

**Clinical Mental Health Counseling
Master's Program**

**Annual Systematic Program
Evaluation Report
Academic Year 2018-2019**



School of Counseling
302 Buchtel Common
Akron, OH 44325-5007

Completed August 2019

Introduction

This report is written to comply with the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2009) standard I.AA which states that every accredited counseling program must distribute an official annual report that documents outcomes of a systematic program evaluation, with descriptions of any program modifications, to students currently in the program, program faculty, institutional administrators, personnel in cooperating agencies (e.g., employers, site supervisors), and the public.

The purposes for this systematic program evaluation report are specific to the Clinical Mental Health Master's Program (CMHC) and include, but are not limited to, well-rounded faculty reflection about program strengths and areas for improvement, sharing program-related information with stakeholders (e.g., students, graduates and employers), and communication about the program's status with institutional administrators.

The data compiled for this systematic program evaluation report was drawn from academic year 2018-2019 (i.e., Fall 2018, Spring 2019, Summer 2019).

Throughout this program evaluation period there were three core CMHC program faculty: Dr. Julie Lenyk (Assistant Professor of Instruction), Dr. Varunee Faii Sangganjanavanich (Professor and Interim School Director) and Dr. Robert Schwartz (Professor and Program/Clinical Coordinator).

Accreditation Standards Monitoring and Evaluation Data

CACREP Section I. Evaluation

AA. Program faculty members engage in continuous systematic program evaluation indicating how the mission, objectives, and student learning outcomes are measured and met.

Throughout this assessment period program faculty engaged in continuous assessment of program strengths and areas for improvement. This occurred through regular faculty conversations, meetings, informal discussions with students, formal student/graduate/supervisor/employer surveys, and feedback from professionals in the field.

The program evaluation data obtained has lead to program reflection, and updates such as: (1) revised content published in the student handbook (effective Fall 2019 semester), (2) updated program resources and marketing information (e.g., program brochures and websites), and (3) enhanced training requirements and resources (e.g., practicum performance evaluation forms and internship site lists). In

addition, program objectives and student key performance indicators were revised, resulting in updated educational missions of the program. These updates were designed to enhance specific and targeted features of already well-functioning aspects of the program.

AA.1. A review by program faculty of programs, curricular offerings, and characteristics of program applicants.

Program faculty noted a stable enrolled (matriculated) student rate throughout the program evaluation period. Average total number of enrolled students was approximately 90-95 during the evaluation period.

Despite a desire to grow the program, faculty have attempted to maintain a steady pool of highly qualified new students for quality assurance purposes. Throughout the program evaluation period approximately 20-25 new students were admitted each Fall and Spring semester, with a goal of admitting approximately 45 new students each academic year (Fall and Spring semesters combined). A range of diversity was noted among currently enrolled students regarding sex, race, nationality and age of applicants, however the majority of student admissions were Euro-American/White females aged 21-30 years.

AA.2. Formal follow-up studies of program graduates assessing graduate perceptions and evaluations of major aspects of the program.

Program faculty conduct formal follow-up studies through online surveys for both current students each semester toward the end of their program (i.e., during internship semester) and program graduates/alumni once annually.

Current Student Exit Survey Results:

Ratings are scored using a Likert-Type scale ranging from 1 (Very Dissatisfied) to 5 (Very Satisfied). Higher scores equate to a higher level of student satisfaction.

<u>Core Course Topic Area</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std Deviation</u>
Ethics & Professional Orientation	3.00	5.00	4.35	.59
Research & Program Evaluation	2.00	5.00	3.94	.80
Assessment & Testing	2.00	5.00	3.88	.83
Human Growth & Development	4.00	5.00	4.53	.50

Individual Counseling Theory	3.00	5.00	4.53	.61
Group Counseling Theory	3.00	5.00	4.65	.59
Multicultural Counseling	2.00	5.00	4.12	.90
Career Counseling	3.00	5.00	4.24	.73

Core Course Survey Data: During this program evaluation period ratings in all core course areas averaged between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied.” In addition, all content areas were rated higher during this evaluation period than in the prior (2017-2018) program evaluation report. Moreover, the standard deviations of ratings in all areas was lower than in the prior evaluation report, showing that current students shared more consensus in perspectives. Although there was a range of opinions, no core course area averaged low satisfaction among current students and no single area was rated “Dissatisfied” by any student.

<u>Clinical Counseling Topic Area</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std Deviation</u>
Addiction Counseling	3.00	5.00	4.71	.57
Mental Disorder Diagnosis/Treatment	3.00	5.00	4.29	.57
Clinical Skills (Practicum & Internship)	3.00	5.00	4.65	.59

Clinical Counseling Course Survey Data: During this program evaluation period all clinical course areas averaged close to “Very Satisfied.”. In addition, all content areas were rated higher during this evaluation period than in the prior (2017-2018) program evaluation report. Given that these clinical counseling topics areas directly link with the two program objectives, and are used for key performance indicator outcome purposes, the mean ratings from current students are encouraging.

