

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

Counselor Education Program
Department of Curriculum and Instruction

SUMMARY OF ENTRY AND DOCTORAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

2008-2009 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	11

COUNSELOR EDUCATION PROGRAM FACULTY MEMBERS

2008-209

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

Charles Blackburn, visiting assistant professor

Roger Callanan, adjunct assistant professor

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

Laura Gonzalez, visiting assistant professor

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

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

Millie Maxwell, visiting assistant professor

Sylvia C. Nassar-McMillan, associate professor, program head

Jose A. Picart, professor, vice provost for diversity and inclusion, interim dean of the college

Rhonda Sutton, visiting assistant professor,

Richard Tyler, visiting assistant professor

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

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION 2008-2009 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 2009 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 2009, surveys were distributed to each of the graduating students by their university internship supervisors who, in turn, collected them in April of 2009. 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 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 4.65 to a low of 4.00, indicating that all averages were in the above average category.

Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the department's student handbook. (n = 9) M = 4.00; SD = 0.71

Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 20) $M = 4.25; SD = 0.72$

Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 20) $M = 4.45; SD = 0.61$

Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 20)
 $M = 4.08; SD = 0.69$

Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 20) M = 4.65; SD = 0.59

College Counseling Students

Three responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.67 to a low of 4.00, indicating that they were all in the above average category.

Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the department's student handbook. (n = 2) M = 4.00; SD = 0.00

Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 3) $M = 4.00; SD = 1.00$

Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 3) $M = 4.00; SD = 1.00$

Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 3)
 $M = 4.33; SD = 0.58$

Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 3) M = 4.67; SD = 0.58
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 4.65 to a low of 3.83, 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 department's student handbook. (n = 6) M = 3.83; SD = 0.75

Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 8) M = 4.25; SD = 0.46

Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 8) M = 4.50; SD = 0.76

Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 8) M = 4.00; SD = 0.75

Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 8) M = 4.65; SD = 0.59

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 5.00 to a low of 4.06, indicating that they were all in the above average category.

Rate the adequacy of the program objectives that were presented in the department's student handbook. (n = 1) M = 5.00; SD = 0.00

Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 9) M = 4.33; SD = 0.87

Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 9) M = 4.78; SD = 0.44

Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 9) M = 4.06; SD = 0.73

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).. The lowest rating among the five items was associated with the adequacy of the program objectives in the student handbook. The handbook is currently online and must be accessed via the Counselor Education program Website. 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. Another concern was the large standard deviation for the advisor adequacy item.

The findings from the specific entry-level tracks highlighted some differences therein. A large percentage of school counseling students were unfamiliar with the student handbook and approximately half of the college counseling students did not complete the questionnaire. Concern about improved access to the student handbook was stated above. We are also challenged to do a better job of accessing student intern responses in the college counseling concentration. Although there are differences in the means and standard deviations for each questionnaire item across the three concentrations, they do not appear to be dramatic enough to suggest important or statistical differences that might suggest remediation anywhere. All averages except one are in the above average category

Survey of Internship Site Supervisors

Method

Surveys were mailed to each of the internship site supervisors with stamped envelopes addressed to Drs. Baker, Grimmett, or Ting. They were completed anonymously and mailed to the program office. 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

Twenty-one 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 4.05, 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?
 $M = 4.38; SD = 0.74$

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process?
 $M = 4.05; SD = 1.07$

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor?
 $M = 4.32; SD = 0.83$

College Counseling Site Supervisors

Six 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 4.17 to a low of 4.00, 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?
 $M = 4.00; SD = 0.63$

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process?
 $M = 4.17; SD = 0.98$

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor?
 $M = 4.13; SD = 1.03$

Community Counseling Site Supervisors

Seven 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 4.14 to a low of 3.14, 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?
 $M = 4.14; SD = 0.90$

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process?
 $M = 3.14; SD = 1.07$

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor?
 $M = 4.00; SD = 0.82$

School Counseling Site Supervisors

Eight 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 4.88 to a low of 4.75, 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?
 $M = 4.88; SD = 0.35$

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process?
 $M = 4.75; SD = 0.46$

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor?
 $M = 4.88; SD = 0.35$

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 present findings indicated that there was a relatively high standard deviation for the item about how well our faculty members worked with the site supervisors. This item also had the lowest average rating.

There seemed to be some differences across the three concentrations. There were higher averages and smaller standard deviations in the school counseling site supervisor data across the three question, indicating higher levels of satisfaction and less variation in responses. Comments made by site supervisors across the sample that assigned average or

below average ratings indicated that some believed that expectations of them were not made clear enough and contacts with university supervisors were too infrequent.

There seems to be evidence that the site supervisors who receive the most attention from university supervisors give higher ratings on the second and third survey items. Presently, the university supervisor for each concentration is responsible for site supervisor preparation and working with the site supervisors over the duration of the internship semester, and the intensity of the degree of attention and interaction between the university and site supervisors varies. It appears as if the program faculty should visit this issue and consider ways to make the preparation of and contact with site supervisors more standardized and effective (e.g., a standardized training workshop for all site supervisors during the fall semester, at least one site visit by the university supervisor during the fall and spring semesters, and weekly email messages to site supervisors containing the content of on-campus group supervision sessions between the interns and the university supervisor).

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
<hr/>	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

<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