

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

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

SUMMARY OF ENTRY AND DOCTORAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

2011-2012 Academic Year

Prepared By

Sejal B. Parikh
Assistant Professor of Counselor Education
sbparikh@ncsu.edu

Anjabeen Ashraf
Graduate Assistant
aashraf@ncsu.edu

Table of Contents

Program Faculty Members3

Introduction4

Survey of Graduating Students5

Survey of Internship Site Supervisors8

Survey of Employers 11

Appendices 13

COUNSELOR EDUCATION PROGRAM FACULTY MEMBERS

2011-2012

COUNSELOR EDUCATION PROGRAM FACULTY MEMBERS

2011-2012

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

James Brooks, visiting assistant professor

Edwin F. Gerler, Jr., professor, coordinator of doctoral 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

Sylvia C. Nassar-McMillan, professor, program head

Sejal Parikh, assistant professor

Jose A. Picart, professor, Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion

Angie Smith, visiting assistant professor

Rhonda Sutton, visiting assistant professor

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

Scott Warren, visiting assistant professor

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION
2010-2011 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 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 2012 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 2012, 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

Eighteen 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 4.67 to a low of 3.94, indicating that all averages were in the above average category.

Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the student handbook presented online within the general information about the Counselor Education Program. (n = 17) *M = 4.24; SD = .437*

Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 18) *M = 4.39; SD = .608*

Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 18) *M = 3.94; SD = .998*

Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 18)
M = 4.42; SD = .493

Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 18) *M = 4.67; SD = .686*

College Counseling Students

Seven responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 5 to a low of 4.14, indicating that they were all in the above average category.

Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the student handbook presented online within the general information about the Counselor Education Program. (n = 6) *M = 4.33; SD = .516*

Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 7) *M = 4.29; SD = .756*

Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 7) *M = 4.14; SD = .899*

Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 7)
M = 4.44; SD = .5

Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 7) *M = 5; SD = 0*

Clinical Mental Health Counseling Students

Four responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.75 to a low of 3.75, 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 student handbook presented online within the general information about the Counselor Education Program. (n = 4) *M = 4; SD = 0*

Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 4) *M = 4.75; SD = .5*

Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 4) *M = 4.25; SD = .5*

Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 4)
M = 4.25; SD = .5

Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 4) *M = 3.75; SD = .957*

School Counseling Students

Seven responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.71 to a low of 4.08, indicating that they were all in the above average category.

Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the student handbook presented online within the general information about the Counselor Education Program. (n = 7) *M = 4.29; SD = .488*

Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 7) *M = 4.29; SD = .488*

Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 7) *M = 3.57; SD = 1.272*

Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 7)
M = 4.43; SD = .535

Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 7) *M = 4.86; SD = .378*

Discussion

The number of survey respondents decreased significantly (N=18) compared to last year (N=31). The decrease is likely due to the low response rate in the Clinical Mental Health track (N = 4). While there were (N=10) students enrolled in the course, the students were given the surveys to take home rather than complete in class in efforts to promote anonymity. Thus, the Clinical Mental Health data should be interpreted with caution. In most instances, however, 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, clinical mental health, and school counseling). The rating for curricular experiences improved from last year (M=4.42 overall); student comments included an endorsement of the collaborative model (SC3) as well as a recommendation to include a family counseling course in the curriculum. The handbook rating increased (M=4.24) maybe in part due to efforts that were made to increase accessibility such as publication of the handbook on the counselor education website. Student comments indicated that not only were they more aware of the availability of objectives in the student handbook but the objectives themselves were clear, straightforward and met throughout the program. Both School Counseling (M=4.29) and College counseling (M=4.33) adequacy increased with College being the highest of the three tracks. The Clinical Mental Health counseling adequacy rating decreased (M=4).

Overall, the findings are similar across the three tracks with a few differences (e.g. lower average ratings of internship experience in Clinical Mental Health; lower average ratings of advisor in school counseling). The overall means from the previous year with the exception of the advisor ratings were consistent with previous years. The 2011-2012 year saw the return of a full-time faculty member and addition of a new full-time faculty member. Several students rated the advisor question low; based on their comments, several students expressed dissatisfaction with the amount of contact with their advisor; many students echoed the desire to meet more regularly with their advisor. Other comments left by students indicated that they would like additional curricular experiences such as counseling students with disabilities and obtaining a copy of the student handbook at orientation. It seems that the 2011-2012 school year was, overall, a positive experience for students.

All averages were in the above average category, indicating that students are generally pleased with the program. Recommendations made by students indicate a desire for additional guidance via advising relationships and reducing the use of adjuncts.

