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**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 accountability criteria.

 Annually, following the spring semester, surveys are sent to graduating entry level master’s degree students to evaluate:

1. The adequacy of program objectives for the curriculum
2. The reported experiences with advisors and the program’s faculty
3. The participation in curricular experiences
4. The reported internship experience in relation to the program’s objectives

 Annually, following the spring semester, surveys are sent to site supervisors of entry level master’s degree students to evaluate::

1. The adequacy of the intern’s academic preparation
2. The adequacy of interactions between site supervisors and university supervisors

At the beginning of each semester, the program’s faculty meet to review the academic, professional, and personal development of each enrolled student. The present report reviews the findings of the master’s level graduate students and site supervisor surveys following the conclusion of 2017 spring semester.

**Survey of Graduating Master’s Students**

**Method**

In April of 2017, surveys were distributed electronically to each of the 24 graduating master’s program students. Twenty-four electronic surveys were submitted and 12 were returned. Means, and standard deviations, were determined for each of the items across the sample. The survey used a likert scale with ratings of 5 (*Excellent*); 4 (*Above Average*); 3 (*Average*); 2 (*Below Average*); 1 (*Inadequate*); 0 (*Not Qualified to Respond*). A copy of the survey is located in Appendix A.

**Results**

**Graduating master’s level students.** The following data pertain to all graduating master’s level students. Of the 24 graduates, 12 responses were received and analyzed. The findings of the overall master’s level graduate responses, remained consistent with historical trends. Questions, means and standard deviations for each of the survey items are presented below.

**Questions and Results**

*Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the student handbook located online within the general information about the Counselor Education Program.*

 *M* = 4.08; *SD* = .90

*Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general.*

 *M* = 4.33; *SD* = .89

*Rate the adequacy of your advisor.*

 *M* = 3.41; *SD* = 1.31

*Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall.*

 *M* = 4.08; *SD* = .79

*Rate how well your internship met its objectives.*

 *M* = 4.36; *SD* = .67

**College counseling students.** The following data pertain to college counseling master’s students. Of the nine college counseling graduates, six responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations for each of the survey items are presented below.

**Questions and Results**

*Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the student handbook located online within the general information about the Counselor Education Program.*

 *M = 3.83; SD = .47*

*Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general.*

 *M* = 4.33; *SD* = .82

*Rate the adequacy of your advisor.*

 *M* = 2.5; *SD* = .11

*Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall.*

 *M* = 4.16; *SD* = .75

*Rate how well your internship met its objectives.*

 *M* = 4.67; *SD* = .52

**Clinical mental health counseling students.** The following data pertain to college counseling master’s students. Of the seven clinical mental health counseling graduates, three responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations for each of the survey items are presented below.

**Questions and Results**

*Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the student handbook located online within the general information about the Counselor Education Program.*

 *M =* 4.33*; SD =*.58

*Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general.*

 *M* = 4.33; *SD* = 1.16

*Rate the adequacy of your advisor.*

 *M* = 4.00; *SD* = 1.00

*Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall.*

 *M* = 4.00; *SD* = 1.00

*Rate how well your internship met its objectives.*

 *M* = 4.00; *SD* = 1.00

 **School counseling students.** The following data pertain to school counseling master’s students. Of the eight school counseling graduates, three responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations for each of the survey items are presented below.

**Questions and Results**

*Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the student handbook located online within the general information about the Counselor Education Program.*

 *M =* 4.33*; SD = .58*

*Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general.*

*M* = 4.33; *SD* = 1.15

*Rate the adequacy of your advisor.*

 *M* = 4.66; *SD* = .58

*Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall.*

 *M* = 4.00; *SD* = 1.00

*Rate how well your internship met its objectives.*

 *M* = 3.67; *SD* = 1.50

**Discussion**

The number of survey respondents decreased from 2016-2017 (*n*=12; 50%) compared to 2014-2015 (*n*=24;86%). This could be due to the year gap in data collection, as 2015-2016 program surveys were not distributed. Instead, a mid-year cycle report covering 2012-2015 was completed. Additionally, during this time the Counselor Education Department was in a state of flux as it moved from Curriculum and Instruction to Educational Leadership, Policy, and Human Development.

Overall, the findings of graduating student responses remained relatively consistent with historical trends; Adequacy of faculty (*M*=4.33) and internship experience (*M*=4.36) received the highest mean scores. Scoring slightly lower than the 2014-2015 ratings were the areas of Adequacy of program objectives (*M*=4.08, 2016-2017; *M*=4.20, 2014-2015), and Participation in curricular experiences (*M*=4.08, 2016-2017; *M*=4.26, 2014-2015). The only area that showed a considerable decline was Adequacy of advisor (*M*=3.41, 2016-2017; *M*=4.25, 2014-2015).

Reviewing data across the three master’s programs support prior findings. Overall, the ratings were in the average to above average categories, indicating that students were generally pleased with the program. In the future, results of the surveys should be reviewed annually by faculty at the beginning of the academic year to address students’ supportive and constructive comments. Additionally, measures should be taken to increase the response rate by distributing the surveys a month prior to graduation, which will allow for an adequate amount of follow-up time to help increase completion rates.

