Final Report for PRAC Grant

Developing a comprehensive assessment system
for a new graduate program in mental health counseling
Submitted by Cheryl B. Warner, PhD & Darrin L. Carr, PhD
IUPUC Mental Health Counseling Program

The Mental Health Counseling program (MHCP) at IUPUC is a 60-credit hour graduate program, resulting in a Master of Arts degree and eligibility for licensure in Indiana as a Licensed Mental Health Counselor. The MHCP's curriculum aligns with Indiana state law state law and national training standards for the counseling profession, which includes 48 credits of content courses and 12 credits (or 1,000 clock hours) of supervised clinical experience. Our admission process mirrors many graduate admission procedures that includes applicants submitting the following materials for consideration: Graduate application, essays, GRE scores, letters of recommendation, and academic transcripts. The program admits new students annually beginning in the fall semester. Since initially matriculating students in the Fall 2012 semester until the Spring semester of 2016, MHCP had enrolled 43 full- and part-time students. Of these students, 15 (34.9%) had earned degrees by May of 2016. Some 17 (39.5%) of students were enrolled in course work and/or field experiences. Seven (16.3%) students had withdrawn from the program and four (9.3%) students were inactive (not currently enrolled or withdrawn). The program also enrolled one non-degree seeking student who was completing coursework needed for licensure.

MHCP identified eight areas of competency in which we expect our graduates to demonstrate proficiencies: Profession of mental health counseling. professional development, counseling skills and processes, cultural competence, ethical practices, evidence-based practices, area of practice/specialization, and communication and technology. This project targets two areas of competency, *profession of mental health counseling* and *clinical skills and processes*, to informed MHCP faculty on students' development and determine if the current assessment measures provide informative data for program evaluation. The project was divided into two separate analyses to provide summative and formative findings from qualitative and quantitative data collected during the academic years, 2013-2016. The first section, analysis of the admission essays, include essays submitted for the academic years, 2013 to 2015. The admission essays were changed for the 2013 year, requiring the exclusion of applicants' essays received for the 2012 admission. The essay question analyzed in this report have been consistently used in the admission process since its revision in 2013. The second section, analysis of field experience data, covers the time period of summer 2013 to spring 2016. Due to the sequence of courses, summer 2013 was the first semester of field experience for the program. In general, full-time students who begin the program in fall semester are eligible for their first semester of field experience (i.e., practicum) by the following summer semester. Hence, the project's data were extracted from the following artifacts:

1. Admission application essay 2 (*Identify the mental health concerns or challenges affecting your community. Discuss how you, as a mental health counselor, will assist your community in addressing these challenges.*)
2. Site Evaluations (completed by students)
3. Site Supervisor Evaluation (completed by students)

4. Practicum Mid-Semester and Final Evaluations (completed by university supervisors)
5. Internship Mid-Semester and Final Evaluations (completed by site supervisors)
6. Advanced Internship Mid-Semester and Final Evaluation (completed by site supervisors)

Profession of Mental Health Counseling

Mental health counseling, as a counseling specialty, has a unique philosophy and characteristics from other mental health professions (e.g., social work or psychology). A national training standard and objective requires all counseling students to understand the history, philosophy, and professional identity of mental health counseling. Thus, the competency for the profession of mental health counseling is defined as:

The demonstration of professional identity, knowledge and skills specific to the counseling specialization of mental health counseling. Mental health counseling professionals: a) possess in-depth understanding of the etiology, classification, treatment, and prevention of a broad range of mental and emotional disorders; and b) provide appropriate and effective services to diverse client populations in a variety of community settings. (MHCP, 2015, p. 5)

It is critical for MHCP to assess students on their development and acquisition of this competency throughout students' graduate studies. The program realized it could establish a baseline of knowledge of this area from applicants' responses on their admission essay. This data provides an assessment of this competency early in students' graduate education.

Thirty-four applications between 2013 and 2015 were submitted for consideration of admission. The applications from the 2012 academic year were excluded because the admission essay questions differed from the remaining years. Table 1 shows the annual breakdown for the admission applications. The instructions for the admission question directed applicants to write a response of no more than 500 words to the question shown on the previous page of this report. All identifiable information was removed from the essays and an identification code was assigned to each essay. The coded essays were sent to the raters, along with the definition of the competency and instructions for reviewing the essays. Raters were instructed to evaluate "applicants' general knowledge of the profession of mental health counseling", using a 4-point rating scale of *4 = exemplary, 3 = proficient, 2 = needs improvement,* and *1 = undeveloped*.

Table 1. *Number of Admission Essays Submitted and Reviewed.*

Years	Number of Essays
2013	9 (26%)
2014	12 (35%)
2015	13 (38%)
Total	34

Two veteran professional counselors participated in the project as raters. Table 2 shows the raters' credentials and professional experiences. The raters were offered a stipend of $250 for their participation. One rater, who recently retired, rejected payment of the stipend, requesting the funds be donated the MHCP's foundation. Unfortunately, according to the

campus's financial policies, the money could not be donated without disbursing the funds to the rater and the raters making a direct donation to the foundation. Combined the raters have 49 years of experience in the counseling profession.

Table 2. *Raters' Professional Credentials and Professional Experiences.*

	Rater 1	Rater 2
Degrees	Ph.D. in Counselor Education M.Ed. in Counseling & Guidance	M.S. in Counseling & Human Services
Years of Professional Experience	24	25
Licensures	Licensed Professional Counselor Licensed Professional Counselor Supervisor	Licensed Mental Health Counselor
Professional Settings	Educational Institution Private Practice Community Mental Health	Private Practice Educational Institution Community Mental Health Correctional Facilities Military Installments
Clinical Areas	Individual, Couples, and Group Counseling Clinical Supervision Counselor Education	Trauma & Loss Military Service Members & Families Disaster Relief Inmate Rehabilitation

Table 3 shows the frequencies of raters' scores based on the Likert scores. Rater 1 rated 21% (7) of the essays as meeting a level of proficient or above; whereas, Rater 2 rated 47% (16) at the same level. Overall, Rater 2 considered the essay responses more favorable to having knowledge of mental health counseling than Rater 1.

Table 3. *Frequencies (percentages) of Scores per Rater.*

Rating Scores	Rater 1 ($n = 34$)	Rater 2 ($n = 34$)	Differences
Exemplary (4)	4 (12)	2 (6)	2
Proficient (3)	3 (9)	14 (41)	11
Needs Improvement (2)	18 (53)	13 (38)	5
Undeveloped (1)	9 (27)	5 (15)	4
Cannot Rate (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	-
Means	2.059	2.382	-.324
Standard Deviations	.919	.817	.102

Due to the sample size, the ratings were converted to two categories: "High" (Exemplar and Proficient) and "Low" (Needs Improvement and Undeveloped). Three percent ($n = 7$) and

47% (*n* = 16) placed in the High categories by Rater 1 and Rater 2, respectively (refer to Table 4).

Table 4. *Frequencies (percentages) of of Converted Scores per Rater.*

Rating Scores	Rater 1	Rater 2
High Scores	7 (21)	16 (47)
Low Scores	27 (79)	18 (52)

A chi square analysis tested the presence of any statistical differences between the groups for each rater. The difference between the ratings in the High group versus the Low group were statistically significant for Rater 1 (X^2 = 11.76, *p* =.001); whereas, no statistically significant difference (X^2 = .118, *p* = .732) was detected between the groups for Rater 2. A chi square analysis could not be computed to determine a statistical significance between the raters because there were insufficient counts for the cell distributions. A t-test analysis between the raters confirmed little difference between the means (*t*(66) = -1.534, *p* = .130); even though Rater 2 scored the essays higher than Rater 1.

The raters' comments provide insights into their perceptions of how they associated scoring with the essay responses (see Table 5 for examples of raters' comments). Raters attributed higher scores to essays that address the multiplicity of mental health issues and service delivery in contrast to assigned lower scores to essays that provided singular view of mental health or simplistic explanation of entering the profession.

