COU 680). The assignment asks students to “research and present their findings on providing career counseling to a selected cultural population.” The assignment rubric then rates students on a 4-point scale from “beginning” to “exemplary” for a number of items, including “Advocacy,” which is used for measurement here.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating that the student “pinpoints and clarifies at least 2 ways that clinicians can advocate for educational and employment opportunities with this population.”

Actual Results

	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023		
	Cohort 18	Cohort 19	Cohort 20	Cohort 21		
Exceeding Standard	100%	84%	100%	100%		
Meeting Standard	0%	8%	0%	0%		
Below Standard	0%	8%	0%	0%		

GOAL: (P1) Articulate and abide by ethical standards of the profession via the ACA code of ethics and applicable legal standards.

Measurement Method 1

Students complete the Mid-Program Evaluation during the 3rd semester of the program. Students are rated on how they exhibit different program objectives. Rating is on a scale of 1-6, with 1 being “unacceptable” and 6 being “exemplary.”

Expected Results

Students are rated on the P1 student learning objective, “Articulates and abides by ethical standards of the profession via the ACA code of ethics and applicable legal standards.” At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 indicating that the student has reached initial competency.

Actual Results

The Mid-Program Evaluation was implemented in Fall 2018; two cohorts were given the evaluation in order to provide feedback to as many students near their mid-program as possible; it should be noted that Cohort 16 was already in their 4th semester.

	Fall 2018		Summer 2019	Summer 2020	Summer 2021	Summer 2022	Summer 2023
	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 19	Cohort 20	Cohort 21	Cohort 22
Exceeding Standard	8%	50%	0%	18%	12%	53%	0%
Meeting Standard	92%	50%	100%	82%	88%	40%	100%
Below Standard	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%

Measurement Method 2

Students complete the Oral Examination near the end of the program. One criterion is used from the Oral exam Rubric to measure students' knowledge of P1, called "Ethical Considerations." Students are rated on a scale of 1-5.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating that the student has "mastered basic skills at developmental level." To earn a score of 3, students would show the following: "Client's identity remains anonymous, student adheres to ACA Guide of Ethics but fails to discuss all potential ethical concerns."

Actual Results

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023		
Exceeding Standard	37.5%	67%	27%	44%	63%		
Meeting Standard	50%	22%	46%	45%	37%		
Below Standard	12.5%	11%	27%	11%	0%		

GOAL: (P2) Demonstrate professional dispositions consistent with the profession; see Appendix A for more detail.

Measurement Method 1

Students complete the Mid-Program Evaluation during the 3rd semester of the program. Students are rated on how they exhibit different program objectives. Rating is on a scale of 1-6, with 1 being "unacceptable" and 6 being "exemplary."

Expected Results

Students will be rated on the P2 student learning objective, "Demonstrates professional dispositions consistent with the profession." At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 indicating that the student has reached initial competency.

Actual Results

The Mid-Program Evaluation was implemented in Fall 2018; two cohorts were given the evaluation in order to provide feedback to as many students near their mid-program as possible; it should be noted that Cohort 16 was already in their 4th semester.

	Fall 2018		Summer 2019	Summer 2020	Summer 2021	Summer 2022	Summer 2023
	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 19	Cohort 20	Cohort 21	Cohort 22
Exceeding Standard	33%	33%	44%	36%	38%	60%	50%
Meeting Standard	50%	67%	44%	64%	50%	27%	33%

Below Standard	17%	0%	11%	0%	12%	13%	17%
----------------	-----	----	-----	----	-----	-----	-----

Measurement Method 2

Students are assessed on the Training Progress Report during their final semester of internship. Question P.10 “Demonstrates professional dispositions consistent with the profession” will be used for measurement and is rated on a scale from 1-6, with 1 being “unacceptable” and 6 being “exemplary.” As of Summer 2021, the program began using the Training Progress Report during course COU 645 instead of the final semester of internship to provide a better consistency in tracking and data.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 4 or more, indicating mid-level competency.