Regarding the first core program objective, when asked “Taking all coursework and clinical experiences into account, how satisfied are you with the following program learning objective - Demonstrating ethical and evidence-based diagnosis knowledge and skills” the following ratings were shown:

<u>Program Objective #1</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std Deviation</u>
	4.00	5.00	4.53	.50

Regarding the second core program objective, when asked “Taking all coursework and clinical experiences into account, how satisfied are you with the following program learning objective - Demonstrating ethical and evidence-based treatment intervention knowledge and skills” the following ratings were shown:

Program Objective #2	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std Deviation</u>
	2.00	5.00	4.36	.81

Regarding program-related organizational feedback, the following ratings were shown:

Program Faculty Guidance	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std Deviation</u>
	2.00	5.00	4.18	.98
Program Policies/Procedures	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std Deviation</u>
	1.00	5.00	3.82	1.04
Overall Satisfaction With Program	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std Deviation</u>
	2.00	5.00	4.18	.92

Positive Qualitative Feedback:

- “Professors very supportive...”
- “Sense of community between all...”
- “Instructors knowledgeable and motivated...”
- “Prepracticum and practicum fantastic...”
- “Lots of hands-on experience...”

Constructive Qualitative Feedback:

- “Some courses overlap content...”
- “Some difficulty scheduling classes for students who work...”
- “More support finding internship placements would be helpful...”

Graduate/Alumni Survey Results:

Survey results show that 100% of program graduates reported being licensed as a Professional Counselor or Professional Clinical Counselor, and 100% of program graduates reported being currently employed in the counseling profession.

Ratings are scored using a Likert-Type scale ranging from 1 (Very Dissatisfied) to 5 (Very Satisfied). Higher scores equate to a higher level of student satisfaction.

<u>Topic Area</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std Deviation</u>
Using Ethics & Professional Identity	4.00	5.00	4.75	.43
Using Research & Program Evaluation knowledge	4.00	5.00	4.75	.43
Performing Assessment & Testing	3.00	5.00	4.25	.83
Using Human Growth & Development Knowledge	4.00	5.00	4.75	.19
Practicing Career Counseling	4.00	5.00	4.50	.50
Using Counseling Theory	4.00	5.00	4.75	.43
Practicing Group Counseling	4.00	5.00	4.74	.43
Using Multiculturally Informed Treatments	5.00	5.00	5.00	.00
Diagnosing Mental Disorders	4.00	5.00	4.75	.43
Treating Mental Disorders	4.00	5.00	4.50	.50

During this program evaluation period ratings in all core course areas averaged between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied” and most knowledge and skill areas approached “Very Satisfied.” Therefore, program graduates reported that they have the knowledge and skills to competently work as professional counselors in the field, with no areas identified as problematic from a professional standpoint.

When asked “Since graduating, overall how would you rate the UA CMHC program” the following ratings were shown:

<u>Overall Satisfaction</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std Deviation</u>
	4.00	5.00	4.75	.43

Positive Qualitative Feedback:

“Practicum, DSM class...”

“Faculty willingness to help students...”

“On-site training clinic...”

Constructive Qualitative Feedback:

“More help lining up internship placements...”

AA.3. Formal studies of site supervisors and program graduate employers that assess their perceptions and evaluations of major aspects of the program.

Supervisor/Employer Survey Results:

Survey results showed that approximately 13 different mental health agencies were represented in this survey. 100% of respondents provided supervision to current students, and 57% were involved in employment decisions for one or more graduate.

Ratings are scored using a Likert-Type scale ranging from 1 (Very Dissatisfied) to 5 (Very Satisfied). Higher scores equate to a higher level of student satisfaction.

<u>Topic Area</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std Deviation</u>
Using Ethics & Professional Identity	5.00	5.00	5.00	.00
Using Research & Program Evaluation knowledge	3.00	5.00	4.46	.75
Performing Assessment & Testing	4.00	5.00	4.54	.75
Using Human Growth & Development Knowledge	4.00	5.00	4.77	.42
Practicing Career Counseling	3.00	5.00	4.77	1.05
Using Counseling Theory	3.00	5.00	4.62	.62
Practicing Group Counseling	3.00	5.00	4.38	.62
Using Multiculturally Informed Treatments	3.00	5.00	4.62	.62
Diagnosing Mental Disorders	3.00	5.00	4.38	.62
Treating Mental Disorders	4.00	5.00	4.69	.46

During this program evaluation period ratings in all topic areas averaged between “Satisfied” and “Very Satisfied.” Supervisors and employers reported very positive overall knowledge and skills among CMHC interns. The highest rated area, Using Ethics and Professional Identity, is a crucial outcome for trainees and graduates. No area was rated poorly, and no single rating on any area was evaluated as “Dissatisfied.”

When asked “Based on your experience during the prior year, overall how would you rate the UA CMHC program” the following ratings were shown:

Overall Satisfaction	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std Deviation</u>
	4.00	5.00	4.62	.49

Positive Qualitative Feedback:

- “Student seem very satisfied...”
- “Students have good engagement skills...”
- “UA professors help interns relate what they are teaching to practice...”
- “Comprehensive training...”
- “Students well prepared for internships...”