Table 5. *Examples of Raters' Comments for Each Score Level.*

Scoring	Rater 1	Rater 2
Exemplary	*Well-developed statement of needs for specific populations along with excellent description of helping behaviors and outreach efforts.*	*Applicant identifies a broad range of Mental Health (MH) issues, focused on integrated/holistic treatment, and recognizes the value of coordinate of care.*
	Used specific examples to identify stigma, lack of knowledge surrounding mental illness; will create opportunities to partner with schools/communities to educate/reduce stigma.	*Applicant demonstrates awareness of cycles and generational patterns associated with MH problems. Also is aware of interaction between the individual, the family, and the community in terms of both prevention and coping.*
Proficient	*Addressed the need for holistic services; offered specific strategies to increase collaboration between physical/mental health.*	No comment provided
	Identify issues of anxiety and depression, using substances to self-medicate; identified specific strategies to assist community.	No comment provided
Needs Improvement	*Discussed substance abuse and its consequences; stated the desire to*	*Applicant awareness of how to help must be developed beyond the role of advocacy.*

Scoring	Rater 1	Rater 2
	help others cope. No specific strategies.	
	Identified several challenges and expressed desire to work with children. No specific strategies.	*Applicant's focus indicates lack of awareness of the prevalence of cognitive-based therapies that already exist, are evidence based, and broadly applied.*
Undeveloped	*Poorly developed discussion of implied stigma and access issues; no mention of how to assist community.*	*Applicant primarily identified one issue – needs broader focus regarding community MH needs.*
	Provided a brief summary of personal experience. Issues not developed.	*Applicant addressed stigma and availability of MH services, but did not identify specific MH needs.*

Summary for Competency Profession of Mental Health Counseling

The purpose of this analysis was to determine if students' responses at the point of applying for admission into the program is a viable data point for assessing growth in the profession of mental health counseling competency. Our raters, who were experienced professional counselors, rated the essays across all four levels of scoring. The raters differ in the assignment of scores; although, their mean differences for the total sample were statistically non-significant. The rating scores illustrated at least 50% of the essays fell within the "low" category of scores, showing room for growth in the development of this area of competency resulting from the program's curriculum. Thus, MHCP can use the admission essays as baseline data in tracking the development of the profession of mental health competency. Thus, faculty should rate the essays during the admission process and store the essays of students enrolled as artifacts for the program's assessment system. However further consideration is needed in determining to use the current Likert scale or one that may further differentiate the quality and content of the admission essays.

Field Experience

Student learning in the area of competency of counseling skills and process occurs through content courses and clinical field experiences. Since students complete content courses as prerequisite for their field experience, the second segment of this project involved only analyzing the field experience data. The program's field experience requirements include practicum (100 hours), internship (600 hours), and advanced internship (300 hours). This requirement translates to four semesters (12 credits) of field experience for our students. Since March 2013, the MHCP has entered into clinical affiliation agreements with 27 separate field training sites, of which 23 of these sites remain currently active. During the time period of this report, 25 students participated in 96 clinical training field experience at 24 separate locations. At midpoint of the semester, clinical supervisors submit formative evaluations on students' performance. At the conclusion of each semester, students and clinical supervisors submit summative evaluations of the field experience (sites and supervisors) and students' progress. This report includes the quantitative analysis of the submitted evaluations.

Evaluation of Sites by Students

The program received 75 separate site evaluations submitted by our students. Of these evaluations, 21 were for practicum experiences, 38 for internship experiences, and 16 for advanced internship experiences. Overall results of these evaluations reported as percentages of item endorsements can be found in Appendix A.

Training and counseling activities at the sites were described by trainees as Constructive (91%), Pertinent and meaningful (66%), Fair and honest (74%), Developing awareness of strengths and weaknesses (74%), and as Specific but not unnecessarily detailed. No trainees rated their training and counseling activities as negative, destructive. Supervisors were described as providing helpful and useful suggestions (93%), spending adequate time in observation and conferences (91%), giving adequate indication of success/failure (94%), and allowing for comments about site performance (97%). Supervisor's ability to communicate effectively was rated as either outstanding (67%) or satisfactory (32%). Site personnel other than supervisors were described as spending adequate time in observation and conferences (84%), giving adequate indication of success / failure (83%), facilitating learning (89%), and providing helpful and useful suggestions (88%).

Overall 87% of trainees rated their field experience site as Excellent or Above Average with 13% judging their site to Average or Below Average. No respondents rated their site as poor. Some 75% of respondents responded that they would "definitely" recommend their field experience site to other students. Additional comments were made by respondents definitely recommending their sites on 25 of 51 evaluations. Themes from their comments included, included expressions of positive feelings about past experiences and anticipation of future experiences, availability of plentiful direct contact hours, inclusion as a member in a collaborative team, development of specialized expertise (e.g., practice management, spirituality in counseling, assessment, working with children and adolescents), the high quality of supervision, and exposure to clients with a wide variety of presenting problems and psychopathologies.

The remaining 25% responded that they would recommend the site with "reservations." Additional comments were made by respondents recommending their sites with reservations on 13 of on 25 submitted evaluations. Examples of reservations described included difficulties with recording for supervision, limited availability of direct contact hours, the need for independent functioning, and the need to share a specialized interest related to the site (e.g., addiction or spirituality).

Evaluation of Site Supervisors by Students

Some 35 supervisors have been involved with graduate student field experiences. The program follows the Indiana licensure codes' credential requirements for eligibility as onsite clinical supervisors. The types and frequencies of supervisor licenses and certifications are listed in Table 6.

Table 6. *Professional Licenses and Certifications of Site Supervisors*

Professional Licenses / Certifications	Numbers
Licensed Clinical Social Workers	14
Licensed Mental Health Counselors	9
Licensed Clinical Addiction Counselors	7

Professional Licenses / Certifications	Numbers
Health Service Professional Providers (licensed psychologists)	6
Licensed Marriage and Family Therapists	2
AACC (Christian Counselors)	1
Advanced Registered Nurse Practitioners	1
Medical Doctor (psychiatrist)	1

Note: The total number of licenses is greater than the number of supervisors as 11
supervisors reported holding multiple licenses.

Overall results of 58 evaluations for 25 distinct supervisors are provided in Appendix B. A majority of students strongly agreed or agreed that their site supervisor treated them professionally ($M = 3.81$, $SD = .40$), exhibited respect for diversity ($M = 3.77$, $SD = .43$), were supportive ($M = 3.72$, $SD = .53$), and were professional in their interpersonal behaviors ($M = 3.69$, $SD = .47$). Graduate students were less positive about the dependability of supervisors with regard to meetings ($M = 3.41$, $SD = .74$), the offering of constructive criticism to improve skills ($M = 3.51$, $SD = .63$), and clarity when communicating expectations ($M = 3.51$, $SD = .63$). In summary, 82.7% of students rated their overall supervision experience as Above Average to Excellent ($M = 4.32$, $SD = .783$). With 15.5% of students rating their overall experiences as average or below average. No students rated their supervisor as poor. It was noticed that some 43.1% of respondents endorsed Item 12 (which addressed supervisor review of portfolios) as not applicable. This suggests that this item might be a candidate for modification or removal from the evaluation.

To investigate if the remaining items of the Supervisor Evaluation might perform as a scale, a reliability analysis was run on 51 evaluations which had responses for all items (i.e., no N/A endorsements). The remaining items of the site supervisor evaluation formed a reliable scale (Chronbach's $\alpha = .94$, $M = 43.57$, $SD = 5.02$). This scale was found to be significantly related to students' overall ratings of their supervisors ($r = .80$, $p < .001$). The distribution was negatively skewed with an 18-point range in individual ratings of supervisors on this scale. The most frequently occurring score was 48 (the maximum score) which occurred one third of the time ($f = 17$). While no supervisors scored greater than one standard deviation above the mean, some 8 supervisors scored greater than one standard deviation below the mean on individual evaluations However, when mean supervisor scores on this scale were compared (i.e., multiple evaluations for each supervisor were averaged), there was no statistically significant difference in ratings among supervisors $F(24,26) = 1.758$, $p = .081$.

Evaluation of Students by Supervisors

The performance of students is evaluated by their university or site supervisors at the middle and end of each semester. Thus, each student will receive a total of eight evaluations at the completion of their 1,000 hours. The evaluation forms are designed to assess students' performance on a 4-point Likert scale on professional characteristics and behaviors, such as Professional Relationships, Professional Attitudes and Behaviors, Personal Characteristics, Cultural Competence, Performance in the Counseling Process, and Performance of Program Duties. Supervisors can also provide written categorical and overall comments on the evaluation forms.