Actual Results

The Training Progress Report was implemented in Fall 2018. The evaluation is provided to all students who are completing their internship during that semester.

	Fall 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	
Exceeding Standard	85.7%	45.5%	54.5%	78.6%	28%	67%	
Meeting Standard	14.3%	54.5%	36.4%	14.3%	29%	33%	
Below Standard	0%	0%	9.1%	7.1%	43%	0%	

GOAL: (P3) Articulate and make reasonable progress toward a plan for their professional career in terms of work setting(s), licensure (if desired), membership in professional organizations, ongoing training, etc.

Measurement Method 1

Students complete the Graduate Survey in their final class of the Program. A number of criterion are used from the Graduate Survey to measure P3, including whether graduates are working as professional counselors, have identified professional counseling settings where they would like to work, and whether they belong to any professional organizations.

Expected Results

At least 25% of students will already have found jobs in the professional counseling field prior to graduation. At least 80% will have identified at least one setting where they would like to work and 80% will also belong to at least one professional organization.

Actual Results

These questions will be added to the Graduate Survey for students who finish the Program beginning in the Fall 2018.

* The Graduate Survey was not completed for the year 2023.

	2018			2019			2020		
	Working as a prof. counselor	Identified work setting	Belong to 1+ prof. organ	Working as a prof. counselor	Identified work setting	Belong to 1+ prof. organ	Working as a prof. counselor	Identified work setting	Belong to 1+ prof. organ
Meeting Standard	80%	90%	100%	50%	100%	83%	67%	100%	100%
Below Standard	20%	10%	0%	50%	0%	17%	0%	0%	0%

	2021			2022			2023		
	Working as a prof. counselor	Identified work setting	Belong to 1+ prof. organ	Working as a prof. counselor	Identified work setting	Belong to 1+ prof. organ	Working as a prof. counselor	Identified work setting	Belong to 1+ prof. organ
Meeting Standard	50%	90%	100%	75%	100%	100%	*	*	*
Below Standard	50%	10%	0%	25%	0%	0%	*	*	*

Measurement Method 2

Students will complete the Alumni Survey (via email) every few years, as alumni relations is able to support these efforts. A number of criterion are used from the Graduate Survey to measure P3, including whether alumni are working as a professional counselor, whether they have taken and passed the NCE (i.e., the national licensing exam for LPC's), whether they are licensed, whether they belong to any professional organization, and how many professional trainings they typically attend per year.

Expected Results

Expectations in regard to graduates' advancement in the field must be tailored to how long they have been in the field. Although all data will be considered, for the purpose of this assessment, overall goals will be as follows:

- At least 70% of graduates will be working as a professional counselor, belong to at least one professional organization, and be attending at least one professional training per year.
- At least 80% of graduates who take the NCE will pass it on the first try.

Actual Results

The Alumni Survey was sent for the first time in November 2018. Since the survey had never been used before, it was sent to all alumni. Alumni Relations had email addresses and sent surveys to 154 alumni; about 25 of those emails bounced back

because of using outdated email addresses. Out of the remaining 129 recipients, 31 replied, giving a total response rate of 24%.

It was sent again in spring 2022, again to all alumni, but using a new system to try and increase response rates. It was sent to 171 alumni email addresses; only 2 of those emails bounced back and 105 were opened, giving a total response rate of 21%. This data may therefore be somewhat overlapping with the fall 2018. Short-answers do seem to demonstrate growing confidence in the program however, and future alumni surveys will be aimed specifically at newer alumni.

	Fall 2018				Spring 2022			
	Working as a professional counselor	Belonging to 1+ professional organizations	Attending 1+ training per year	Passing NCE on 1 st try	Working as a professional counselor	Belonging to 1+ professional organizations	Attending 1+ training per year	Passing NCE on 1 st try
Meeting Standard	77%	45%	84%	100%	86%	56%	86%	92%
Below Standard	23%	55%	16%	0%	14%	44%	14%	8%

Measurement Method 3

Since the administration Alumni Survey is proving to be a sporadic measure, the program decided to create an additional assessment for P3 at the beginning of the program, during the Professional Orientation course (COU500). The assignment asks students to write about various counseling settings, professional organizations, trends in the field, and licensing regulations—both generally in relation to the field and personally in relation to their interests. The assignment rubric then rates students on a 5-point scale from “missing” to “exemplary” for a number of items, including “Counseling Settings,” “Professional Organizations,” and “Licensing,” which are used for measurement here.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 12 or more (cumulatively, in these 3 areas), indicating that the student names and describes a number of counseling settings, professional organizations, and licensing regulations—both in general and in relation to their own interests.

