

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

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

SUMMARY OF ENTRY AND DOCTORAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

2013-2014 Academic Year

Prepared By

Aisha Al-Qimlass
Graduate Assistant
mialqiml@ncsu.edu

Sylvia Nassar-McMillan
Program Coordinator
Professor
snassar@ncsu.edu

S. Raymond Ting
College Counseling / Student Development Program Coordinator
Director of Graduate Program
Professor
ting@ncsu.edu

Table of Contents

Program Faculty Members 3

Introduction 4

Survey of Graduating Students 5

Survey of Internship Site Supervisors 7

Survey of Employers 9

Appendices 11

COUNSELOR EDUCATION PROGRAM FACULTY MEMBERS

2013-2014

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

Roger Callanan, adjunct assistant professor

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

Marc A. Grimmett, associate professor, coordinator of community/clinical mental health counseling program

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

Sylvia C. Nassar-McMillan, professor, program head

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

Angie Smith, assistant professor

Rhonda Sutton, visiting assistant professor

Richard Tyler, 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
2013-2014 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, every three years, 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 2014 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 2014, surveys were distributed electronically to each of the 25 graduating masters program students. They were completed anonymously and submitted via the electronic form. Of the 25 distributed surveys, 13 were completed. 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

Thirteen 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 4.31 to a low of 4.00, indicating that all averages were in the above average category.

<i>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 = 13)</i>	<i>M = 4.15; SD = .800</i>
<i>Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 13)</i>	<i>M = 4.31; SD = .630</i>
<i>Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 13)</i>	<i>M = 4.08; SD = 1.553</i>
<i>Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 12)</i>	<i>M = 4.00; SD = .853</i>
<i>Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 13)</i>	<i>M = 4.31; SD = 1.109</i>

Discussion

The number of survey respondents decreased ($n=13$) compared to last year ($n=24$). This could be reflective of the new electronic survey administration method utilized during the data collection period. Also, as the electronic surveys were completed anonymously, an error was overlooked in requesting that the survey respondents indicate which master's track they were enrolled; i.e. School, College or Clinical Mental Health. Therefore, data will only be provided in terms of overall graduating student responses.

The findings of the overall graduating student responses remained relatively consistent with historical trends. Adequacy of faculty ($M=4.31$) and internship experience ($M=4.31$) received the highest mean scores. Student comments about the adequacy of faculty included appreciation of their support, knowledge, mentorship

and creating a trusting environment. Student comments about the adequacy of their internship included their appreciation of the experience it provided them in regards to the types of clientele they worked with and skills that they were able to build and develop.

The rating for adequacy of program objectives found within the student handbook ($M=4.15$) decreased from last year but remains above average. Student comments included appreciation for the thoroughness of the Student Handbook, as well as recommending more information regarding the financial investment required during the practicum and internship semesters.

The rating of student advisors ($M=4.08$) also decreased from the previous year, but remained in the above average range. Comments by students indicated an appreciation for faculty advisors to be engaging, responsive and supportive throughout their coursework. Other comments by students included recommendations for greater availability from faculty advisors and more investment from advisors in their relationships with advisees.

The rating for curricular experiences ($M=4.00$) also decreased from last year. One rating of "0", indicating "Not Qualified to Respond" was removed from the data set for this item. Student comments included recommendations to include a marriage and family counseling course in the curriculum, include more emphasis on the DSM, connect interns to sites in a more effective way, inform students early on about the time intensive nature of internship and allow more collaboration between masters and doctoral students to foster mentoring roles.

All ratings 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 more information regarding the internship experience prior to the semester or year that they enroll.

Survey of Internship Site Supervisors

Method

Surveys were distributed electronically to 26 Internship Site Supervisors. They were completed anonymously and submitted via the electronic form. Of the 26 distributed surveys, 16 were completed. 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

Sixteen 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 4.38 to a low of 4.27, 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 = 16) *M = 4.38; SD = 1.088*

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 16) *M = 4.31; SD = .793*

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 15) *M = 4.27; SD = .799*

Discussion

Data were gathered in regards to the site description (e.g. Middle School, College or University etc.) but did not include the Master's track with which they were affiliated; i.e. School, College or Clinical Mental Health. Therefore, data will only be provided in terms of overall site supervisor responses.

The return rate ($n=16$) was lower than last year ($n=26$). The drop in response rate cannot be attributed to any specific factors, however the site supervisor findings were similar to overall historical trends and higher than the previous year's findings.

Ratings for 'how adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern' was the highest ($M=4.38$). Supervisor comments highlighted intern attributes such as counseling knowledge and professional behavior. Interestingly, other comments reflected naivety of intern in regards to the same aspects, counseling knowledge, and workplace challenges.

