



**LINCOLN CHRISTIAN**  

---

**UNIVERSITY**

YEAR END SUMMARY

2021-2022

MASTER OF ARTS IN COUNSELING

## Program Director's Note

Each year I have the pleasure of formulating a report with the kind and wonderful assistance of our MAC team (Dr. Kim Baldwin, Dr. Denise Houser and myself) as well as numerous individuals both within the university and those outside the university, such as site supervisors, who share how the program has fared over the year. Not only is it a report about CACREP standards and evaluations but it is a story of the how this program has impacted the lives of our students and graduates. It tells of areas we need to address and how we will do so. It sets a benchmark for the coming year.

I should be quick to note that this year's Year End Summary (YES) will be presented in a little different format than that of other years. This is the result of the review done in the Self-Study for our re-accreditation and the responses and questions that the CACREP readers brought to our attention for clarification. Their review has been most helpful in allowing us to see areas that need to be addressed and we have sought to do as much as we are able within this year's report timeline. We are looking forward to our on-site visit from CACREP in the Fall of 2022. We are also appreciative of the email received June 8, 2022 stating "Due to the current timeline and cycle end date, the CACREP Board has granted a no-penalty extension to the program to allow time to complete the review process." A copy of the letter is in the Icon below.

My thanks to the administration of LCU for their continued support of the MAC program, Library Services, IT, maintenance and environmental services as each provide resources and assistance in making our classes work. Thanks as well to the MAC team, Seminary faculty, Board of Advisors, Site Supervisors and a special thanks to our students and their families for investing into the work of becoming a counselor.

C. Nolan Thomas, Ph.D., D. Min., LCPC

MAC Program Director

The Seminary at Lincoln Christian University



2022.6.1 - No  
Penalty Extension Le

One of the newer developments within this year was a reframing of our Program Evaluation Plan (PEP). This report is based on that plan and follows its outline. In order to keep this report at a manageable length various documents will be inserted as “Icons” so that if you seek fuller details, you may click on the Icon and it will open the full document. The Program Evaluation Plan can be read in detail by clicking the Icon below.



Program Evaluation  
plan 05.16.2022.doc

## STUDENT DATA

The first set of data in our evaluation is data provided to us by students. There are three sources included. One is the **Best Practice Audit** completed in class by students at the end of each eight week session. The class professor reviews the comments and makes a determination what, if any, changes need to occur for the next time the class is taught. The second is provided by the school and is a **Course Evaluation Report** that students completed on line at the end of a class. The data is provided to the individual faculty and the program director for review. The third set of data is done the last week of school as students complete a **Student End of Year Summary**. This provides students the opportunity to field questions about the program and they are provided a response prior to the end of school.

### Best Practice Audit (BPA)

At the conclusion of each class the students are invited to share their thoughts on the class in terms of what they liked, what they would like to see different, or what ideas they have to offer to improve the class. This is done either in written format or by discussion. A report of these items is submitted to the program director for reporting purposes.

#### *Findings:*

Most were positive comments towards teachers, class material, books, videos, process of the class, articles, and in-class projects. There were limited comments suggesting changes in books, due dates of papers, amount of reading, more in-class demonstration/role play, syllabus questions, updated resources, heating in the room, and testing. This process has a nearly 100% participation rate.

#### *Proposal:*

Note below the changes for core classes as based on the BPA

Course	Comments
COUN 601- Research and Evaluation in Counseling	Review that all assignments have a rubric
COUN 602- Basic Counseling Techniques	Second CPRP assignment changed to include integrative behavioral health to meet standard C3d - Add corollary reading assignment

COUN 662- Abnormal Psychology ( name is being changed to Psychopathology)	Update quizzes
COUN 663- Major Theories of Counseling	Add assigned reading on consultation to meet F5c
COUN 666- Developmental Psychology	No changes
COUN 667- Tests and Measures for Counseling	No changes
COUN 668- Group Theories and Practice	Advise students to read the Schopenhauer Cure text as they go through the class rather than waiting till the end.
COUN 751- Career Development Counseling	Add career counseling video
COUN 760- Multicultural Counseling	Provide additional time in class to process the Rwanda movie
COUN 804- Family Systems Counseling	No changes noted
COUN 807- Substance Abuse and Addictions Counseling	(Adjunct-no report)
COUN 810- Ethical and Legal Issues for Counselors and Other Christian Leaders	No changes

### Course Evaluation Report

The university provides survey response scores from the students to the program director. The percentage of those who responded to the survey was an aggregate of 42% for the year. This is slightly higher than last year's 31% return rate. This provides a look from less than half of the student body. In one class there was a 27% return rate and a 69% in another. Program averages are as follows for the three areas as based on a 1-5 scale with five being high. A special note is necessary as the school changed the format on their survey. The scores were developed from the new set of questions used in the course evaluation and that were similar as possible to questions used in the previous survey.