Practicum Students. Two, slightly different versions of evaluation forms have been used to review practicum students. Form 1 was used during the Summer and Fall of 2013 with 6 students resulting in 11 total evaluations (6 at midterm and 5 final evaluations at the end of the semester). Form 2 has been used to evaluate 15 students during the remaining semesters. Faculty supervisors completed 29 student evaluations using Form 2 for 15 students, 14 at midterm and 15 final evaluations at semester's end. After its initial administration, a review of Form 1 indicated a large number of items in the counseling process section that were not applicable to practicum experiences (e.g., "Knowledge of assessments") necessitating that these items be dropped and/or revised.

A one-way ANOVA for mean scores for common and distinct items for both Form 1 and Form 2 are presented in Appendix C. It should be noted changes in form versions, apparent inconsistent use of the not applicable option by respondents, and the presence of missing data on some forms caused the sample size to vary by item. Statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) from midterm to final evaluations were noted for in the area of professional attitudes and behaviors, specifically: 1) the ability to maintain confidentiality; 2) adherence to ethical standards; 2) ability to function as a team member; 3) ability to interact or collaborate productively with other personnel; and 4) an understanding of mental health counseling. In the area of performance of program duties, two items were significant: 1) an overall understanding of the setting's organization and 2) functions and knowledge of community referral sources. In addition, two items assessing "emotional stability" and "awareness of one's own cultural values and biases" were also significant in other sections of the evaluation. The effect size for all significant differences was small ($.10 < \eta^2 < .17$).

Internship and Advanced Internship Students. Twenty-five interns were evaluated by 22 supervisors creating 99 separate evaluations across both Fall and Spring semesters. A one-way ANOVA comparing midterm and final mean scores for items across both the Fall and Spring semesters are presented in Appendix D. Statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) were noted for in the area of professional relationships, specifically improved relationships with site supervisor and staff. Significant changes were also observed in the area of cultural competence, specifically awareness of own values and biases and awareness of client's worldview, attitudes, and beliefs. Finally, a significant difference was found for overall counseling skills. The effect size for all significant differences was small ($.02 < \eta^2 < .04$).

When midterm and final internship evaluations were compared within the Fall semesters only (i.e., typically a trainee's first internship after summer practicum) a pattern of significant differences emerges that is nearly identical to that shown when Fall and Spring semesters are combined (see Appendix E). Added to this pattern, is a positive change in another cultural competence item, "Ability to relate to diverse types of clients." Effect sizes within the Fall semester were slightly larger than combined Fall / Spring comparison, but still relatively modest ($.09 < \eta^2 < .13$).

When midterm and final internship evaluations were compared within the Spring semesters only (i.e. second semester of internship), no significant changes were found among the items (see Appendix F). Similarly, there were no significant shifts in performance of

graduate students between midterm and final evaluations during Advanced Internship which is typically completed during the student's final semester of enrollment (see Appendix G).

Overall item means and standard deviations for each field experience evaluation are shown in Table 7. Significant differences exist between practicum and internship 1 ($t(97) = 2.97, p < .01, d = .60$) and internship 1 and internship 2 ($t(98) = 2.12, p < .05, d = .43$). There is no significant difference between the overall item mean for internship 2 and advanced internship surveys ($t(98) = 0.64, p > .05$).

Table 7. *Overall Item Means by Survey*

	M	SD	n
Practicum	3.16	.73	49
Internship 1	3.56	.60	50
Internship 2	3.78	.39	50
Advanced Internship	3.71	.63	50

Summary of Competency Clinical Skills and Processes

In general, evaluations of sites, supervisors, and students appear to be providing information that is helpful in evaluating the performance of the program and related individuals. Using these instruments, it is possible to identify both superior and underperforming sites and supervisors with their respective evaluations. Also, when comparing student midterm to final evaluations within each field experience, significant changes are seen for selected items during both practicum and the first semester of internship. Also, when comparing overall item means of the evaluations, there is a general upward trend with significant differences among the first three field experiences.

However, there are also some limitations to the data produced by the surveys. First, it does appear that neither students nor supervisors typically use the entire range of the scale with the majority of ratings being higher than the midpoint of the scale. Also, only about 10% of 149 items from practicum, internship, and advanced internship surveys were sensitive to change during the semester. Furthermore, no individual items showed significant changes between midterm and final evaluation for both the second semester of internship and advanced internship. Finally, while there is an upward trend in overall item means, this does not continue between the second semester of internship and advanced internship.

In order to improve evaluation data derived from the surveys, the following enhancements may be considered by MHC faculty: 1) provide a behavioral definition for each survey item to improve supervisor and student understanding of the item; 2) provide faculty and site supervisors with appropriate developmental benchmarks for graduate students at each stage of training; 3) use an online survey format that will reduce problems with data capture (specifically the issue of "N/A" items); and 4) provide training to faculty and site supervisors on best practices when completing student evaluations.

Project Budget

The grant award supported the cost of graduate student workers, rater's stipend, and attendance to IUPUI's 2014 Assessment Institute. Table 8 shows the itemized list of

expenditures when compared to the project's budget. As previous mentioned, one rater refused the stipend due to her retirement status. The money was redirected to support graduate student workers. Two students qualified for federal work study (FWS), which offset some of the cost budgeted for student workers. The grant funds reimbursed the program for the dollars paid from the Division of Science budget, not 100% of the students' hourly wage. From the savings from federal work study and the rejection of the stipend from one rater, this project was completed under the proposed budget.

Table 8. *Project's Budgeted and Actual Expenditures.*

Expenditures	Actual Costs		Budget
Graduate Student Workers ($15.00 per hour)			
2014-2015			
26.50 hours (FWS)	$ 99.38		
2015-2016			
37.80 hours	567.00		
85.00 hours (FWS)	318.75	$ 985.13	$ 1,740.00
Raters' Stipend		250.00	500.00
2014 Assessment Institute		290.00	250.00
Other expenses (i.e., postage)		33.39	
Total		**$1,558.52**	**$2,490.00**

Conclusion

The project aimed to determine if the analyses of MHCP's artifacts provide summative and formative information regarding students' progress. The findings indicate the data does inform the program but can benefit from some modifications to ensure the quality of the future findings. For instance, MHCP may reconsider the nuances of their assessment measures (i.e., Likert scale response anchors and measures) to insure a more accurate developmental interpretation of student progress or provide site supervisors instructions on evaluating students. This project serves as the beginning in the continual process of evaluating and re-evaluating a comprehensive developmental assessment system and provides much information for MHCP to discuss and investigate. This project only evaluated artifacts for two separate competencies out of the program's eight areas. Further analyses on the remaining competencies will provide similar assistance received from this project in determining needed improvements in evaluating student learning.

Appendix A

Graduate Student Evaluations of Sites
(Numbers represent percentage of endorsement, $n = 75$)

1. The training and counseling activities were:
(*Check as many as appropriate)****

91.4	Constructive	32.9	Specific, but not unnecessarily detailed
74.3	Fair and honest	7.1	Too general, vague
.0	Negative, destructive	1.4	Too unnecessarily detailed
65.7	Pertinent and meaningful	74.3	Made me aware of strengths & weaknesses

     * Multiple items could be endorsed therefore percentages do not sum to 1.