Actual Results

The assignment and rubric were added to the course in Fall 2021.

	2021	2022	2023				
Exceeding Standard	100%	70%	80%				
Meeting Standard	0%	18%	20%				
Below Standard	0%	12%	20%				

GOAL: (E1) Articulate a variety of theories related to individual and family development across the lifespan and apply them to conceptualizing clients.

Measurement Method 1

Students will be assessed using a rubric for their summative assignment in their Human Growth & Development course (COU 653). The assignment asks students to “create a case conceptualization that focuses on developmental issues, in addition to other significant factors. The student should evaluate the individual using at minimum three of the developmental theories discussed in class, and be able to determine in which developmental stage the individual is per each developmental theorist.” The assignment rubric then rates students on a 5-point scale from “Deficits: significant remediation needed” to “Exceptional: skills and understanding beyond developmental level” for a number of items, including the application of each “Developmental Theory,” the average of which is used for measurement here.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating that the student is at an “expected” level, showing “developmentally appropriate understanding of concepts and skills.”

Actual Results

The Human Growth & Development rubric is a new evaluation, which was used for the first time in Spring 2018.

	Spring 2018 (C. 15)	Spring 2019 (C. 16)	Summer 2019 (C.17)	Spring 2020 (C. 18)	Spring 2021 (C. 19)	Spring 2022 (C. 20)	Spring 2023 (C.21)
Exceeding Standard	78%	100%	78%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Meeting Standard	11%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Below Standard	11%	0%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%

(Cohort 17 data is missing due to a professor error.)

Measurement Method 2

Students complete the Oral Examination near the end of the program. One criterion is used from the Oral exam Rubric to measure students’ knowledge of E1, called “Systems and Developmental Theory.” Students are rated on a scale of 1-5.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating that the student has “mastered basic skills at developmental level.” To earn a score of 3, students would show the following: “Clear description of a theory through a systems and developmental model (i.e. family, culture, contextual, etc.) but description lacks some details to fully understand problems or define symptoms”

Actual Results

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023		
Exceeding Standard	37.5%	56%	46%	67%	71%		
Meeting Standard	50%	22%	36%	33%	29%		
Below Standard	12.5%	22%	18%	0%	0%		

GOAL: (E2) Articulate multiple theories and models of counseling to create effective treatment plans for clients.

Measurement Method 1

Students are assessed on the Training Progress Report during the Practicum Course, which is typically the 4th semester of the program. Question A2 “Articulates multiple theories and models of counseling to create effective treatment plans” will be used for measurement and is rated on a scale from 1-6, with 1 being “unacceptable” and 6 being “exemplary.”

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more indicating, initial competency.

Actual Results

The Training Progress Report was implemented in Fall 2018. The evaluation is provided to all students at the end of the Practicum Course.

	Fall 2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	
Exceeding Standard	16.7%	50.0%	36.4%	40%	69%	54%	
Meeting Standard	83.3%	50.0%	63.6%	60%	31%	37%	
Below Standard	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	0%	9%	

Measurement Method 2

Students complete the Oral Examination near the end of the program. Two criteria are used from the Oral exam Rubric to measure students’ knowledge of E2, called “Counseling Theories” and “Treatment Direction & Goals.” Students are rated on each criterion on a scale of 1-5, for a total score of up to 10 points.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a combined score of 6 or more, indicating that the student has “mastered basic skills at developmental level.” To earn a score of 6, students would have to show both of the following:

- o “Theory is described and applied to client with some minor errors. There may be incomplete descriptions or flawed rationale, but basic information and application is accurate”
- o “Treatment goals and plans are described in depth but have minor conflict with theory or client goals..”