#### *Findings:*

Area	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022
Course	4.4	4.3	3.8
Instructor	4.4	4.6	4.3
Learning	4.4	4.6	4.0
Overall average	4.3	4.4	4.0

*Proposal:*

A review was done of the written comments to determine, if possible, some of the scoring patterns. What became apparent was that those who filled out the surveys were often at odds with the learning environment. The large classroom used for the larger classes makes it difficult to hear clearly. So between the technologies, size of room, and timely grading in the respondents view, this created a sense that the course was not as good as it could be and that learning was hampered. As a program we will seek to advise the University of the impact of technology and room size and speak with the registrar about the availability of other smaller rooms. Individual professors will seek to improve in the timing that grading is completed. An email was sent to IT/Registrar regarding this issue on June 6, 2022. (See icon R49 below).



R49.docx

**Student End of Year Summary**

At the conclusion of each school year students in the program are invited to respond to a short survey regarding the overall program. Areas of particular interest include what they see as the way to improve the overall program and what questions they might like to have answered. (See i

*Findings:*

2020-2021 End of Year Survey

About 95% of the students in the program responded to the survey. This number of responses provides us with a good representation of questions that are being asked. The following is a summary of the questions and the responses that were provided to the students.

*Proposal: Response provided*

(Please see icon May 5 for email copy of what is noted below)



May 5 Email to MAC  
Group Student.docx

End of Year Survey Response

May 5, 2022

First, let me say thanks for taking the time to fill out our survey. Your feedback is appreciated and your ideas and comments often help us tweak the program to make it stronger and stronger for our students. Below you will find some of the questions that were asked and a brief response. You were kind enough to ask and I think it fair that you hear how they might be answered.

1. Are we going to have a spiritual formation group for the MAC program?

Thank you for that question. We have already had some preliminary discussion on this. I don't have a solid response yet as I need to speak to our new VP of Academics and see how she plans to address the undergrad services on campus. I could envision a pre-class time for this but at this point have no specific details. (Note: I did speak with the VP of Academics and there will be some form of spiritual development activity. However the exact details are not available at this time(6-8-22).

2. Would it be possible to have more electives built into the program?

Yes, it is possible. Is it likely? No. Since we are a 60 hour program and 54 of those hours are set aside for core classes needed to meet State and CACREP standards the only way to add more electives is make the program itself longer. That does not seem wise at this point as it impacts our ability to compete with other programs who also offer 60 hour programs. You are also welcome to come back and take an elective after you graduate as part of your continuing education requirements for the state. Taking one of our classes would earn you 15 CEU's and you will need 30 every two years.

3. Why do we need to find our own practicum and internship sites?

While it could be possible for the program to assign a site to a student, it would often prove counterproductive as the site may not be a population you want to serve or is at a distance that creates problems. By allowing each student to locate their own site both from the provided list and their own resources one can usually find a good fit for them.

4. Do you screen out students who do not seem to be good fits for becoming counselors?

As I am sure all of you are aware there is a process for entrance into the program where certain standards are set by the school. In our admissions interview we look for a number of areas that suggest that a student can succeed in the program and are a good fit for the field in general. Beyond that, the faculty meets quarterly to review the professional development of each student. Along with your classes, students are often given additional things to do to develop either through an OAS assignment or a Student Progress Form. As you can see we have a number of items in place to help students succeed. They also provide an avenue for identifying weaknesses which may result in removal from the program.

5. With all the changes this year, where do you see the program moving forward? (There were a couple of these types of questions)

Both I and the President of the University see our program as one that will continue to maintain and grow in the coming years. We are set to gain our next accreditation after the

fall CACREP on-site visit, our admissions remain strong at this point in the enrollment cycle for next fall, and plans are under way to promote specifically the MAC program in areas from which we generally draw our students. The greatest impact in the changes has been to the undergrad programs not the seminary. Actually you can help in this by letting your friends and employers know that we are here and will continue to educate our fine students.

6. I would like to know if the program truly prepares one for counseling. Hearing from alumni would help.

Each year we prepare a Year End Summary (YES) report. You can find them on our part of the schools website. This report shares all we do and how it's going. More specifically it tells you our pass rate and hire rate for our reporting graduates. Both are at 100% based on those who respond to our surveys. There are also a couple of testimonials there for you to read at the same place on the website. For those who took Careers when we've had guest speakers (mostly our graduates), you heard them speak to how they were prepared. However, education does not end when you get a degree or earn a license. You will still have much to learn. We seek to provide the foundation for your own journey.