2. Suggestions made by the site supervisor:

92.9	Helpful and useful	1.4	Inappropriate
1.4	Nonexistent	4.3	Not applicable to my situation

3. Suggestions made by other site personnel:

87.7	Helpful and useful	1.5	Inappropriate
4.6	Nonexistent	6.2	Not applicable to my situation

4. Throughout experience, site supervisor:

94.3	Gave adequate indication of my success or failure
5.7	Made no judgment of my overall performance

5. Throughout experience, other site personnel:

82.8	Gave adequate indication of my success or failure
17.2	Made no judgment of my overall performance

6. The supervisor:

97.1	Allowed for my comments about your site performance
.0	Showed little interest in my comments
2.9	Seemed concerned about my attitude toward my responsibilities

7. Other site personnel:

85.7	Allowed for your comments about your site performance
7.9	Showed little interest in your comments
6.3	Seemed concerned about your attitude toward your responsibilities

8. Supervisor:

91.2	Spent adequate time in observation and conferences
8.8	Did not spend adequate time in observation and conferences

9. Other site personnel:

83.9	Spent adequate time in observation and conferences

16.1   Did not spend adequate time in observation and conferences

1. The supervisor's ability to communicate effectively was:

66.7   Outstanding

31.9   Satisfactory

1.4   Inadequate

11. In general, the disposition of the supervisor:

91.1   Facilitated learning

7.4   Had no bearing on learning

1.5   Impeded learning

12. In general, the disposition of other site personnel:

88.9   Facilitated learning

9.5   Had no bearing on learning

1.6   Impeded learning

13. I would rate this field experience site as:

55.7   Excellent

31.4   Above Average

11.4   Average

1.4   Below Average

.0   Poor

14. I would recommend this field experience site to other students:

75.0   Yes, definitely

25.0   Yes, with reservations

.0   No

Appendix B
Graduate Student Evaluations of Site Supervisors
(Numbers represent percentage of endorsement, *n* = 58)

		Strongly Agree 4	Agree 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1	Not Applicable	Mean (*SD*)
1.	My site supervisor promoted growth in my interests, abilities, learning, and understanding.	63.8	34.5	1.7	.0	.0	3.62 (.52)
2.	My site supervisor was very professional in her/his dealings with me.	31.0	69.0	.0	.0	.0	3.69 (.47)
3.	My site supervisor made suggestions regarding observations of my counseling skills and development that were beneficial.	6.4	31.0	5.2	.0	3.4	3.57 (.60)
4.	My site supervisor created a setting of support.	74.1	2.7	3.5	.0	1.7	3.72 (.53)
5.	My site supervisor treated me as a professional.	81.0	19.0	.0	.0	.0	3.81 (.40)
6.	My site supervisor was dependable regarding our meetings.	53.4	37.9	5.1	3.4	.0	3.41 (.75)
7.	My site supervisor was attentive during our meetings.	63.8	29.3	.0	.0	6.9	3.69 (.47)
8.	The site supervisor offered me constructive criticism that assisted in improving my counseling and administrative skills.	56.9	34.5	6.9	.0	1.7	3.51 (.63)
9.	My site supervisor communicated expectations and objectives clearly.	56.9	34.5	6.9	.0	1.7	3.51 (.63)
10.	My site supervisor provided timely feedback and reports of my progress.	51.7	41.4	5.2	.0	1.7	3.47 (.60)
11.	My site supervisor exhibited respect for students and acceptance of cultural, intellectual, and ethnic diversity.	74.1	22.4	.0	.0	3.5	3.77 (.43)
12.	My site supervisor reviewed, critiqued, and returned my professional portfolio in a timely manner.	39.7	13.8	3.4	.0	43.1	3.64 (.60)
13.	The requirements made of me by the site supervisor were fair and challenging.	55.2	32.8	3.4	1.7	6.9	3.52 (.67)

	Excellent 5	Above Average 4	Average 3	Below Average 2	Poor 1	Missing	Mean (*SD*)
Overall, I would rate my supervision experience as:	48.3	34.5	13.8	1.7	.0	1.7	4.32 (.783)

Appendix C
Midterm & Final Evaluations of Practicum Students by Supervisors
(Forms 1 & 2 Combined)

		N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
1. Professional Relationships								
a.	Relationship with site supervisor	2	3.32 (.58)	3.58 (.61)	.26	1.86 (1, 36)	.181	.05
b.	Relationship with other professional staff	3	3.17 (.71)	3.53 (.61)	.36	2.746 (1, 35)	.106	.07
c.	Relationship with support personnel	4	3.11 (.83)	3.44 (.71)	.33	1.681 (1, 34)	.203	.05
d.	Relationship with other students/interns on site	17	3.18 (.87)	3.18 (1.17)	0	0 (1, 20)	1	0
2. Professional Attitudes & Behaviors								
a.	Genuine interest in clients	1	3.53 (.61)	3.55 (.76)	.02	.011 (1, 37)	.915	0
b.	Ability to take initiative & perform independently	2	3.11 (.99)	3.37 (.76)	.26	.84 (1, 36)	.366	.02
c.	Promptness		3.26 (.65)	3.42 (.61)	.16	.596 (1, 36)	.445	.02
d.	Dependability	2	3.37 (.60)	3.47 (.61)	.1	.288 (1, 36)	.595	.01
e.	Displays cooperation	2	3.32 (.58)	3.58 (.51)	.26	2.206 (1, 36)	.146	.06
f.	Preparedness	2	3.21 (.79)	3.37 (.76)	.16	.395 (1, 36)	.534	.01
g.	Openness to supervision and feedback	4	3.41 (.80)	3.74 (.45)	.33	2.336 (1, 34)	.136	.06
h.	Ability & desire to follow through on suggestions/feedback	5	3.00 (1)	3.5 (.62)	.5	3.206 (1, 33)	.083	.09
i.	Ability to maintain confidentiality	2	3.37 (.60)	3.79 (.42)	.42	6.33 (1, 36)	.016*	.15
j.	Adherence to ethical standards	3	2.94 (.64)	3.47 (.61)	.53	6.623 (1, 35)	.014*	.16
k.	Ability to function as a team member	5	2.71 (.99)	3.44 (.71)	.73	6.565 (1, 33)	.015*	.17

		N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
l.	Ability to interact or collaborate productively with other personnel in the setting	3	2.89 (.90)	3.47 (.70)	.58	4.914 (1, 35)	.033*	.12
m.	An understanding of mental health counseling	4	2.76 (.83)	3.26 (.56)	.5	4.527 (1, 34)	.041*	.12
3. Personal Characteristics								
a.	Self-awareness & self-understanding	5	3.06 (.73)	3.35 (.79)	.29	1.355 (1, 33)	.253	.04
b.	Emotional stability	5	3.22 (.65)	3.65 (.49)	.43	4.737 (1, 33)	.037*	.13
c.	Self-control	5	3.33 (.59)	3.65 (.49)	.32	2.873 (1, 33)	.099	.08
d.	A sense of adequacy, self-worth, and self-confidence	3	2.72 (.83)	3.05 (.71)	.33	1.718 (1, 35)	.198	.05
e.	Ability to verbally communicate effectively and clearly	2	2.83 (.92)	3.32 (.82)	.49	2.83 (1, 35)	.101	.08
f.	Ability to communicate in writing effectively and clearly	11	2.86 (.86)	3.33 (.62)	.47	2.946 (1, 27)	.098	.1
g.	Ability to adapt to new situations	3	3.11 (1.02)	3.58 (.61)	.47	2.901 (1, 35)	.097	.08
4. Cultural Competence								
a.	An awareness of one's own cultural values and biases	7	2.75 (.58)	3.24 (.56)	.49	5.982 (1, 31)	.02*	.16
b.	An awareness of clients' worldview, attitudes, and beliefs	8	2.87 (.64)	3.06 (.56)	.19	.827 (1, 30)	.37	.03
c.	(Form 1) Ability to relate to diverse types of clients	7	3.5 (.71)	3.5 (.71)	0	.000 (1,2)	1.00	.00
c.	(Form 2) An awareness of the cultural implications of the counseling process	0	2.57 (.65)	2.80 (.56)	.23	1.039 (1,27)	.32	.04
d.	(Form 1)Ability to use culturally- appropriate counseling strategies	7	3.5 (.71)	3.0 (1)	.5	.333 (1,1)	.67	.25

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
5. Performance in the Counseling Process:							
a. Ability to understand client's subjective world or point of view	10	3.00 (.88)	3.38 (.62)	.38	1.867 (1, 28)	.183	.06
b. Ability to establish and maintain rapport	13	3.00 (1)	3.25 (.68)	.25	.599 (1, 25)	.446	.02
c. An understanding of clients' developmental stages and tasks	9	2.47 (.83)	3.00 (.73)	.53	3.601 (1, 29)	.068	.11
d. (Form 1) Knowledge of evidence-based treatments	9	3.00 ( )	4.00 ( )	1	N/A	N/A	N/A
d. (Form 2) Ability to research appropriate evidence- based treatments	1	2.69 (1.03)	3.20 (.86)	.69	2.014 (1,26)	.168	.07
e. (Form 1) Ability to research appropriate evidence- based treatments	9	4 ( )	4 ( )	0.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
e. (Form 2) Ability to accurately assess the psychological needs of clients (Form 2 5e)	0	2.71 (.61)	3.07 (.70)	.36	2.059 (1,27)	.163	.07
f. (Form 1) Ability to accurately assess the psychological needs of clients	9	3.00 ( )	4.00 ( )	1	N/A	N/A	N/A
f. (Form 2) Knowledge of intake procedures used in the setting	9	2.22 (.83)	2.82 (.75)	.60	2.828 (1, 18)	.110	.14
g. (Form 1)Knowledge of assessments used in the setting and their proper interpretation	10	3.00 ( )	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
g. (Form 2)Ability to summarize the clients' presenting issues	1	2.79 (.89)	3.21 (.58)	.42	2.272 (1, 26)	.144	.08
h. (Form1) Ability to match individual needs to appropriate individual and/or group settings and services	8	3.00 ( )	4.00 ( )	1.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
i. (Form 1) Ability to use appropriate appraisal techniques for the gathering and utilization of information	9	3.00 ( )	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

