

n

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

Counselor Education Program  
Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Counselor Education

SUMMARY OF ENTRY AND DOCTORAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

2009-2010 Academic Year

Prepared By

Stanley B. Baker

Professor of Counselor Education

Stanley\_Baker@ncsu.edu

Table of Contents

Content	Page
Program Faculty Members	3
Introduction	4
Survey of Graduating Students	5
Survey of Internship Site Supervisors	7
Survey of Employers	9
Appendices	12

COUNSELOR EDUCATION PROGRAM FACULTY MEMBERS

2009-2010

Stanley B. Baker, professor, coordinator of school counseling program

Charles Blackburn, visiting assistant professor

Roger Callanan, adjunct assistant professor

Angel Dowden, visiting assistant professor

Edwin F. Gerler, Jr., professor, coordinator of doctoral program, director of graduate program

Marc A. Grimmett, associate professor, coordinator of community counseling program

Donna Kornegay, visiting assistant professor

Helen S. Lupton-Smith, visiting assistant professor, coordinator of clinical experiences

Millie Maxwell, visiting assistant professor

Sylvia C. Nassar-McMillan, professor, program head

Jose A. Picart, professor, interim dean

Rhonda Sutton, visiting assistant professor,

Richard Tyler, visiting assistant professor

Siu-Man R. Ting, professor, coordinator of college counseling program

Scott Warren, visiting assistant professor

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION  
2009-2010 Academic Year

*Introduction*

In response to the program accountability standards of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), the Counselor Education program at North Carolina State University annually and periodically engages in evaluation activities designed to meet the following expectations.

- Time will be set aside during the last week of the spring semester to survey graduating entry level (master's degree) program students annually regarding:
  1. The adequacy of program objectives for the curriculum
  2. Their advisor and the faculty in general
  3. The curricular experiences in which they participated
  4. How well their internships met it's the program objectives
- Annually, following the spring semester, site supervisors of graduating entry level program interns will be surveyed regarding:
  1. The adequacy of the preparation of their interns
  2. The adequacy of interactions between site supervisors and university supervisors
- Periodically, employers of entry-level and doctoral program graduates will be surveyed in order to determine the perceived effectiveness of the program's graduates.
- Survey findings will be shared with program stakeholders annually during the following fall semester.
- At the beginning of each semester, the program faculty members will meet to review the academic, professional, and personal development of each enrolled student.

This report presents the findings from surveys of graduating students in the entry-level program and of their internship supervisors at the close of the spring semester of 2010 and the most recent survey of a sample of employers of graduates of the entry level and doctoral programs.

### *Survey of Graduating Students*

#### *Method*

In April of 2010, surveys were distributed to each of the graduating students by their university internship supervisors. They were completed anonymously. Means, standard deviations, and sample sizes were determined for each of the items across the sample. The rating scale for the survey was: Excellent = 5, Above Average = 4, Average = 3, Below Average = 2, Inadequate = 1, and Not Qualified to Respond = 0. Average scores can range from 1 to 5 with higher scores indicating better ratings. A copy of the survey is located in the appendices.

#### *Results*

##### *All Graduating Students*

Twenty-five responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations for each of the items are presented below. The range of the means was from a high of 4.76 to a low of 3.98, indicating that all averages were in the above average category.

*Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the program's student handbook. (n = 23)*  $M = 4.36; SD = 0.56$

*Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 25)*  $M = 4.56; SD = 0.47$

*Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 24)*  $M = 4.38; SD = 0.75$

*Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 25)*  
 $M = 3.98; SD = 0.63$

*Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 25)*  $M = 4.76; SD = 0.44$

##### *College Counseling Students*

Nine responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.44 to a low of 3.93, indicating that they were all in the above average category.

*Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the program's student handbook. (n = 9)*  $M = 4.11; SD = 0.55$

*Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 9)*  $M = 4.39; SD = 0.42$

*Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 9)*  $M = 3.83; SD = 0.87$

*Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 9)*  
 $M = 3.83; SD = 0.50$

*Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 9) M = 4.44; SD = 0.73*

#### *Community Counseling Students*

Eight responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 5.00 to a low of 4.17, indicating that they were all in the above average to above average category.

*Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the program's student handbook. (n = 7) M = 4.60; SD = 0.55*

*Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 8) M = 4.71; SD = 0.49*

*Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 8) M = 4.86; SD = 0.38*

*Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 8) M = 4.17; SD = 0.75*

*Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 8) M = 5.00; SD = 0.00*

#### *School Counseling Students*

Nine responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.78 to a low of 4.22, indicating that they were all in the above average category.

*Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the program's student handbook. (n = 8) M = 4.57; SD = 0.53*

*Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 9) M = 4.38; SD = 0.52*

*Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 9) M = 4.56; SD = 0.53*

*Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 9) M = 4.22; SD = 0.67*

*Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 9) M = 4.78; SD = 0.44*

#### *Discussion*

In most instances the findings reflect the historical trend of responses to the items on the student survey at the close of the program. For example, the internship experience invariably receives the highest rating across all three of the entry level training options (i.e., college, community, and school counseling). This past year the lowest rating among the five items was associated with the curricular experiences item. Although not a significantly low rating, it did indicate that some students were not as pleased with the curriculum as they were with other aspects of the training program. No substantive recommendations for

improving the curriculum were entered on the surveys. A positive finding was that more students responded to the program objectives item than has usually been the case, and the ratings were good. The objectives are in the student handbook that is currently online and must be accessed via the Counselor Education program Website. In the 2008-2009 academic year, a number of students reported that they had not read the objectives, indicating that a better effort should be made to encourage and motivate students to read them. The findings for 2009 -2010 suggest that we successfully encouraged students to become familiar with the program objectives.

The findings from the specific entry-level tracks highlighted a few differences (e.g., lower average ratings of the advisor and faculty in general among the college counseling students and unanimous agreement among the community counseling interns that their internship experience was excellent). Otherwise, the findings seemed quite similar across the three tracks.

### *Survey of Internship Site Supervisors*

#### *Method*

Surveys were distributed to each of the internship site supervisors by Drs. Baker, Grimmett, or Ting. They were completed, some anonymously and some not, and submitted to each of the three track supervisors. Means, standard deviations, and sample sizes were determined for each of the items across the sample. The rating scale for the survey was: Excellent = 5, Above Average = 4, Average = 3, Below Average = 2, Inadequate = 1, and Not Qualified to Respond = 0. Average scores can range from 1 to 5 with higher scores indicating better ratings. A copy of the survey is located in the appendices.

#### *Results*

##### *All Site Supervisors*

Fifteen responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations for each of the items are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.40 to a low of 4.07, indicating that all averages were in the above average and average categories.

*How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern? (n = 15)* *M = 4.40; SD = 0.51*

*How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 14)* *M = 4.36; SD = 0.50*

*How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 15)* *M = 4.07; SD = 0.88*

*College Counseling Site Supervisors*

Five responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations for each of the items are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.40 to a low of 3.40, indicating that all averages were in the above average and average categories.

*How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern? (n = 5)*  $M = 4.40; SD = 0.55$

*How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 4)*  $M = 4.00; SD = 0.00$

*How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 5)*  $M = 3.40; SD = 0.89$

*Community Counseling Site Supervisors*

Five responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations for each of the items are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.50 to a low of 4.20, indicating that all averages were in the average and above average and average categories.

*How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern? (n = 5)*  $M = 4.50; SD = 0.58$

*How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 5)*  $M = 4.40; SD = 0.55$

*How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 3)*  $M = 4.20; SD = 0.83$

*School Counseling Site Supervisors*

Five responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations for each of the items are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.40 to a low of 4.25, indicating that all averages were in the above average and average categories.

*How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern? (n = 5)*  $M = 4.25; SD = 0.50$

*How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 5)*  $M = 4.40; SD = 0.55$

*How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 5)*  $M = 4.40; SD = 0.55$



### *Discussion*

The site supervisor findings were similar to historical trends as well. For example, the site supervisors often rate the quality of the interns and their preparation higher than the faculty's efforts to assist them even though all of the ratings are quite good. The return rate was lower than we are accustomed to experiencing ( $N = 15 = 60\%$ ). There are a number of possible reasons for this. Perhaps a more uniform and persistent approach to collecting the site supervisor data should be considered in the future. Presently, each of the university track supervisors is responsible for collecting data from their site supervisors and each uses a different data collection method. In some instances, the anonymity of the respondents was not protected. Another recommendation is to emphasize the importance of completing these evaluation forms to the site during the training sessions for the site supervisors. Achieving a higher return rate and making all of the responses anonymous should be a goal for the 2011 collections.

In 2008-2009, the average ratings for the question about how well the faculty supervisor worked with the site supervisor during the internship process was relatively low ( $M = 4.05$  overall and  $M = 3.14$  in the Community Counseling track). The average ratings for that item were improved in 2009-2010 ( $M = 4.36$  overall and  $M = 4.40$  in the Community Counseling track). It appears as if an effort to achieve improvement in that area was successful.