7. Why must there be in person site supervision AND in person school supervision?

Yes, this creates extra driving miles. Two things. One is that this is one of the CACREP standards. If we want that accreditation then we do what the standards ask. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly the group supervision provides a great opportunity to learn from others at other and different locations about the counseling process and approaches. This would not happen if one did supervision only on site. I would encourage a reframe to seeing this as opportunity to grow. Group supervision also allows us as a faculty to more closely monitor what is happening at the sites to ensure your experiences match the program's expectations.

8. Let me put two questions together here about core classes, electives and the Bible-Theology- Church History classes.

We hear you. What to do with the required seminary classes has been a topic for a number of years. What I am going to share at this moment, unfortunately, will not directly impact those of you who are presently in the program but will for those coming in this next fall. Starting Fall 2022 those three (Bible-Theology-Church History) classes are no longer part of our curriculum. They have been replaced with three classes that are now part of the core curriculum that all students will take. The three classes are Neuroscience (this helps keep our students current with the field), Introduction to

Traumatology (every counselor needs a basic understanding of this), and Integration of Psychology and Theology (this incorporates some of the material from the seminary classes but specifically relates them to counseling). This is also creating some new elective classes that are still in the TBA stage.

Lastly, students who are currently in the program who wish to transfer over to the new catalog requirements are welcome to discuss this with their academic advisor to determine whether this would be a good move or not. You would be required to do a change of major form through the registrar's office after the fall semester starts.

I hope you know how much we love you. Thanks for being part of the MAC family and I am looking forward to some great years ahead.

Blessings

C. Nolan Thomas, Ph.D, D.Min, LCPC

MAC Program Director

## FACULTY DATA

The second set of data in our evaluation is data gathered by the faculty. There are five sources included. One is the **Pre-Practicum Exam** which is completed by students who are preparing to enter a practicum experience. This test is given each fall and spring. This is aggregate data that addresses student knowledge in the areas of basic skill, theories, psychopathology, and ethics. The second is a review of the **Ongoing Assessment Submission (OAS)** for each student that address both skills and knowledge for each class they take during the year and is aggregate data. The third area is the **Professional Disposition Form (PDF)** report that is developed by the faculty in a review that occurs at the end of each eight week class. This provides aggregate data that addresses student professional disposition. The next section is the **Key Performance Indicators (KPI)** -which align with our student learning outcomes- and aggregates student assessment data that addresses student knowledge and skills. The last section is a report on **Individual-KPI Learning Outcomes** and is a summary of how each student in the program has met the programs KPI's.

### Pre-Practicum Exam

Prior to being allowed to do a practicum, each student is required to pass the pre-practicum test based on the four prerequisite classes to be taken prior to a practicum experience. The test thus covers the areas of Theories (COUN 663), Basic Counseling Techniques (COUN 602), Abnormal Psychology (COUN 662;- new name for Fall 2022 will be Psychopathology), and Ethics (COUN 810). There are 20 questions per area. The student is required to respond to 14 questions correctly in each content area to pass.



*Findings:*

Fall 2021 Pre-Practicum Review

Seven students took the Fall pre-practicum evaluation. Six passed all sections on the first attempt. One had to review their theories responses, after this review, this student also passed resulting in all students having passed the pre-practicum test. Final average scores for the pre-practicum for this group was 68 out of 80.

Spring 2022 Pre-Practicum Exam Review

Nine students took the Spring pre-practicum evaluation. Eight passed all sections on the first attempt. One had to review the Theories and Ethics sections and has yet to complete the second testing. Scores reporting will be based only on those who have completed the testing. Final average scores for the pre-practicum exam for this group was: 73 out of 80.

*Proposal:*

Of the four areas tested, Theories seems to be the one section students tend to fail with Ethics being a second. However failure is usually by missing the cut off score by one error. In review of the responses there was no one area or question that seemed to catch the students. The professor of those two areas will be asked to review the test questions and see how they align with what is presently taught in those classes. However students will be reminded to pay special attention to wording on tests and look for “exceptions” and “all but.” In Ethics, the instructor will need to affirm more clearly the difference between confidentiality and privileged communication.

**Ongoing Assessment Submission**

In each class a major project is given as an assignment to assess how the student is progressing. This also reflects meeting certain CACREP standards as well as an overall view of student writing, knowledge, and application skills. Scoring is based on three items: quality of writing, knowledge and understanding of concepts, and application of concepts as based on a 1-3 scale on the OAS and transposed into a 1-5 scale used in other measures of the program. A score of one means standards are unmet, a score of two indicates that standards are met, and a score of three indicates the student exceeds standards on the OAS form. The five point scale uses the following indicators:

- 1 = Does not meet expectations
- 2 = Below expectations
- 3 = Meets expectations
- 4 = Exceeds expectations
- 5 = Well exceeds expectations

*Findings:*

The following chart displays the average OAS score for each class.