**Survey of Internship Site Supervisor**

**Method**

Thirty anonymous surveys were distributed electronically to 30 internship site supervisors, and 12 were returned. Means, standard deviations, and sample sizes were determined for each of the items across the sample. The survey used a likert scale with ratings of 5 (*Excellent*); 4 (*Above Average*); 3 (*Average*); 2 (*Below Average*); 1 (*Inadequate*); 0 (*Not Qualified to Respond*). A copy of the survey is located in Appendix B.

**Results**

**Site supervisors.** The following data pertain to site supervisor’s ratings of master’s level students’ preparation and interaction with the university supervisor. Of the 30 site supervisors, 12 responses were received and analyzed. Questions, means and standard deviations for each of the survey items are presented below.

**Questions and Results**

*How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern?*

 *M* = 3.92; *SD* = .67

*How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process?*

 *M* = 4.42; *SD* = .52

*How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor?*

 *M* = 4.58; *SD* = .67

**College counseling site supervisors.** The following data pertain to college counseling site supervisors. Five responses were received and analyzed. Questions, means and standard deviations for each of the survey items are presented below.

**Questions and Results**

*How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern?*

 *M* = 3.8; *SD* = .837

*How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process?*

 *M* = 4.20; *SD* = .447

*How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor?*

 *M* = 4.40; *SD* = .245

**Clinical mental health site supervisors.** The following data pertain to clinical mental health site supervisors. Two responses were received and analyzed. Questions, means and standard deviations for each of the survey items are presented below. Means and standard deviations for each of the items are presented below.

**Questions and Results**

*How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern?*

 *M* = 3.50; *SD* = .707

*How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process?*

 *M* = 4.50*; SD = .707*

*How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor?*

 *M* = 4.40; *SD* = .245

**School counseling site supervisors.** The following data pertain to school counseling site supervisors. Five responses were received and analyzed. Questions, means and standard deviations for each of the survey items are presented below.

**Questions and Results**

*How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern?*

 *M* = 4.2; *SD* = .45

*How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process?*

 *M* = 4.60; *SD* = .55

*How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor?*

 *M* = 5.00; *SD* = 0

**Discussion**

The return count (*n*=12) was considerably lower than two years ago (*n*=27). The decrease in response rate could possibly be attributed to lack of follow-up by the Counselor Education faculty and staff, as well as the continued use of electronic administration of the survey. Overall, site supervisor ratings were higher than previous-years findings. Each category and the respective averages for 2016-2017 and 2014-2015 are discussed.

Ratings for ‘*how well did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor?*’ was the highest (*M*=4.58) and it was higher than two years ago (*M*=4.41). Reviewed by program, results either increased or remained relatively stable over the past two years, School Counseling (*M*=5.0, 2016-2017; *M*=4.69, 2014-2015) and College Counseling (*M*=4.40, 2016-2017; *M*=4.56, 2014-2015), and Clinical Mental Health (*M*=4.50, 2016-2017; *M*=3.60, 2014-2015).

Ratings for ‘*how adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern?’* decreased slightly (*M*=3.92, 2016-2017; *M*=4.41, 2014-2015). Broken down by concentration, an increase was again seen in both School Counseling (*M*=4.2, 2016-2017; *M*=4.69, 2014-2015) and College Counseling (*M*=3.80, 2016-2017; *M*=4.22, 2014-2015), with a decrease in Clinical Mental Health (*M*=3.50, 2016-2017; *M*=4.00, 2014-2015).

Ratings for ‘*how well the faculty supervisor worked with the site supervisor*’ also increased overall (*M*=4.42, 2016-2017; *M*=4.41, 2014-2015) from the previous year. Broken down by concentration, an increase was again seen in both School Counseling (*M*=4.60, 2016-2017; *M*=4.69, 2014-2015), College Counseling (*M*=4.20, 2016-2017; *M*=4.33, 2014-2015), and Clinical Mental Health (*M*=4.50, 2016-2017; *M*=3.80, 2014-2015).

Overall, site supervisor ratings were in the average to excellent ranges, indicating that supervisors were generally pleased with the program’s internship process. In the future, data should be reviewed annually by faculty at the beginning of the academic year to address site supervisor’s supportive and constructive comments. Additionally, measures should be taken to increase response rates either by encouraging university supervisors to reach out to site supervisors in a sufficient amount of time to initiate an adequate follow-through period.

Appendices

# Appendix A

Survey of Graduating Master’s Students

**Counselor Education Program -** **North Carolina State University**

**Graduating 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.

Please Select your Masters Concentration:

\_\_\_\_\_\_ School Counseling

\_\_\_\_\_\_ College Counseling

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Clinical Mental Health Counseling

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Agency

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Thank You**

# Appendix B

Survey of Internship Site Supervisors

**Counselor Education Program - North Carolina State University**

**Site Supervisor Survey**

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.

# Select the designation that best describes your site:

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Elementary School

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Middle School

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Secondary School

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Agency

\_\_\_\_\_\_ College or University

**Select the Masters concentration that your supervisee is affiliated with:**

\_\_\_\_\_\_ School Counseling

\_\_\_\_\_\_ College Counseling

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Clinical Mental Health Counseling

**Would you be willing to supervise one of our interns again?**

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_\_ No

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**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

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**