Constructive Qualitative Feedback:

- “Better understanding of community mental health differing from other settings...”
- “Continue supporting self-care...”
- “More site visits by internship instructors...”

AA.4. Assessment of student learning and performance on professional identity, professional practice, and program area standards.

The following program objectives and student key performance indicators were instituted beginning Fall 2018 semester. The following results show outcomes of these performance indicators:

Program Objective #1: Demonstrate ethical and evidence-based diagnosis knowledge and skills.

Key Performance Indicator #1: Students will demonstrate skill using the diagnostic process, including differential diagnosis and the use of current diagnostic classification systems, including the

Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders and the International Classification of Diseases (CACREP Standard Section 5.C.2.d).

- Evaluation method 1 = 5600:664 DSM → Final examination (multiple choice test; minimum grade = B [3 or higher on a 1-5 grading scale]) (knowledge) (before practicum, < year 2)

Fall 2018 = 100% of students met this key performance indicator. Scores ranged from 85-95%

Spring 2019 = 100% of students met this key performance indicator. Scores ranged from 88-100%

Summer 2019 = 100% of students met this key performance indicator. Scores ranged from 82-98%

- Evaluation method 2 = 5600:685 Internship → Internship performance evaluation (direct experience; minimum rating = 3 [competent] or higher on a 1-5 scale on all relevant performance areas) (skill) (after practicum, > year 2)

Fall 2018 = 100% of students met this key performance indicator. All students received performance evaluation ratings of 3 or better in all areas.

Spring 2019 = 100% of students met this key performance indicator. All students received performance evaluation ratings of 3 or better in all areas.

Summer 2019 = 100% of students met this key performance indicator. All students received performance evaluation ratings of 3 or better in all areas.

Program Objective #2: Demonstrate ethical and evidence-based treatment intervention knowledge and skills.

Key Performance Indicator #2: Students will demonstrate techniques and interventions for prevention and treatment of a broad range of mental health issues (CACREP Standard Section 5.C.3.b).

- Evaluation method 1 = 5600:666 Treatment in Clinical Counseling → final examination (essay; instructor grading rubric minimum score = minimum 15 points total (i.e., average of 3 [adequate] or higher on a 1-5 scale) (knowledge) (before practicum, < year 2)

Fall 2018 = 100% of students met this key performance indicator. Scores ranged from 93-100%

Spring and Summer 2019 = N/A (course not offered)

- Evaluation method 2 = 5600:685 Internship → Internship performance evaluation (direct experience; minimum rating = 3 [competent] or higher on a 1-5 scale on all relevant performance areas) (skill) (after practicum, > year 2)

Fall 2018 = 100% of students met this key performance indicator. All students received performance evaluation ratings of 3 or better in all areas.

Spring 2019 = 100% of students met this key performance indicator. All students received performance evaluation ratings of 3 or better in all areas.

Summer 2019 = 100% of students met this key performance indicator. All students received performance evaluation ratings of 3 or better in all areas.

Program-Related Updates

During this program evaluation period program faculty received approval for curricular changes to all core and clinical courses, adding web-enhanced, web-based, and online options for every course. These curriculum proposals were granted final approval by May 2019. Although offering web-based and/or online courses are not currently scheduled, these updates were completed for future flexibility in course offerings. A school-wide survey was conducted and results showed that the vast majority of current students preferred face-to-face (i.e., traditional) course delivery, the majority of current students perceived that future students would increasingly prefer web-based and/or online course delivery for certain (e.g., more lecture format) coursework.

Significant program-related policy changes were not made during this evaluation period due to a high degree of stability within the program and positive feedback from current students, alumni, supervisors, and employers. Minor updates included wording revisions to the student handbook, updated program websites, and minor updates to program course syllabi.

AA.5. Evidence of the use of findings to inform program modifications.

A thorough and objective review of all data presented in this program evaluation report has lead program faculty to retain all essential components of the program.

Program Accreditation

During this evaluation period the program began transitioning course syllabi, the student handbook, and program objectives/student key performance indicators toward CACREP 2016 accreditation standards. This transition, and related collection and review of data, will continue during the next evaluation period (2019-2020).

Program Mission Statement Updates

The program mission statement changed slightly to better align with CACREP 2016 accreditation standards:

The Clinical Mental Health Counseling master's program's mission is to prepare culturally informed professional counselors who competently diagnose and treat a variety of life concerns including but not limited to mental disorders using ethical and evidence-based interventions.

This mission statement, and related review of congruence with the program's goals, will continue during the next evaluation period (2019-2020).

Program Curricula and Course-Specific Updates

After a review of CACREP (2009) CMHC standards, Ohio Professional Counselor licensure standards, and student/alumni/supervisor/employer feedback, no significant program course-plan/required coursework updates occurred.

Given the recent CACREP re-accreditation status of the program until March 2024, all course-specific syllabi were updated to ensure consistency with structure and the use of well-informed and faculty-approved grading rubrics for all assignments. The new syllabi were implemented Fall 2018, and will continue to be used (along with related collection and review of data) during the next evaluation period (2019-2020).