Class	Research 601	Basics 602	Abnormal 662	Theories 663	Developmental 666	Tests 667	Group 668	Multi-cultural 760	Career 751	Family 804	Ethics 810	Substance 807
Score 2016- 2017	4.00	3.77	3.39	3.20	3.25	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.25	3.00	Adjunct  Not Available
Score 2017- 2018	Adjunct  Not Avail	3.00	3.00	4.25	3.50	2.75	4.00	4.25	3.75	4.00	3.00	Not available
Score 2018- 2019	3.00	3.19	3.25	3.50	3.75	3.00	3.35	3.75	3.10	4.60	3.00	3.68
Score 2019- 2020	3.00*	2.80	4.00	4.00	3.00*	3.25	3.75	3.00	3.00*	3.00	3.00	3.00*
Score 2020- 2021	Adjunct  Not Avail	2.98	2.75	3.00	2.75	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.25	3.25	5.0 Adjunct
2021- 2022	3.00*	3& 5 two sectio ns	3.00	3.25	3.00	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.25	3.5	3.85	5.00

All Course Averages	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022
	3.41	3.55	3.69	3.21	3.18	3.69

*\*Reflects apparent scores as either adjuncts or professor of record did not provide an OAS score and OAS number was based on observing grade and comments on papers by the writer of this document.*

*Proposal:*

Scores from 2021-2022 and course average indicate that we are meeting standards in writing, knowledge, and application in all assessed classes. The Program Director will review with our adjuncts the OAS scoring and reporting so as to provide a clearer picture of the assessment.

**Professional Disposition Form**

Each quarter the faculty meets to discuss each student in terms of their meeting or not meeting the five areas the MAC faculty have defined as developing a professional disposition in counseling. The areas and definitions are as follows

Psychological Fitness	Self-aware, self-care, empathy, aware of own motives and values, aware of unfinished emotional business and or mental health concerns and work toward resolving them
Cultural Sensitivity	Embrace diversity, honor others as worthy of respect as being made in the image of God, values service to oppressed and disenfranchised.
Ethical Soundness	Honest and genuine
Dependability	Reliable, timely, accessible
Flexibility	Open to feedback, able to tolerate ambiguity, able to adjust to changes

*Findings:*

Out of a student body of 61 students only three were identified with an unmet area in the PDF. This represents 5% of the students. One had an unmet in the area of “Flexibility” the first quarter and had no other “unmets” for the rest of the school year. The second student had an “unmet” in the areas of “dependability” in the fourth quarter. The third student, who dropped from the program, had an unmet in the area of “dependability.” One student seemed to lack motivation and the other lacked time management skills. If a student has four “unmets” during their time in the program they may be dismissed from the program. All other students were mailed a thank you note for meeting standards at the end of the school year.

*Proposal:*

There does not appear to be enough data at this time to require a programmatic change.

**Key Performance Indicators (KPI)**

You are invited to open the link below for the full document. The Master Standards Document and review the KPI standards that our program tracks. You will also notice that the CACREP standards are tied to both our Student Learning Outcomes and the Institutional Learning Outcomes. Although nearly all standards were met, there are defining comments in the last column that describes future courses of action.



2021-2022Master  
Standards Documen

**Individual-KPI Learning Outcomes**

Besides tracking the overall program scores for each KPI standard, the program also tracks each individual student’s scores on each KPI as they take the class where the KPI is placed. Scores are kept in a Google document shared with the counseling professors. Should an issue arise with scoring, the student will meet with the instructor and a Student Progress Form (SPF) is filled out, if needed, with a copy provided to the student and a copy placed into the student’s file.

**CLINICAL TRAINING DATA**

This section reviews assessments on how students perform in the practice of counseling and its related processes, including reports from clinical training site supervisors regarding their evaluation of the students’ performances, as well as assessment of supervision and sites from the counselors-in-training. This section will also review the Clinical Training Component evaluation, in which students assess the clinical training portion of their experience in the program.

**Evaluation of Students by Site Supervisors**

As the practicums and internships are the venue for students to apply their counseling knowledge and skills, feedback regarding their success is valuable for the program. We rely on the observations, evaluations, and input of the site supervisors. All site supervisors have a minimum of two years’ experience in their field and hold a terminal license as a mental health provider (LCPC, LCSW, or LCP). Most site supervisors have had multiple years of experience as a supervisor in mental health care. Each supervisor is provided with a scoring tool which covers the following areas: interpersonal/general factors, clinical skills, the conceptualization process, multicultural competencies, personalization/countertransference, diagnosis and test administration, and professional development. Evaluations are based on a 1-5 scale with five as high. The descriptive anchors for the rating state that “1” does not meet expectations, “2” may require a remediation plan and falls below acceptable standards to pass the course on the final evaluation, “3” meets expectations, “4” indicates a level of performance that is substantial both

in quantity and quality, and “5” well exceeds expectations and is not necessarily expected at this level of training. (Evaluation forms provide additional anchor descriptions to guide supervisory evaluations.)