		N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
j.	(Form1) Ability to theoretically conceptualize clients' presenting concerns	8	3.00 ( )	4.00 ( )	1.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
k.	(Form 1) Ability to prepare appropriate treatment plan based on conceptualization	8	3.00 ( )	4.00 ( )	1.0	N/A	N/A	N/A
l.	(Form 1) Ability to prepare a com-prehensive case study	8	3.00 ( )	4.00 ( )	1.0	N/A	N/A	N/A

6. Performance of Program Duties:

		N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
a.	An overall understanding of the setting's organization and functions	4	2.72 (.75)	3.22 (.65)	.5	4.575 (1, 34)	.04*	.12
b.	The ability to organize a counseling program appropriate to the setting	11	2.46 (.78)	3.00 (.89)	.54	2.92 (1, 27)	.099	.1
c.	Knowledge of community referral sources	11	2.33 (.72)	2.93 (.73)	.6	4.857 (1, 27)	.036*	.15
d.	Knowledge of in-house referral sources	17	2.36 (.51)	2.75 (.62)	.39	2.648 (1, 21)	.119	.11

7. Please rate the student on overall:

		N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
a.	Counseling skills	14	2.6 (.70)	2.87 (.81)	.27	.789 (1, 24)	.383	.03
b.	Professionalism	2	3.16 (.83)	3.37 (.60)	.21	.8 (1, 36)	.377	.02
c.	Ethical decision-making and behaviors	5	3.00 (.73)	3.26 (.65)	.26	1.266 (1, 33)	.269	.04
d.	Cultural competence	6	2.59 (.62)	2.82 (.53)	.23	1.422 (1, 32)	.242	.04
e.	Potential for overall success as a future mental health counselor in a setting similar to the current setting	5	3.24 (.83)	3.63 (.60)	.39	2.741 (1, 34)	.107	.08

Note: ( ) denotes no standard deviation for *n* = 1.

Appendix D
Midterm and Final Evaluations of Interns by Supervisors
(Combined Fall and Spring Semesters)

		N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
1.	Professional Relationships							
a.	Relationship with site supervisor	0	3.86 (.35)	3.98 (.14)	.12	5.191 (1,97)	.025*	.05
b.	Relationship with other professional staff	3	3.85 (.36)	3.98 (.14)	.13	5.066 (1,94)	.027*	.05
c.	Relationship with support personnel	1	3.77 (.47)	3.9 (.30)	.13	2.619 (1,96)	.109	.03
d.	Relationship with other students/interns on site	37	3.82 (.48)	3.9 (.31)	.08	.503 (1,55)	.481	.01
2. Professional Attitudes & Behaviors								
a.	Genuine interest in clients	0	3.86 (.35)	3.86 (.35)	0	.002 (1,97)	.968	0
b.	Ability to take initiative & perform independently	0	3.61 (.61)	3.66 (.52)	.05	.177 (1,97)	.675	.00
c.	Promptness	0	3.67 (.59)	3.74 (.53)	.07	.35 (1,97)	.556	.00
d.	Dependability	0	3.88 (.39)	3.88 (.33)	0	.001 (1,97)	.973	0
e.	Displays cooperation	0	3.94 (.24)	3.98 (.14)	.04	1.075 (1,97)	.302	.01
f.	Preparedness	0	3.84 (.37)	3.88 (.33)	.04	.375 (1,97)	.542	.00
g.	Openness to supervision and feedback	0	3.96 (.20)	3.88 (.59)	-.08	.784 (1,97)	.378	.01
h.	Ability & desire to follow through on suggestions/feedback	0	3.9 (.31)	3.9 (.30)	0	.001 (1,97)	.973	0
i.	Ability to maintain confidentiality	0	3.92 (.28)	3.96 (.20)	.04	.744 (1,97)	.391	.01
j.	Adherence to ethical standards	0	3.88 (.33)	3.94 (.24)	.06	1.158 (1,97)	.285	.01
k.	Ability to function as a team member	0	3.86 (.35)	3.88 (.33)	.02	.111 (1,97)	.74	.00

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
l. Ability to interact or collaborate productively with other personnel in the setting	0	3.78 (.42)	3.86 (.35)	.08	1.178 (1,97)	.281	.01
m. An understanding of mental health counseling	1	3.48 (.58)	3.62 (.57)	.14	1.468 (1,96)	.229	.02

3. Personal Characteristics

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
a. Self-awareness & self-understanding	3	3.68 (.56)	3.73 (.45)	.05	.275 (1,94)	.601	.00
b. Emotional stability	1	3.81 (.45)	3.9 (.30)	.09	1.303 (1,96)	.256	.01
c. Self-control	0	3.83 (.43)	3.92 (.27)	.09	1.43 (1,96)	.235	.02
d. A sense of adequacy, self-worth, and self-confidence	1	3.5 (.55)	3.58 (.58)	.08	.499 (1,96)	.482	.01
e. Ability to verbally communicate effectively and clearly	0	3.71 (.50)	3.84 (.37)	.13	2.027 (1,97)	.158	.02
f. Ability to communicate in writing effectively and clearly	1	3.64 (.53)	3.73 (.45)	.09	.935 (1,94)	.336	.01
g. Ability to adapt to new situations	0	3.71 (.50)	3.8 (.40)	.09	.882 (1,97)	.35	.01

4. Cultural Competence

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
a. An awareness of one's own cultural values and biases	9	3.57 (.63)	3.8 (.40)	.23	4.592 (1,88)	.035*	.05
b. An awareness of clients' worldview, attitudes, and beliefs	12	3.36 (.76)	3.7 (.51)	.34	6.115 (1,86)	.015*	.07
c. Ability to relate to diverse types of clients	8	3.52 (.73)	3.74 (.49)	.22	2.938 (1,89)	.09	.03
d. Ability to use culturally-appropriate counseling strategies	17	3.47 (.76)	3.64 (.57)	.17	1.211 (1,80)	.274	.02

5. Performance in the Counseling Process:

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
a. Ability to understand	2	3.49 (.62)	3.7 (.46)	.21	3.615 (1,95)	.06	.04

	N/A	Midterm Mean (SD)	Final Mean (SD)	Difference	F (df)	Sig	η^2
	client's subjective world or point of view						
b.	Ability to establish and maintain rapport	2	3.7 (.59)	3.84 (.37)	.14	1.94 (1,95)	.167	.02
c.	An understanding of clients' developmental stages and tasks	3	3.48 (.62)	3.55 (.61)	.07	.328 (1,93)	.568	.00
d.	Knowledge of evidence-based treatments (Form 1d)	3	3.37 (.74)	3.5 (.54)	.13	.977 (1,94)	.325	.01
e.	Ability to research appropriate evidence- based treatments	15	3.58 (.64)	3.76 (.52)	.18	2.044 (1,82)	.157	.02
f.	Ability to accurately assess the psychological needs of clients	2	3.45 (.72)	3.54 (.54)	.09	.525 (1,95)	.47	.01
g.	Knowledge of assessments used in the setting and their proper interpretation	4	3.45 (.69)	3.56 (.62)	.11	.75 (1,93)	.389	.01
h.	Ability to match individual needs to appropriate individual and/or group settings and services	4	3.39 (.68)	3.63 (.53)	.24	3.742 (1,93)	.056	.04
i.	Ability to use appropriate appraisal techniques for the gathering and utilization of information	7	3.42 (.82)	3.61 (.57)	.19	1.753 (1,90)	.189	.02
j.	Ability to theoretically conceptualize clients' presenting concerns	5	3.5 (.76)	3.66 (.63)	.16	1.247 (1,92)	.267	.01
k.	Ability to prepare appropriate treatment plan based on conceptualization	13	3.39 (.86)	3.5 (.70)	.11	.418 (1,83)	.52	.01
l.	Ability to prepare a comprehensive case study	26	3.49 (.70)	3.53 (.61)	.04	.073 (1,69)	.788	.00