On the other hand, the average rating for the question about how our faculty prepared the site supervisors was lower in 2009-2010 ( $M = 4.07$ ) than in 2008-2009 ( $M = 4.32$ ). This was especially surprising because we conducted training programs for the site supervisors for the first time in the fall and spring semesters in the 2009-2010 academic year. The low number of responses caused outliers to affect the average more dramatically than would have been the case if a larger number of responses had been acquired. Thus, even though all of the other 13 ratings were either 4s or 5s, one 2 rating and one 3 rating for this question led to a larger standard deviation than is usually the case ( $SD = 0.88$ ) and a lower mean than might otherwise have occurred. The individual who provided the 3 rating offered no comments, and the individual who offered the 2 rating stated: "I would actually like more interaction with university supervisors during both practicum and internship. Being able to discuss what the intern needs to work on would be great (even if they are doing a great job, getting ideas from another supervisor would be helpful)." Therefore, it is possible that, even though the program is offering group instruction for the site supervisors twice a year, some of them may yet want to receive attention during the supervision process. Perhaps each track supervisor should find out which site supervisors need this kind of attention and respond accordingly in the future.

### *Survey of Employers*

#### *Method*

The most recent survey of employers was conducted in summer of 2006. We identified 73 graduates of the entry level and doctoral programs between the spring semester of 2004 and the spring semester of 2006. Surveys were sent electronically to all these graduates with a cover letter explaining the survey and requesting their permission and help by asking their employers/supervisors to complete and return the surveys to the program. Four weeks later, the same letters and surveys were mailed again to the permanent addresses of the graduates to encourage their participation. All responses were collected in early fall. The survey content reflects the important competency categories in a training program accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). A copy of the survey is located in the appendices.

### *Findings*

Twenty-one responses were received and analyzed, yielding a response rate of 28.7%, better than the previous survey (26.9%). Five surveys were returned because of incorrect addresses. Means and standard deviations for each of the items are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.76 to a low of 4.33, indicating that all item averages were in the above average category.

1. *Ability to behave in an ethically appropriate manner.*  $M = 4.76; SD = 0.43$
2. *Facilitates interpersonal relations with clients, colleagues, supervisors, and parents.*  $M = 4.67; SD = 0.48$
3. *Understands the nature and needs of individuals and groups.*  $M = 4.47; SD = 0.62$
4. *Efforts to strengthen his or her professional development.*  $M = 4.50; SD = 0.52$
5. *Sensitivity to cultural, gender, disability, and sexual-preference issues.*  $M = 4.65; SD = 0.49$
6. *Performance when working in one-to-one relationships with clients.*  $M = 4.38; SD = 0.97$
7. *Ability to develop thoughtful, well organized programs that meet the needs of clients/students/or others.*  $M = 4.65; SD = 0.49$
8. *Ability to cope with the technological challenges associated with her/his position*  $M = 4.41; SD = 0.51$
9. *Ability to assemble, organize, and disseminate counseling information*  $M = 4.55; SD = 0.51$
10. *Understanding of career and lifestyle development.*  $M = 4.43; SD = 0.51$
11. *Skill in applying appropriate strategies in crises.*  $M = 4.57; SD = 0.68$

12. *Ability to handle administrative responsibilities effectively.*  $M = 4.52; SD = 0.52$
13. *Performance as an advocate for her/his clients, profession, and agency/school.*  
 $M = 4.71; SD = 0.46$
14. *Ability to maintain liaisons and cooperative working relationships with agencies in the community at large.*  $M = 4.43; SD = 0.51$
15. *Performance in applicable assessment activities (i.e., testing, diagnosis, interpretation, reporting).*  $M = 4.61; SD = 0.61$
16. *Effectiveness in group counseling or developmental or preventive groups.*  
 $M = 4.47; SD = 0.60$
17. *Ability to conduct in-house research and evaluation and report the results clearly to others.*  
 $M = 4.33; SD = 0.85$

### *Discussion*

All items rated above average range, an improvement from the previous survey. The response rate improved slightly from 26.9% to 28.7%. Compared to the previous study, average scores improved on 13 of the 17 items. These areas are: facilitating skills, counseling programs, use of technology, delivery of counseling services, career counseling and development, crisis counseling skills, administration, advocacy for clients, liaison with agencies, assessment, group counseling, and research and evaluation. The remaining items (1, 3, 4, and 6) were rated similarly to those of the previous survey. These findings indicate that employers rate our entry level and doctoral program graduates highly across all of the categories on the survey.