In addition to the mid- and end-semester evaluations, each month the Clinical Training Coordinator contacts every site supervisor a minimum of two times via email. The first email asks the site supervisors to rate their trainee from 1-10 (1= horrible, serious concerns; 10= absolutely wonderful, no concerns whatsoever). This monthly update is tracked on a google spreadsheet that is accessible by all faculty group supervisors so they can have current feedback about the students in their group supervision. This regular ongoing feedback allows the program to more adequately track training needs. The second email provides the site supervisors with up-to-date research information about supervision in order to help support currency in supervisory information for the sites. Both emails invite specific feedback or further communication as desired by the site supervisor.

#### *Findings:*

For practicums, fall 2021 final evaluation scores averaged 4.23. Spring 2021 final evaluation scores averaged 4.52. The lowest average scores achieved was 3.83 on item 44 [Completes mental status exams (MSE)] and 3.94 on item 43 [Identifies cognitions, feelings, and/or behaviors (including addictions and risk behavior) in the client important to making a diagnosis according to the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM)* and/or *International Classification of Disease (ICD)*].

For internships, since some students completed their internships in the fall semester, final (2<sup>nd</sup> semester of internship) evaluations for the students’ final semesters were combined from the fall and spring semesters and evaluated. Final evaluation scores for 2021-2022 academic year averaged 4.34. The lowest average scores achieved in the final evaluations were 3.88 on question #53 [Administers test(s) according to the procedures in the test manual] and 3.94 on question #54 [Interprets tests appropriately]. Both of these items address testing ability, which likely reflects that most students take the COUN 667 Test and Measures course during their last 8 week block.

#### *Proposal:*

Each of the low-scoring items during the final practicum evaluation and the *final* semester of internship achieved beyond the “meets” requirement (3.83 & 3.94 and 3.88 & 3.94, respectively). No changes appear necessary at this time.

### **Evaluation of Site Supervisors**

Students provide a valuable source of information about the learning process by assessing the supervision they receive from their clinical training site supervisors. The rating scale is based on a 1-5 scale with five as high. Since sites host both practicum and internship students, scores for site supervisor evaluations have been combined. If site supervisors receive low scores from more than one student, then that site/supervisor is not recommended for future students. If a site supervisor receives exceptionally low scores from a student, the clinical training coordinator meets with the student to discuss the situation to determine if the site/supervisor should be pulled from our recommended list immediately.

*Findings:*

For both the fall 2021 and spring 2022, the overall average supervisor score was 4.70. One supervisor scored below “meets” for average score. This supervisor was scored very low by one student (2.30) but was scored 4.60 by the second student at that site. The discrepancy in these scores appears to be based on a change in supervisors mid-spring. It is unclear to which supervisor each of the students was referring to on their evaluation. Based on individual discussions with both students and the site, it appears that the supervisor who received the low score has been dismissed from this site. Another student also scored their supervisor low on one item (# 12: I felt I could disagree with my supervisor without fear of repercussions) with an overall score of 3.70 for this supervisor. This site is not in use this coming semester, but this situation will be monitored should a student decide to use this site. Another site supervisor was not scored low but during individual discussions with the student who was at this site, the student reported numerous occasions when the supervisor engaged in not reportable but less than exemplar behavior toward the student. This site has been removed from our possible site list.

In both the fall and spring semesters, the item that scored the lowest with an average score of 4.38 was item II.7 on the evaluation [My supervisor demonstrated knowledge of a variety of theoretical approaches in conceptualizing clients/systems]. It is noted that although these were the low-scoring items, the scores were very acceptable.

*Proposal:*

As noted in the findings above, one site will be under review should a student decide to use this site and one site has been removed from our list based on a number of discussions between the student and the clinical training coordinator. The faculty will continue to provide introductory training to site supervisors regarding basic supervisory concepts, the role of evaluation, and specific guidelines pertaining to the process at LCU. LCU also provides site supervisors login access to LCU (and I-share) library holdings including several volumes of training videos. The LCU Clinical Training Coordinator also contacts the sites twice per month as noted above. This process seems to be producing above-average supervisory experiences in the majority of cases.