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
6. Performance of Program Duties:							
a. An overall understanding of the setting's organization and functions	2	3.5 (.65)	3.63 (.60)	.13	1.084 (1,95)	.3	.01
b. The ability to organize a counseling program appropriate to the setting	35	3.37 (.81)	3.53 (.67)	.16	.764 (1,60)	.386	.01
c. Knowledge of community referral sources	8	3.3 (.67)	3.23 (.79)	-.07	.16 (1,89)	.69	.00
d. Knowledge of in-house referral sources	3	3.33 (.76)	3.38 (.75)	.05	.121 (1,94)	.728	.00
e. Ability to provide psychoeducational services	11	3.68 (.57)	3.62 (.71)	-.06	.227 (1,86)	.635	.00
7. Please rate the student on overall:							
a. Counseling skills	2	3.35 (.70)	3.65 (.52)	.3	5.704 (1,95)	.019*	.06
b. Professionalism	0	3.78 (.42)	3.84 (.37)	.06	.655 (1,97)	.42	.01
c. Ethical decision-making and behaviors	0	3.69 (.59)	3.86 (.41)	.17	2.712 (1,97)	.103	.03
d. Cultural competence	9	3.48 (.70)	3.63 (.57)	.15	1.301 (1,88)	.257	.02
e. Potential for overall success as a future mental health counselor in a setting similar to the current setting	2	3.77 (.56)	3.78 (.68)	.01	.005 (1,96)	.942	.00

Appendix E
Midterm and Final Evaluations of Interns by Supervisors
(Fall Semesters Only)

		N/A	Midterm Mean (SD)	Final Mean (SD)	Difference	F (df)	Sig	η^2
1.	Professional Relationships							
a.	Relationship with site supervisor	0	3.83 (.38)	4 (0)	0.17	4.209 (1, 44)	.046*	.09
b.	Relationship with other professional staff	0	3.83 (.38)	4 (0)	0.17	4.209 (1, 44)	.046*	.09
c.	Relationship with support personnel	1	3.78 (.52)	3.95 (.21)	0.17	2.081 (1, 43)	.156	.05
d.	Relationship with other students/interns on site	16	3.77 (.6)	3.92 (.28)	0.15	0.706 (1, 24)	.409	.03
2. Professional Attitudes & Behaviors								
a.	Genuine interest in clients	0	3.83 (.38)	3.82 (.4)	-0.01	0.018 (1, 44)	.895	0
b.	Ability to take initiative & perform independently	0	3.42 (.72)	3.73 (.55)	0.31	2.678 (1, 44)	.109	.06
c.	Promptness	0	3.62 (.65)	3.77 (.53)	0.15	0.712 (1, 44)	.403	.02
d.	Dependability	0	3.79 (.51)	3.86 (.35)	0.07	0.306 (1, 44)	.583	.01
e.	Displays cooperation	0	3.92 (.28)	4 (0)	0.08	1.913 (1, 44)	.174	.04
f.	Preparedness	0	3.75 (.44)	3.77 (.43)	0.02	0.031 (1, 44)	.861	0
g.	Openness to supervision and feedback	0	3.96 (.2)	3.73 (.88)	-0.23	1.557 (1, 44)	.219	.03
h.	Ability & desire to follow through on suggestions/feedback	0	3.83 (.38)	3.91 (.29)	0.08	0.563 (1, 44)	.457	.01
i.	Ability to maintain confidentiality	0	3.88 (.34)	3.95 (.21)	0.07	0.893 (1, 44)	.35	.02
j.	Adherence to ethical standards	0	3.79 (.42)	3.95 (.21)	0.16	2.727 (1, 44)	.106	.06
k.	Ability to function as a team member	0	3.83 (.38)	3.91 (.29)	0.08	0.563 (1, 44)	.457	.01

		N/A	Midterm Mean (SD)	Final Mean (SD)	Difference	F (df)	Sig	η^2
l.	Ability to interact or collaborate productively with other personnel in the setting	0	3.75 (.44)	3.91 (.29)	0.16	2.023 (1, 44)	.162	.04
m.	An understanding of mental health counseling	1	3.35 (.65)	3.41 (.67)	0.06	0.098 (1, 43)	.756	0

3. Personal Characteristics

		N/A	Midterm Mean (SD)	Final Mean (SD)	Difference	F (df)	Sig	η^2
a.	Self-awareness & self-understanding	2	3.52 (.67)	3.76 (.44)	0.24	1.963 (1, 42)	.169	.05
b.	Emotional stability	0	3.71 (.55)	3.91 (.29)	0.2	2.319 (1, 44)	.135	.05
c.	Self-control	0	3.71 (.55)	3.91 (.29)	0.2	2.319 (1, 44)	.135	.05
d.	A sense of adequacy, self-worth, and self-confidence	1	3.3 (.56)	3.41 (.67)	0.11	0.328 (1, 43)	.57	.01
e.	Ability to verbally communicate effectively and clearly	0	3.54 (.59)	3.77 (.43)	0.23	2.281 (1, 44)	.138	.05
f.	Ability to communicate in writing effectively and clearly	2	3.48 (.59)	3.52 (.51)	0.04	0.074 (1, 42)	.787	0
g.	Ability to adapt to new situations	0	3.54 (.59)	3.73 (.46)	0.19	1.412 (1, 44)	.241	.03

4. Cultural Competence

		N/A	Midterm Mean (SD)	Final Mean (SD)	Difference	F (df)	Sig	η^2
a.	An awareness of one's own cultural values and biases	8	3.42 (.61)	3.79 (.42)	0.37	4.742 (1, 36)	.036*	.12
b.	An awareness of clients' worldview, attitudes, and beliefs	7	3.2 (.83)	3.74 (.56)	0.54	5.502 (1, 37)	.024*	.13
c.	Ability to relate to diverse types of clients	6	3.15 (.88)	3.65 (.59)	0.5	4.502 (1, 38)	.04*	.11
d.	Ability to use culturally-appropriate counseling strategies	11	3.18 (.88)	3.56 (.71)	0.38	1.982 (1, 33)	.168	.06

5. Performance in the Counseling Process:

		N/A	Midterm Mean (SD)	Final Mean (SD)	Difference	F (df)	Sig	η^2
a.	Ability to understand	2	3.27 (.7)	3.55 (.51)	0.28	2.172 (1, 42)	.148	.05

	N/A	Midterm Mean (SD)	Final Mean (SD)	Difference	F (df)	Sig	η^2
client's subjective world or point of view							
b. Ability to establish and maintain rapport	2	3.55 (.74)	3.82 (.4)	0.27	2.333 (1, 42)	.134	.05
c. An understanding of clients' developmental stages and tasks	3	3.24 (.7)	3.33 (.66)	0.09	0.206 (1, 40)	.652	.01
d. Knowledge of evidence-based treatments (Form 1d)	3	3.14 (.85)	3.32 (.57)	0.18	0.634 (1, 41)	.43	.02
e. Ability to research appropriate evidence- based treatments	10	3.25 (.78)	3.65 (.67)	0.4	2.755 (1, 34)	.106	.08
f. Ability to accurately assess the psychological needs of clients	2	3.14 (.83)	3.45 (.6)	0.31	2.122 (1, 42)	.153	.05
g. Knowledge of assessments used in the setting and their proper interpretation	3	3.22 (.8)	3.35 (.75)	0.13	0.315 (1, 41)	.578	.01
h. Ability to match individual needs to appropriate individual and/or group settings and services	3	3.09 (.75)	3.48 (.6)	0.39	3.431 (1, 41)	.071	.08
i. Ability to use appropriate appraisal techniques for the gathering and utilization of information	5	3 (.97)	3.48 (.68)	0.48	3.326 (1, 39)	.076	.08
j. Ability to theoretically conceptualize clients' presenting concerns	3	3.1 (.89)	3.5 (.74)	0.4	2.643 (1, 41)	.112	.06
k. Ability to prepare appropriate treatment plan based on conceptualization	9	3.11 (1.05)	3.24 (.83)	0.13	0.167 (1, 34)	.685	.01
l. Ability to prepare a comprehensive case study	14	3.28 (.83)	3.23 (.73)	-0.05	0.027 (1, 29)	.871	0