APPENDICES

**Student Survey**

**Site Supervisor Survey**

**Employer Survey**

**Counselor Education Program  
North Carolina State University**

**Student Survey**

Directions: Please respond to the following questions to the best of your ability. This information will help us to continue efforts to improve our training program and fulfill the requirements of our accrediting agency The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Note that these ratings are important information for the program faculty, its students, and its graduates. The information from these surveys will be used for department self-assessments and improvements and will be shared with prospective students and agencies who employ our students. Therefore, we are all stakeholders in the outcomes.

For each item use the following rating scale:

Excellent = 5, Above Average = 4, Average = 3, Below Average = 2, Inadequate = 1  
Not Qualified to respond = 0

Rating

Question

\_\_\_\_ 1. Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented on pages 2-4 in the August 2000 version of the department's student handbook.

Comments

\_\_\_\_ 2. Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general.

Comments

\_\_\_ 3. Rate the adequacy of your advisor

Comments

\_\_\_ 4. Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall

Comments

\_\_\_ 5. Rate how well your internship met its' objectives

Check the setting in which your internship took place: College/university \_\_\_

Public school \_\_\_

Agency \_\_\_

Comments

**Thank You**

**Counselor Education Program  
North Carolina State University**

**Site Supervisor Survey**

**Introduction:** We are very interested in acquiring feedback from our site supervisors that will help us to assess the adequacy of our training program and engage in a continuous process of improvement. Each year, we attempt to acquire feedback from interns, university supervisors, and site supervisors about the internship process that will help us to work toward achieving a high level quality in our training program. Please help us by completing this brief survey at your earliest convenience and returning it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope that has been provided. Please use the reverse side of this survey to complete comments if necessary.

**Descriptive information: Circle the designation that best describes your site:**

elementary school   middle school   secondary school   agency   college or university

**Would you be willing to supervise one of our interns again? (check one) Yes\_\_\_No\_\_\_**

**For each item use the following rating scale:**

Excellent = 5, Above Average = 4, Average = 3, Below Average = 2, Inadequate = 1  
Not Qualified to respond = 0

Rating

Question

\_\_\_ 1. How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern?  
Comments

\_\_\_ 2. How well did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor?  
Comments

\_\_\_ 3. How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process?  
Comments

Thank You

**Counselor Education Program**  
**NC State University**  
**Employer Survey**

**Directions:** Please respond to the following questions to the best of your ability. After completion, please return the survey via mail to Dr. S. Raymond Ting with the stamped envelope or by fax to 919-515-6891.

Use the scale below to rate the graduate of our program on each item :  
Excellent = 5, Above Average = 4, Average = 3, Below Average = 2, Inadequate = 1  
Not Qualified to respond = 0

Rating

Question

- \_\_\_ 1. Understands the nature and needs of individuals and groups.
- \_\_\_ 2. Facilitates interpersonal relations with clients, colleagues, supervisors, and parents
- \_\_\_ 3. Ability to conduct in-house research and evaluation and report the results clearly to others.
- \_\_\_ 4. Performance in applicable assessment activities (i.e. testing, diagnosis, interpretation, reporting).
- \_\_\_ 5. Ability to assemble, organize, and disseminate counseling information effectively (e.g., career, personal-social, and governmental information)
- \_\_\_ 6. Effectiveness in group counseling or developmental or preventive groups.
- \_\_\_ 7. Performance when working in one-to-one relationships with clients.
- \_\_\_ 8. Skill in applying appropriate strategies in crises.
- \_\_\_ 9. Ability to maintain liaisons and cooperative working relationships with agencies in the community at large.
- \_\_\_ 10. Ability to handle administrative responsibilities effectively.
- \_\_\_ 11. Sensitivity to cultural, gender, disability, and sexual-orientation issues.
- \_\_\_ 12. Performance as an advocate for her/his clients, profession, and agency/school.
- \_\_\_ 13. Ability to behave in an ethically appropriate manner.



- \_\_\_ 14. Ability to cope with the technological challenges associated with her/his position.
- \_\_\_ 15. Ability to develop thoughtful, well organized programs that meet the needs of clients/students/or others.
- \_\_\_ 16. Understanding of career and lifestyle development.
- \_\_\_ 17. Efforts to strengthen his or her professional development.

**Thank You**