## **Evaluation of Sites**

Students provide feedback about their overall satisfaction with their training sites. Since sites host both practicum and internship students, scores for site evaluations have been combined. This information is used to help guide recommendations for sites. The rating scale is also based on a 1-5 scale with five as high.

*Findings:*

For the fall 2021-spring 2022 year, sites achieved an average overall rating of 4.19 for practicums and internships combined. The lowest site score was 2.9 and 3.0 by two interns. This is the site noted above that changed supervisors mid-spring. Additionally, this site discontinued its counseling services and transitioned out all clients with no notice. The site made arrangements for the interns to complete their hours and finish with their clients under another

licensed supervisor; however, we do not expect they will resume taking trainees any time soon. The second site that scored lower than we would want is the site with the supervisor who scored low on #12 above in the supervisory evaluation. This site will be under review if a student wishes to use it in the future.

*Proposal:*

Sites overall rated well. In those cases in which the student scored the site lower, we were already aware of the particular situations and were working to deal with them. This is a sound indicator that our clinical training supervision stays aware of current trainee concerns. We will continue to manage site application processes to ensure successful site placements and we will continue to have open channels of communication between trainees, group supervisors, and the clinical training coordinator in order to work with situations before they become unmanageable.

### **Evaluation of the Clinical Training Component of the MAC Program**

The program also strives to incorporate feedback about how the entire clinical training portion of the program is perceived by the students. This evaluation assesses the process of obtaining a site and understanding procedures, as well as the process of the weekly group supervision. Again, the scale is 1-5 with five being high.

*Findings:*

For practicums and internships combined, the combined fall 2021 and spring 2022 average score was 4.63. Lowest average scored item was item #10 (4.41) [I had adequate opportunity to discuss multicultural concerns in group supervision]. This duplicates last year's score for this item. The lowest scores for this item were located within one group. It is noted that although this was the lowest scoring item, the overall score was very acceptable. When individually evaluating each faculty group supervisor, overall faculty ratings ranged from 4.26 to 4.98.

*Proposal:*

Overall, scores indicate that the clinical training process and group supervision is going well. Incorporating multicultural concerns has been a specific topic to cover in group supervision and this being the lowest scoring item on the evaluations has been noted for the last two years as well as this year. Faculty will be reminded that multicultural concerns should be incorporated into any case study discussed. Additional reading pertaining to supervision and incorporating multicultural concerns will be required of all faculty. The professor of COUN 760 (Multicultural Counseling) will provide these readings. One MACFAC weekly meeting will be devoted to discussing how to incorporate multicultural concerns into group supervision and reviewing what was gleaned from the required articles. The lowest scores for this item were located within one group; therefore, this item will be discussed with the faculty supervisor for that group. It is noted that although this was the lowest scoring item, the overall score was quite acceptable (4.51) and the overall score for this group was acceptable (4.26).

## **POST-GRADUATE DATA**

The program seeks to obtain information that can help us determine any changes that the program may need to make based on information gained from our recent graduates, their employers, and the National Counselor Exam (NCE) scores as compared to the scores from the Counselor Education Comprehensive Exam (CECE) taken when students entered the program

### **Graduate Survey**

Each year the recent graduates are contacted one semester post-graduation in order to obtain NCE scores, employment information, and comments regarding what they think would help the program improve. This school year the graduates (2020-2021) were contacted weekly during the Spring semester (2022) requesting that they fill out the graduate survey. There were 15 graduates for the 2020-2021 school year and we had four responses. This represents a 27% return rate.

#### *Findings:*

All four are employed within the counseling field. One provided the passing scores but not the area scores. In terms of comments from these graduates they included the following:

1. Add more role playing in all classes
2. Provide more training on counseling online
3. Provide a learning opportunity on preparing for the NCE

#### *Proposal:*

The faculty reviewed the responses and in determining how this may impact any program changes the following comments are offered:

1. With a response of 27% of graduates there seems to be no clear pattern within the responses to build any substantive changes. However, although the responses are low, we recognize that these were perceived needs and want to give them a careful response.
2. Each professor will review their course and see if they sense a need for additional role playing activities. Many classes do these already and with a tight schedule within an eight week schedule, the need to balance the course material, standards required, regular discussion, and role plays will need to be determined by the professor of each class.
3. Although we added a Telemental Health Training section to our group supervision course, students who have yet to take this class are not aware of the training given. It should also be noted that student do practice telemental health session in the COUN 602 class.
4. At the end of each semester graduating students are provided an information packet that explains how to apply for licensure, the testing process was introduced when they took the CECE at the entry of the program, and students are provided with resources available to them to prepare for the NCE including study guides, websites, and information from the Illinois Mental Health Counseling Association regarding a one day training on how to take the test. If a student will make use of the resources offered the suggestion about providing a learning event for preparing for the NCE is met.