Actual Results

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023		
Exceeding Standard	87.5%	44%	64%	44%	69%		
Meeting Standard	12.5%	56%	9%	45%	22%		
Below Standard	0%	0%	27%	11%	9%		

GOAL: (E3) Utilize research to identify evidence-based counseling practices for various diagnoses and disorders, and critically evaluate their application to actual clients.

Measurement Method 1

Students complete the Mid-Program Evaluation during the 3rd semester of the program. Students are rated on how they exhibit different program objectives. Rating is on a scale of 1-6, with 1 being “unacceptable” and 6 being “exemplary.”

Expected Results

Students are rated on the E3 student learning objective, “Utilizes research to identify evidence-based counseling practices for various diagnoses and disorders, and critically evaluates their application to actual clients.” At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 indicating that the student has reached initial competency.

Actual Results

The G1 was implemented in Fall 2018; two cohorts were given the evaluation in order to provide feedback to as many students near their mid-program as possible; it should be noted that Cohort 16 was already in their 4th semester.

	Fall 2018		Summer 2019	Summer 2020	Summer 2021	Summer 2022	Summer 2023
	Cohort 16	Cohort 17	Cohort 18	Cohort 19	Cohort 20	Cohort 21	Cohort 22
Exceeding Standard	33%	50%	33%	18%	25%	27%	8%
Meeting Standard	67%	50%	67%	82%	63%	73%	84%
Below Standard	0%	0%	0%	0%	12%	0%	8%

Measurement Method 2

Students complete the Oral Examination near the end of the program. One criterion is used from the Oral exam Rubric to measure students' knowledge of E3, called "Theory and Treatment Justification." Students are rated on a scale of 1-5.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more indicating that the student has "mastered basic skills at developmental level." To earn a score of 3, students would show the following: "Identifies some current peer reviewed resources to justify theory and treatment."

Actual Results

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023		
Exceeding Standard	75%	33%	18%	11%	46%		
Meeting Standard	25%	33%	55%	78%	46%		
Below Standard	0%	33%	27%	11%	8%		

GOAL: (E4) Identify assessments for diagnostic and intervention planning purposes.

Measurement Method 1

Students complete the Oral Examination near the end of the program. One criterion is used from the Oral exam Rubric to measure students' knowledge of E4, called "Test Data and Assessment." Students are rated on a scale of 1-5.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating that the student has "mastered basic skills at developmental level." To earn a score of 3, students would show the following: "Appropriate assessment(s) chosen but discussed very briefly or with some inaccuracies (in general or in application to client). Assessment may or may not add to understanding of client."

Actual Results

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023		
Exceeding Standard	50%	33%	64%	78%	62%		
Meeting Standard	37.5%	44%	27%	22%	38%		
Below Standard	12.5%	22%	9%	0%	0%		

Measurement Method 2

Students took the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam in the last semester of their program. Student scores for the core area of "Assessment & Testing" were used for this measurement.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will score within (or above) one standard deviation of the national mean in the section on Assessment & Testing. The national mean differs for each version of the exam and is taken into account for the scores below.

Actual Results

	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2018	2019*	2020
	Cohort 13	Cohort 14	Cohort 15	N/A	N/A
Exceeding Standard	86%	75%	70%	85%	73%
Meeting Standard	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Below Standard	14%	25%	30%	15%	27%

**Data condensed to a year at a time, due to low numbers of students taking the exam each semester.*

Measurement Method 3

Due to the aforementioned issues with the CPCE, a new summative assignment was created for the Tests & Assessment course (COU660) in Summer 2021. The assignment asks students to find and give at least one appropriate test, based upon an intake and mental status completed on a client. The assignment rubric then rates students on a 5-point scale from “Missing” to “Exemplary” for a number of items, including the “Test Chosen” which is area used for measurement here.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating that the student is at an “accomplished” level, meaning “Student accurately describes at least one test, who created it, for what purpose, and the reliability and validity. They are also able to articulate strong reasons for how this test will help them diagnose, intervene, or otherwise counsel the individual. The descriptions are accurate and supported by academic sources, but some elements may be missing or incomplete.”