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
6. Performance of Program Duties:							
a. An overall understanding of the setting's organization and functions	2	3.35 (.78)	3.57 (.75)	0.22	0.946 (1, 42)	.336	.02
b. The ability to organize a counseling program appropriate to the setting	15	3.13 (.96)	3.4 (.83)	0.27	0.727 (1, 29)	.401	.02
c. Knowledge of community referral sources	5	3.35 (.75)	3.14 (.85)	-0.21	0.682 (1, 39)	.414	.02
d. Knowledge of in-house referral sources	2	3.05 (.84)	3.18 (.91)	0.13	0.267 (1, 42)	.608	.01
e. Ability to provide psychoeducational services	6	3.53 (.7)	3.48 (.87)	-0.05	0.04 (1, 38)	.843	0
7. Please rate the student on overall:							
a. Counseling skills	2	3.04 (.77)	3.57 (.6)	0.53	6.394 (1, 42)	.015*	.13
b. Professionalism	0	3.75 (.44)	3.82 (.4)	0.07	0.302 (1, 44)	.585	.01
c. Ethical decision-making and behaviors	0	3.54 (.72)	3.82 (.5)	0.28	2.241 (1, 44)	.142	.05
d. Cultural competence	8	3.21 (.86)	3.47 (.7)	0.26	1.082 (1, 36)	.305	.03
e. Potential for overall success as a future mental health counselor in a setting similar to the current setting	1	3.65 (.65)	3.64 (.9)	-0.01	0.005 (1, 43)	.946	0

Appendix F
Midterm and Final Evaluations of Interns by Supervisors
(Spring Semesters Only)

		N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
1.	Professional Relationships							
a.	Relationship with site supervisor	0	3.86 (.35)	3.96 (.2)	.1	1.276 (1, 44)	.265	.03
b.	Relationship with other professional staff	3	3.9 (.3)	4 (0)	.1	2.208 (1, 41)	.145	.05
c.	Relationship with support personnel	0	3.77 (.43)	3.92 (.28)	.15	1.837 (1, 44)	.182	.04
d.	Relationship with other students/interns on site	19	3.92 (.28)	4 (0)	.08	1 (1, 24)	.327	.04
2.	Professional Attitudes & Behaviors							
a.	Genuine interest in clients	0	3.86 (.35)	3.88 (.34)	.02	.013 (1, 44)	.911	0
b.	Ability to take initiative & perform independently	0	3.77 (.43)	3.54 (.51)	-.23	2.745 (1, 44)	.105	.06
c.	Promptness	0	3.82 (.4)	3.79 (.42)	-.03	.049 (1, 44)	.826	0
d.	Dependability	0	4 (0)	3.92 (.28)	-.08	1.913 (1, 44)	.174	.04
e.	Displays cooperation	0	3.95 (.21)	3.96 (.2)	.01	.004 (1, 44)	.951	0
f.	Preparedness	0	3.91 (.29)	3.96 (.2)	.05	.441 (1, 44)	.51	.01
g.	Openness to supervision and feedback	0	3.95 (.21)	4 (0)	.05	1.093 (1, 44)	.301	.02
h.	Ability & desire to follow through on suggestions/feedback	0	3.95 (.21)	3.92 (.28)	-.03	.26 (1, 44)	.613	.01
i.	Ability to maintain confidentiality	0	3.95 (.21)	3.96 (.2)	.01	.004 (1, 44)	.951	0
j.	Adherence to ethical standards	0	3.95 (.21)	3.92 (.28)	-.03	.26 (1, 44)	.613	.01
k.	Ability to function as a team member	0	3.91 (.29)	3.88 (.34)	-.03	.132 (1, 44)	.718	0

		N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
l.	Ability to interact or collaborate productively with other personnel in the setting	0	3.82 (.4)	3.83 (.38)	.01	.018 (1, 44)	.895	0
m.	An understanding of mental health counseling	0	3.55 (.51)	3.75 (.44)	.2	2.123 (1, 44)	.152	.05

3. Personal Characteristics

		N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
a.	Self-awareness & self-understanding	1	3.81 (.4)	3.75 (.44)	-.06	.221 (1, 43)	.641	.01
b.	Emotional stability	1	3.95 (.22)	3.96 (.2)	.01	.009 (1, 43)	.925	0
c.	Self-control	0	3.95 (.22)	3.92 (.28)	-.03	.221 (1, 43)	.641	.01
d.	A sense of adequacy, self-worth, and self-confidence	0	3.64 (.49)	3.67 (.48)	.03	.044 (1, 44)	.834	0
e.	Ability to verbally communicate effectively and clearly	0	3.86 (.35)	3.88 (.34)	.02	.013 (1, 44)	.911	0
f.	Ability to communicate in writing effectively and clearly	1	3.76 (.44)	3.87 (.34)	.11	.957 (1, 43)	.333	.02
g.	Ability to adapt to new situations	0	3.91 (.29)	3.92 (.28)	.01	.008 (1, 44)	.929	0

4. Cultural Competence

		N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
a.	An awareness of one's own cultural values and biases	1	3.64 (.66)	3.78 (.42)	.14	.795 (1, 43)	.377	.02
b.	An awareness of clients' worldview, attitudes, and beliefs	2	3.48 (.68)	3.63 (.5)	.15	.718 (1, 43)	.402	.02
c.	Ability to relate to diverse types of clients	1	3.81 (.4)	3.79 (.42)	-.02	.021 (1, 43)	.885	0
d.	Ability to use culturally-appropriate counseling strategies	4	3.68 (.58)	3.65 (.49)	-.03	.038 (1, 40)	.847	0

		N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	*F* (*df*)	Sig	η^2
5. Performance in the Counseling Process:								
a.	Ability to understand client's subjective world or point of view	0	3.64 (.49)	3.79 (.42)	.15	1.346 (1, 44)	.252	.03
b.	Ability to establish and maintain rapport	0	3.82 (.4)	3.83 (.38)	.01	.018 (1, 44)	.895	0
c.	An understanding of clients' developmental stages and tasks	0	3.64 (.49)	3.67 (.57)	.03	.037 (1, 44)	.848	0
d.	Knowledge of evidence-based treatments (Form 1d)	0	3.5 (.6)	3.58 (.5)	.08	.263 (1, 44)	.611	.01
e.	Ability to research appropriate evidence- based treatments	5	3.79 (.42)	3.82 (.4)	.03	.051 (1, 39)	.823	0
f.	Ability to accurately assess the psychological needs of clients	0	3.68 (.48)	3.54 (.51)	-.14	.924 (1, 44)	.342	.02
g.	Knowledge of assessments used in the setting and their proper interpretation	1	3.62 (.5)	3.67 (.48)	.05	.106 (1, 43)	.746	0
h.	Ability to match individual needs to appropriate individual and/or group settings and services	1	3.62 (.5)	3.71 (.46)	.09	.387 (1, 43)	.537	.01
i.	Ability to use appropriate appraisal techniques for the gathering and utilization of information	2	3.75 (.44)	3.67 (.48)	-.08	.35 (1, 42)	.557	.01
j.	Ability to theoretically conceptualize clients' presenting concerns	2	3.85 (.37)	3.75 (.53)	-.1	.506 (1, 42)	.481	.01
k.	Ability to prepare appropriate treatment plan based on conceptualization	4	3.63 (.6)	3.61 (.58)	-.02	.016 (1, 40)	.901	0
l.	Ability to prepare a comprehensive case study	12	3.64 (.5)	3.63 (.5)	-.01	.004 (1, 31)	.949	0