## **Graduate Employer/Supervisor Survey**

The Graduate Survey is sent to the employers of our students who graduated in 2020-2021. It is also sent the same time the graduates are asked to fill out their surveys and are dependent on the graduate survey in order to obtain the employer/supervisor information. There were 15 graduates in the 2020-2021 class and we received three responses for the employer/supervisor responses. This represents a 20% return rate. Employers/supervisors are asked to rate our graduates in 17 different areas covering therapeutic skills, assessment, consultation, ethics, integration, and work with multicultural clients and issues. They are also asked to comment on what they see as the strengths and weaknesses of the training program.

### *Finding:*

Of the three reported, two had completed the graduate assessments with no scores lower than a four (rating is 1-5 with 5 as excellent) and the average score of 4.73. The other report did not do the assessment.

Comments from the employers/supervisors included the following:

1. No comments
2. Strength was the quality of candidates enrolled in the program and their identity in Christ
3. No weaknesses were noted

### *Proposal:*

After review by the faculty, there were no changes to be made to the program based on the Graduate Employer/Supervisor Survey. We will send the note from the employer regarding the strength of the training program to marketing department for possible use. Email is noted below in the Icon.



Heather.docx

## **National Counselor Exam Scores**

Like the other elements of the Post-Graduate data, we are reliant on graduate response in this area. We received three NCE score reports. No reports provided a complete scoring report on both the NCE CACREP Areas and Counselor Work behavior Areas. What was provided is reported below. Where able there will also be a comparison between the NCE CACREP Areas and the CECE CACREP Areas taken when the student entered the program to track growth.

### *Findings:*

Student One- scored a 98 with passing score set at 90

Student two reported on the Counselor Work Behavior Areas with a score of 118 and a passing score set at 96.

Student three provided the CACREP Area scores and only a portion of the Counselor Work Behavior Areas. This student passed the CACREP areas with a score of 129 with 96 set as the required passing score.

NCE/CECE Comparison (Note: This student is compared to the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam (CPCE) scores taken at entry as at that time we had not changed to the CECE)

CACREP Area	CPCE Score	NCE Score
Orientation and Ethics	58%	89%
Social and Cultural Diversity	47%	89%
Human Growth and Development	53%	90%
Career Counseling	41%	78%
Counseling and Helping Relationships	76%	78%
Group Counseling and Group Work	59%	78%
Assessment and Testing	59%	84%
Research and Program Evaluation	35%	57%
Average scores	54%	80%

*Proposal:*

Although we are able to demonstrate growth in all areas from entry to licensure, it is only for one student. We cannot make program changes based on such limited data. However it will be important to track the scores on Research and Program Evaluation and see if a pattern develops. The other observation of note is that this comparison may demonstrate the general nature of a counseling relationship. There was relatively little movement in the Helping Relationship area which may be indicative of the kind of person who enters into the field.

**DEMOGRAPHIC DATA**

Due to the review work of CACREP, we were made aware of a weakness in our reporting information. This is the beginning of our effort to correct that error. Although we had demographic data on file, it was not part of the program evaluation. The review caused us to become more specific in our information gathering and tracking. In essence, we are now working at tracking demographic data on all the applicants to the program and using the same demographics to track our graduates. Specifically, we are tracking both ethnicity and gender in both applicants and graduates. We are working with Enrollment Services to set in place a tracking system for both ethnicity and gender for the applicants in particular as this had not been done previously for both ethnicity and gender. In conversation with the Director of Enrollment

they will be setting this type of information into their tracking document starting this fall semester and from here on. Thus our next YES document should have a more complete picture in those areas and will be followed up by a report from the meeting between the MAC faculty and the Enrollment Director of how we can reach a more diverse population and seek to be relatively comparable to the general population from the surrounding area from which we draw our students. Noted below are the present findings based on available information.

**Applicant/Enrolled Student Demographic Data**

*Findings:*

For the 2021-2022 school year there were 48 applicants of which 15 reported their gender as male and 33 reported as female. No ethnic information was gathered. Those who actually enrolled into the program for the 2021-2022 school year were 25 students of which four identified as male and 21 identified as female. Ethnically, 19 identified as White for their ethnicity, one identified as Black/African American and one identified with two ethnicities, one identified as Asian and one identified as Other.

Thus for the 2021-2022 school year 52% of applicants entered the program. Of those 26% were self-identified as male and 67% self-identified as female. For those within the program 76% self-identified as White, 4% self-identified as either Black/African American. 4% self-identified as two ethnicities 4% self-identified as Asian and 4% self-identified as Other.