Actual Results

The Tests rubric is a new evaluation, which was used for the first time in Summer 2021.

	2021*	2022	2023				
Exceeding Standard	100%	100%	100%				
Meeting Standard	0%	0%	0%				
Below Standard	0%	0%	0%				

**While this assignment was created and put in place prior to the summer 2021 testing course, an adjunct professor changed the assignment slightly at the last minute, due to student concerns during the pandemic; assignment requirements and criteria were not as robust as planned and results should be interpreted with caution as a result.*

GOAL: (E5) Articulate dynamics associated with group process and development.

Measurement Method 1

Students will be assessed using a rubric for their summative assignment in their Group Dynamics & Counseling course (COU 640). The assignment asks students to create a 10-session group model, covering everything from type of group to ethical and professional issues. The professor then rates all students on rubric with a 4-point scale from “beginning” to “exemplary” for their ability to articulate dynamics associated with group process and development.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more, indicating initial competency.

Actual Results

The rubric was implemented in Spring 2019.

	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023	
<i>Exceeding Standard</i>	40%	71%	73%	78%	90%	100%	
<i>Meeting Standard</i>	60%	29%	27%	22%	10%	0%	
<i>Below Standard</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	

Measurement Method 2

Students took the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam in the last semester of their program. Student scores for the core area of “Group Counseling & Group Work” were used for this measurement.

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will score within (or above) one standard deviation of the national mean in the section on Group Counseling & Group Work. The national mean differs for each version of the exam and is taken into account for the scores below.

Actual Results

	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2018	2019*	2020
	Cohort 13	Cohort 14	Cohort 15	N/A	N/A
<i>Exceeding Standard</i>	71%	100%	100%	100%	93%
<i>Meeting Standard</i>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Below Standard	29%	0%	0%	0%	7%
----------------	-----	----	----	----	----

*Data condensed to a year at a time, due to low numbers of students taking the exam each semester.

Measurement Method 3

Due to the aforementioned issues with the CPCE, additional information regarding E5 will be taken from the Training Progress Report at the second semester of internship COU 645, which is typically the 6th or 7th semester of the program. Question A8 “Articulates dynamics associated with group process and development.” will be used for measurement and is rated on a scale from 1-6, with 1 being “unacceptable” and 6 being “exemplary.”

Expected Results

At least 80% of students will receive a score of 3 or more indicating, initial competency.

Actual Results

This item was added to the Training Progress Report in 2021. The evaluation is provided to all students at the end of the Internship Course.

	2021	2022	2023				
Exceeding Standard	89%	33%	0%				
Meeting Standard	11%	67%	100%				
Below Standard	0%	0%	0%				

Analysis of Data Collection According to Established Benchmarks

- **Met or exceeded benchmark standards:** Goals S1, S2, S3, H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, A2, A3, P1, P2, E1, E2, E3, E4, E5
- **Below benchmark standard:** None
- **Mixed results by data point or assessment measure:** Goal A1, P3

Recommendations Based Upon Assessment Outcomes

- **Challenges**
During 2022-23, as with many other institutions of higher education, the university continued to struggle financially, leading to broad layoffs in administration, faculty, and staff and the eventual closing of Multnomah University. Although MAC was not subject to these lay-offs, morale on the campus was often in flux. The university was purchased by Jessup University. Due to MAC being CACREP accredited, the program was left to operate without interruption, unlike many other departments and programs that experienced massive shifts in curriculum and leadership.

One faculty member, Mariah LeFeber, resigned in the summer of 2023 for a position at another local university. The Program Director, Kristen White, resigned that position in order to focus on being faculty only, and full time faculty member, Danielle Render Turmaud, agreed to be the Program Director at the conclusion of her maternity leave. The Counseling Center Director and adjunct faculty member, Becca Jones, filled in as Interim Director in the summer of 2023.