Survey of Internship Site Supervisors

Method

Surveys were mailed with a self-addressed stamped envelope to each of the internship site supervisors by Dr. Helen Lupton-Smith, Counselor Education program clinical coordinator. They were completed and mailed back. 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

Eleven 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 4.45 to a low of 4.18, 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 = 11) *M = 4.18; SD = .404*

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 11) *M = 4.45; SD = .809*

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 11) *M = 4.36; SD = .688*

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 4.2 to a low of 3.8, 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; SD = 0*

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 5) *M = 4.2; SD = .837*

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 5) *M = 3.8; SD = .837*

Clinical Mental Health Counseling Site Supervisors

Three 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 5 to a low of 4.33, 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 = 3) *M = 4.33; SD = .577*

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 3) *M = 4.33; SD = .577*

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 3) *M = 5; SD = 0*

School Counseling Site Supervisors

Three 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 5 to a low of 4.33, 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 = 3) *M = 4.33; SD = .577*

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 3) *M = 5; SD = 0*

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 3) *M = 4.67; SD = .577*

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 ratings for this item increased across all three tracks. Site supervisors stated that the interns had a 'good foundation' when beginning their internships.

In 2010-2011, the average ratings for how well the faculty supervisor worked with the site supervisor increased from the previous year. The ratings for that item in 2011-2012 continued to improve (M=4.45 overall, M= 4.2 college counseling, M=4.33 Clinical Mental Health and M=5 school counseling). Based on

comments by site supervisors, regular contact via email served to improve the relationship between faculty and site supervisors. The 'how well did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor item' decreased from the previous year (M=4.36) although it remains above average. The ratings for that item improved for the School Counseling (M=4.67) and Clinical Mental Health (M=5) tracks. Additionally, comments left by site supervisors indicated that increased contact with the faculty supervisors via email and face to face meetings proved valuable in addition to the training programs offered twice a year. Several supervisors left comments indicating how helpful the training sessions and meetings were.

The highest rating across all three tracks was for 'how adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern'. The rating decreased from 2010-2011 although they remained above 4.0 across all three tracks; a much smaller sample size may explain the decrease. Irrespective of the decrease in intern ratings, supervisor comments repeatedly highlighted intern attributes such as counseling knowledge and self-awareness. One comment indicated that the site desired to hire the intern; however, the intern had different interests in counseling. Overall, site supervisors are pleased with our interns.

Survey of Employers

Method

The most recent survey of employers was conducted in spring 2011. We identified 107 graduates of the entry level and doctoral programs between 2007-2010. Surveys were sent electronically to 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 emails were bounced back. The effective sample size was 103. A follow-up email was sent to the alums a week later. All responses were collected in three weeks. A copy of the cover letter and of the Employer Survey was listed in the Appendix.

Findings

Twenty-two responses were received and analyzed, yielding a response rate of 21.4%. Means and standard deviations for each of the items are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.89 to a low of 4.25, indicating that all averages were in the Above Average category.

Items	M	SD
1. Understands the nature and needs of individuals and groups.	4.77	.43
2. Facilitates interpersonal relations with clients, colleagues, supervisors, and parents	4.72	.46
3. Ability to conduct in-house research and evaluation and report the results clearly to others.	4.50	.52
4. Performance in applicable assessment activities (i.e., testing, diagnosis, interpretation, reporting).	4.35	.49
5. Ability to assemble, organize, and disseminate counseling information effectively (e.g., career, personal-social, and governmental information).	4.61	.50
6. Effectiveness in group counseling or developmental or preventive groups.	4.61	.61
7. Performance when working in one-to-one relationships with clients.	4.89	.32
8. Skill in applying appropriate strategies in crises.	4.25	.68
9. Ability to maintain liaisons and cooperative working relationships with agencies in the community at large.	4.67	.49
10. Ability to handle administrative responsibilities effectively.	4.78	.43
11. Sensitivity to cultural, gender, disability, and sexual-orientation issues.	4.89	.32
12. Performance as an advocate for her/his clients, profession, and agency/school.	4.72	.46
13. Ability to behave in an ethically appropriate manner.	4.89	.32

14. Ability to cope with the technological challenges associated with her/his position.	4.59	.51
15. Ability to develop thoughtful, well organized programs that meet the needs of clients/students/or others.	4.56	.62
16. Understanding of career and lifestyle development.	4.41	.62
17. Efforts to strengthen his or her professional development.	4.67	.49

Discussion

All items rated above average range, all items were above 4 out of a five-point Likert scale, most items were above 4.5. The highest scores were found in the following areas: facilitating skills, counseling programs, administration, use of technology, delivery of counseling services, cultural skills, professional ethics, advocacy for clients, liaison with agencies, and group counseling. Scores which are slightly lower (but still above 4.0) include assessment and crisis counseling. This shows that our employers continue to rate between above average and excellent on most of the items including professional ethics, individual and group counseling needs and strategies, and working relationship with clients. The overall findings are encouraging. Our graduates in the study appear to be doing well.

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 in the student handbook presented online within the general information about the Counselor Education Program.

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 ___

Clinical MH ___

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
North Carolina State University**

Employer Survey

Directions: Please respond to the following questions about our graduate's performance to the best of your ability. After completion, please return the survey by sending it via email to raymond_ting@ncsu.edu by May 13 (Fri), 2011.

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

- | <u>Rating</u> | <u>Question</u> |
|---------------|--|
| ___ | 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