*Proposal:*

Regarding race/ethnicity, in our last review of our community and surrounding areas, the following information was gathered: (Note- Report percentages are based on community and state sources and may not add up to 100%)

Based on July 2019 Census information	African American Black	Asian	Hispanic Latino	Two or more	White
Bloomington	10%	7%	6%	2%	78%
Normal	7.7%	4.3%	5.2%	2.7%	82%
Decatur	23%	1%	2.2%	3%	72%
Lincoln	3.5%	1.4%	2.4%	3.3%	91%
Peoria	27%	6%	6.3%	4%	61%
Springfield	15%	1.5%	2.8%	1.5%	81%
Area Average	14%	3.5%	4.1%	2.8%	75%

The chart above provides a glimpse at the ethnic backgrounds from which our students come to the program. Based only on the 2021-2022 school year enrolled students we are comparable to our area in terms of ethnic make-up in the categories of White, Asian, and Two or more. This year’s entry students lacked any representation from the Hispanic/Latino population and was 10% below the average in the African American/Black categories.

In meeting with the Director of Enrollment Services a plan was developed to reach out to specific regional areas via billboards and radio commercials. These signs, radio commercials, and internet search engine optimizations to guide prospective students toward our web site are set up in Bloomington and Springfield which are two of the larger communities we draw from and have a larger African American population.

**Annual Graduate Demographic Data**

*Findings:*

There were 15 graduates from the program in the 2021-2022 school year. Twenty percent were self-identified as male and 80% self-identified as female. Fifteen percent self-identified as Hispanic/Latino and 85% self-identified as White. When compared to the application data from the 2021-2022 school year, the program has lost its Hispanic/Latino representation in the student body. We are maintaining the Asian, two or more ethnic categories and have not lost in the African American category although it is lower than the larger community population in terms of percentage. The replacement values indicate that we are holding steady on the number of self-identified males and females with relatively little change in the overall student body. The spring 2022 class self-identified as 21% male and 79% female.

*Proposal:*

In a meeting with the Vice President of Academics on June 8, 2022 the findings were discussed. We became aware that to impact the demographics of the graduates from the program, we had to impact enrollment. We opted to fall back to the planning set in motion by Enrollment Services and the Marketing Department as our best response

**SUMMARY**

We realize that this is a large document and so in order to seek to simplify for the reader changes that are occurring due to this assessment are listed below. These will also be the check points for our YES Plan Implementation meeting that will occur just prior to the start of school that will allow us to create a “loop” document kept in the MACFAC meeting notes demonstrating that we completed the assessment cycle.

Note below the changes for core classes as based on the BPA

Course	Comments
COUN 601- Research and Evaluation in Counseling	Review that all assignments have a rubric
COUN 602- Basic Counseling Techniques	Second CPRP assignment changed to include integrative behavioral health to meet standard C3d - Add corollary reading assignment

COUN 662- Abnormal Psychology ( name is being changed to Psychopathology)	Update quizzes
COUN 663- Major Theories of Counseling	Add assigned reading on consultation to meet F5c
COUN 666- Developmental Psychology	No changes
COUN 667- Tests and Measures for Counseling	No changes
COUN 668- Group Theories and Practice	Advise students to read the Schopenhauer Cure text as they go through the class rather than waiting till the end.
COUN 751- Career Development Counseling	Add career counseling video
COUN 760- Multicultural Counseling	Provide additional time in class to process the Rwanda movie
COUN 804- Family Systems Counseling	No changes noted
COUN 807- Substance Abuse and Addictions Counseling	(Adjunct-no report)
COUN 810- Ethical and Legal Issues for Counselors and Other Christian Leaders	No changes

\_\_\_ The Theories and Ethics professors will be asked to review the test questions in the Pre-Practicum Test and see how they align with what is presently taught in those classes.

\_\_\_ Due to either inflation of scores on the OAS or lack of scores being reported the Program Director will review with our adjuncts the OAS scoring and reporting so as to provide a clearer picture of the assessment.

\_\_\_ COUN 601 the professor will make the cultural relevance explicit in the program evaluation to meet Standard F.8.j.

\_\_\_ COUN 804 the professor will enhance the lecture and possibly the reading portion of the class devoted to resilience strategies that are culturally and ethically appropriate to meet standard F.3.i.

\_\_X\_ On Evaluation of the Clinical Training there is to be a meeting with one of the faculty group supervisors regarding a low score. (Note: Meeting occurred on June 7, 2022).

\_\_\_ Each professor is to review their course and see if they sense a need for additional role playing activities.

\_\_\_ Add to group supervision training on counseling online clients.

\_\_\_ Although this cannot be “looped” till the next years YES document, will track the NCE scores on Research and program Evaluation.

\_\_\_ Program Director will meet with Director of Enrollment Services (by September) regarding the plans to reach out to specific areas in our region.