- **Commendations**

While we honor the pain of change and loss, we also honor the incredible perseverance of both students and staff/faculty during this time. Faculty and staff have continued to provide “wrap-around services” to help students successfully complete academic and clinical requirements amidst personal, educational, and societal challenges. Retention and graduation rates have remained stable. The addition of Dr. Kristi Cash White to the full-time MAC faculty filled the vacant faculty role without disruption.

Most notably this year, the MAC program was granted CACREP accreditation status with the full eight-years until the next required assessment. This award came after years of hard work and dedication by the administration and faculty to bring the program in alignment with the highest standards in the field. Furthermore, CACREP approved the Substantive Change Report for MAC as Multnomah University transitioned to the Multnomah Campus of Jessup University.

In relation specifically to program assessment, the MAC Program is commended for continuing to successfully complete the evaluation process, including implementing suggested recommendations from previous years. In addition to the specific steps discussed within the assessments for these years (some of which are highlighted below, under “Records of Improvements Implemented”), the program continues a “trauma-track” where students can complete all five electives in relevant electives to create a specialty in this area. This option is a strong example of Educational Excellence, in which the program seeks to stay up-to-date and relevant with the changes of the field.

The Program is commended for continuing to meet or exceed standards in almost all areas; standards S3, H5, and P2 all moved from mixed results to meets/exceeds standards. There were no areas where benchmarks were below standards.

- **Recommendations by Standard**

P3 – This standard did not have below or mixed standards, but the information was found to be incomplete. In the transition of Program Directors, the graduate survey was not completed in 2022, so we were unable to ascertain the extent of graduates’ ability to articulate professional readiness. The other two markers in this standard did meet or exceed standards.

A1 - This standard that relates to multicultural competencies showed mixed results in 2022, with one standard reaching 76% out of the expected 80% while the other two standards met their goals. Initially this came as a surprise as diversity education is seen as a strength in our program. Upon further reflection, the conclusion drawn is that faculty has raised the expectations and standards regarding the articulation of diversity considerations in the students' Orals Presentations. Due to the high standards now being implemented, fewer students are easily passing this standard. In addition to the excellence of the Diversity curriculum already in place, we are adding an emphasis to diversity in the writing assignments of Internship I and II in order to directly assist students to better articulate their values and experiences.

Appendix A: PROFESSIONAL Dispositions for Student Counselors

Positive: Student is appropriately positive—showing budding confidence, the ability to take a strengths-based perspective, the capacity for hope and gratitude, etc.

Responsible: Student is reliable and dependable. He/she also takes responsibility for personal actions and their consequences.

Open: Student is approachable, genuine, engaged, and motivated about learning and growing in the program and profession.

Flexible: Student is able to tolerate new, changing, and ambiguous situations without becoming overly anxious or controlling.

Emotionally grounded: Student is conscious of his/her emotions (and limits) and is able to appropriately share and regulate them, as the situation warrants. He/she also appears to take appropriate steps to care for self emotionally, physically, relationally, and spiritually.

Spiritually-minded: Student embodies integrative, Christ-centered values; he/she shows the developing capacities to think, practice, and live in a way that integrates personal values and faith with professional theory and ethics.

Self-aware: Student is increasingly able to reflect upon and explore his/her self, recognizing personal beliefs, values, emotions, biases, stimulus value, impact on others, and more.

Integrious: Student demonstrates sound judgment, thoughtful decision making, honesty, and integrity.

Oriented: Student is fully oriented as a person and demonstrates the ability to comprehend, retain, and apply material to his/her budding work as a counselor.

Non-defensive: Student is open to feedback (e.g., concerning assignments, tests, clinical skills, and professional dispositions) and implements suggestions as needed. He/she is also able to discuss differing perspectives (e.g., regarding diversity) without becoming defensive or shut down.

Articulate: Student is able to communicate clearly via verbal and written modes.

Loving: Student interacts well with others, engaging in a caring and respectful way. He/she is also able to demonstrate acceptance of both self and others and manage conflict in a professional manner as it arises.