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
6. Performance of Program Duties:							
a. An overall understanding of the setting's organization and functions	0	3.68 (.48)	3.71 (.46)	.03	.036 (1, 44)	.849	0
b. The ability to organize a counseling program appropriate to the setting	18	3.67 (.49)	3.67 (.49)	0	0 (1, 25)	1	0
c. Knowledge of community referral sources	3	3.24 (.63)	3.45 (.67)	.21	1.195 (1, 41)	.281	.03
d. Knowledge of in-house referral sources	1	3.57 (.6)	3.58 (.58)	.01	.005 (1, 43)	.946	0
e. Ability to provide psychoeducational services	5	3.84 (.38)	3.77 (.53)	-.07	.228 (1, 39)	.636	.01
7. Please rate the student on overall:							
a. Counseling skills	0	3.59 (.5)	3.67 (.48)	.08	.272 (1, 44)	.605	.01
b. Professionalism	0	3.86 (.35)	3.92 (.28)	.06	.321 (1, 44)	.574	.01
c. Ethical decision-making and behaviors	0	3.82 (.4)	3.88 (.34)	.06	.276 (1, 44)	.602	.01
d. Cultural competence	1	3.64 (.49)	3.7 (.47)	.06	.171 (1, 43)	.682	0
e. Potential for overall success as a future mental health counselor in a setting similar to the current setting	1	3.95 (.21)	3.96 (.2)	.01	.004 (1, 44)	.951	0

Appendix G

Midterm and Final Evaluations of Advanced Interns
by Supervisors

		N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
1.	Professional Relationships							
a.	Relationship with site supervisor	0	3.87 (.5)	4 (0)	.13	1 (1, 30)	.325	.03
b.	Relationship with other professional staff	0	3.81 (.54)	4 (0)	.19	1.901 (1, 30)	.178	.06
c.	Relationship with support personnel	0	3.81 (.54)	4 (0)	.19	1.901 (1, 30)	.178	.06
d.	Relationship with other students/interns on site	11	3.8 (.63)	3.8 (.63)	0	0 (1, 18)	1	0
2. Professional Attitudes & Behaviors								
a.	Genuine interest in clients	0	3.75 (.58)	3.87 (.5)	.12	.429 (1, 30)	.518	.01
b.	Ability to take initiative & perform independently	0	3.75 (.78)	3.81 (.54)	.06	.07 (1, 30)	.793	0
c.	Promptness	0	3.81 (.54)	3.87 (.5)	.06	.115 (1, 30)	.737	0
d.	Dependability	0	3.81 (.54)	3.87 (.5)	.06	.115 (1, 30)	.737	0
e.	Displays cooperation	0	3.81 (.54)	3.87 (.5)	.06	.115 (1, 30)	.737	0
f.	Preparedness	0	3.75 (.78)	3.87 (.5)	.12	.294 (1, 30)	.592	.01
g.	Openness to supervision and feedback	1	3.8 (.56)	3.87 (.5)	.07	.155 (1, 29)	.697	.01
h.	Ability & desire to follow through on suggestions/feedback	1	3.8 (.56)	3.81 (.54)	.01	.004 (1, 29)	.95	0
i.	Ability to maintain confidentiality	1	3.87 (.52)	3.87 (.5)	0	.002 (1, 29)	.964	0
j.	Adherence to ethical standards	1	3.87 (.52)	3.87 (.5)	0	.002 (1, 29)	.964	0
k.	Ability to function as a team member	1	3.8 (.78)	3.81 (.54)	.01	.003 (1, 29)	.959	0

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	*F* (*df*)	Sig	η^2
l. Ability to interact or collaborate productively with other personnel in the setting	1	3.67 (.82)	3.75 (.58)	.08	.109 (1, 29)	.744	0
m. An understanding of mental health counseling	1	3.73 (.59)	3.75 (.58)	.02	.006 (1, 29)	.937	0

3. Personal Characteristics

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	*F* (*df*)	Sig	η^2
a. Self-awareness & self-understanding	1	3.53 (.92)	3.75 (.58)	.22	.63 (1, 29)	.434	.02
b. Emotional stability	1	3.73 (.59)	3.87 (.5)	.14	.519 (1, 29)	.477	.02
c. Self-control	1	3.73 (.59)	3.81 (.54)	.08	.15 (1, 29)	.701	.01
d. A sense of adequacy, self-worth, and self-confidence	1	3.67 (.62)	3.87 (.5)	.2	1.073 (1, 29)	.309	.04
e. Ability to verbally communicate effectively and clearly	1	3.73 (.59)	3.81 (.54)	.08	.15 (1, 29)	.701	.01
f. Ability to communicate in writing effectively and clearly	1	3.73 (.59)	3.81 (.54)	.08	.15 (1, 29)	.701	.01
g. Ability to adapt to new situations	1	3.67 (.72)	3.75 (.58)	.08	.126 (1, 29)	.725	0

4. Cultural Competence

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	*F* (*df*)	Sig	η^2
a. An awareness of one's own cultural values and biases	5	3.43 (.65)	3.62 (.65)	.19	.56 (1, 25)	.461	.02
b. An awareness of clients' worldview, attitudes, and beliefs	4	3.5 (.65)	3.57 (.65)	.07	.085 (1, 26)	.773	0
c. Ability to relate to diverse types of clients	4	3.5 (.65)	3.64 (.63)	.14	.347 (1, 26)	.561	.01
d. Ability to use culturally-appropriate counseling strategies	4	3.36 (.75)	3.57 (.65)	.21	.661 (1, 26)	.424	.03

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	*F* (*df*)	Sig	η^2
5. Performance in the Counseling Process:							
a. Ability to understand client's subjective world or point of view	0	3.56 (.63)	3.81 (.54)	.25	1.446 (1, 30)	.239	.05
b. Ability to establish and maintain rapport	0	3.56 (.81)	3.81 (.54)	.25	1.043 (1, 30)	.315	.03
c. An understanding of clients' developmental stages and tasks	2	3.6 (.51)	3.8 (.56)	.2	1.05 (1, 28)	.314	.04
d. Knowledge of evidence-based treatments (Form 1d)	0	3.38 (.89)	3.63 (.62)	.25	.857 (1, 30)	.362	.03
e. Ability to research appropriate evidence- based treatments	2	3.6 (.63)	3.67 (.62)	.07	.085 (1, 28)	.772	0
f. Ability to accurately assess the psychological needs of clients	0	3.5 (.82)	3.87 (.5)	.37	2.455 (1, 30)	.128	.08
g. Knowledge of assessments used in the setting and their proper interpretation	3	3.6 (.83)	3.93 (.27)	.33	2.005 (1, 27)	.168	.07
h. Ability to match individual needs to appropriate individual and/or group settings and services	0	3.5 (.82)	3.75 (.58)	.25	1 (1, 30)	.325	.03
i. Ability to use appropriate appraisal techniques for the gathering and utilization of information	0	3.56 (.81)	3.81 (.54)	.25	1.043 (1, 30)	.315	.03
j. Ability to theoretically conceptualize clients' presenting concerns	0	3.5 (.82)	3.81 (.54)	.31	1.623 (1, 30)	.212	.05
k. Ability to prepare appropriate treatment plan based on conceptualization	1	3.53 (.83)	3.75 (.58)	.22	.715 (1, 29)	.405	.02
l. Ability to prepare a comprehensive case study	6	3.73 (.47)	3.73 (.59)	0	.001 (1, 24)	.978	0

	N/A	Midterm Mean (*SD*)	Final Mean (*SD*)	Difference	F (*df*)	Sig	η^2
6. Performance of Program Duties:							
a. An overall understanding of the setting's organization and functions	0	3.56 (.81)	3.75 (.58)	.19	.565 (1, 30)	.458	.02
b. The ability to organize a counseling program appropriate to the setting	7	3.33 (.99)	3.75 (.62)	.42	1.536 (1, 22)	.228	.07
c. Knowledge of community referral sources	0	3.44 (.89)	3.75 (.58)	.31	1.384 (1, 30)	.249	.04
d. Knowledge of in-house referral sources	0	3.5 (.89)	3.69 (.6)	.19	.484 (1, 30)	.492	.02
e. Ability to provide psychoeducational services	0	3.56 (.81)	3.81 (.54)	.25	1.043 (1, 30)	.315	.03
7. Please rate the student on overall:							
a. Counseling skills	0	3.19 (1.22)	3.81 (.54)	.62	3.488 (1, 30)	.072	.1
b. Professionalism	0	3.31 (1.4)	3.94 (.25)	.63	3.086 (1, 30)	.089	.09
c. Ethical decision-making and behaviors	0	3.38 (1.09)	3.87 (.5)	.49	2.791 (1, 30)	.105	.09
d. Cultural competence	4	3.36 (.63)	3.64 (.63)	.28	1.425 (1, 26)	.243	.05
e. Potential for overall success as a future mental health counselor in a setting similar to the current setting	0	3.81 (.54)	3.87 (.5)	.06	.115 (1, 30)	.737	0