Ratings for 'how well the faculty supervisor worked with the site supervisor' increased overall ($M=4.31$) from the previous year. Recommendations made within supervisor comments included desiring more specifics on how to meet any supervision requirements as well as desiring more information regarding continuing education credits for supervision trainings.

Ratings for 'how well did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor' also increased overall ($M=4.27$) from the previous year. One rating of "0", indicating "Not Qualified to Respond" was removed from the data set for this item. Comments left by site supervisors indicated that there was a need for increased communication between the site supervisor and NCSU faculty member, as well as reflecting on scheduling conflicts during the semester.

Survey of Employers

Method

The most recent survey of employers was conducted in fall 2014. We identified 128 graduates of the entry level and doctoral programs between spring of 2011 to spring of 2014. Of the 128 graduates, 102 had active emails. Letters were sent electronically to these graduates explaining the survey and requesting their permission and help by asking for their employers'/supervisors' email addresses in order to complete the electronic employer surveys. Contact information for seven employers/supervisors were collected. Electronic letters were then sent to each employer/supervisor with a cover letter explaining the attached survey, five of the seven employer completed the electronic survey. 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. Two follow-up emails were sent to the employers/supervisors at one week and two weeks later. All responses were collected within three weeks. A copy of the cover letter and of the Employer Survey is listed in the Appendix.

Findings

Five responses were received and analyzed, yielding a response rate of 71.4% of the contacted employers/supervisors but only 4.9% of the overall entry level and doctoral program graduates. Two responses indicated an entry level graduate, one response indicated a doctoral level graduate and two responses did not indicate either. Means and standard deviations for each of the items are presented below; ratings of "0" were not included in the analysis. The range of means was from a high of 4.80 to a low of 3.00, indicating that all averages were in the Average to Above Average category.

Items	M	SD
1. Understands the nature and needs of individuals and groups.	4.60	.55
2. Facilitates interpersonal relations with clients, colleagues, supervisors, and parents	4.40	.89
3. Ability to conduct in-house research and evaluation and report the results clearly to others.	4.40	.55
4. Performance in applicable assessment activities (i.e., testing, diagnosis, interpretation, reporting).	4.20	.45
5. Ability to assemble, organize, and disseminate counseling information effectively (e.g., career, personal-social, and governmental information).	4.40	.55
6. Effectiveness in group counseling or developmental or preventive groups.	3.00	1.41
7. Performance when working in one-to-one relationships with	4.50	.58

clients.

8. Skill in applying appropriate strategies in crises.	4.00	.71
9. Ability to maintain liaisons and cooperative working relationships with agencies in the community at large.	3.40	1.52
10. Ability to handle administrative responsibilities effectively.	4.60	.55
11. Sensitivity to cultural, gender, disability, and sexual-orientation issues.	4.60	.55
12. Performance as an advocate for her/his clients, profession, and agency/school.	4.50	1.00
13. Ability to behave in an ethically appropriate manner.	4.80	.45
14. Ability to cope with the technological challenges associated with her/his position.	4.20	.45
15. Ability to develop thoughtful, well organized programs that meet the needs of clients/students/or others.	4.40	.55
16. Understanding of career and lifestyle development.	3.40	1.52
17. Efforts to strengthen his or her professional development.	4.80	.45

Discussion

All items rated in the average to above average range, all items were at a 3 or above, out of a five-point Likert scale, most items were above 4.0. The highest scores were found in the following areas: professional development, professional ethics, multi-cultural skills, administration, and individual/group case conceptualization. The lowest scores include group counseling, acting as a liaison with agencies and career counseling. High Standard Deviations (SD) between .89 and 1.52 are found in five areas: interpersonal relationships, group counseling, community liaison, advocacy, and career/lifestyle development. These SDs may be larger due to the low sample size we were able to collect; thus allowing each response to carry a larger percentage of the overall mean.

The results show that our employers continue to rate our graduates highly, but overall ratings have dropped since the last employer survey was conducted. Additionally, the low response rate does not allow for generalizations to be made.

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 faculty in general.

Comments

____ 2. 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

3. Who is your advisor? _____

____ 4. Rate the adequacy of your advisor
Comments

____ 5. Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall
Comments

____ 6. Rate how well your internship met its' objectives
Comments

7. Check the setting in which your internship took place:
College/university ____
Public school ____
Clinical MH ____

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. Please note that the content of this survey and your responses are confidential. No identifying information needs to be provided.

Descriptive information: Select 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?

- Yes____
- No____
- Other _____

Comments

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. 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).

Please select the category that best describes your employee:

Masters Program Graduate _____

Doctoral Program Graduate _____

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