

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

Counselor Education Program
Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Human Development

SUMMARY OF ENTRY AND DOCTORAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

2014-2015 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 9

Survey of Employers 12

Appendices 14

COUNSELOR EDUCATION PROGRAM FACULTY MEMBERS

2014-2015

Stanley B. Baker, Professor, Coordinator of School Counseling Program

Roger Callanan, Teaching Assistant Professor

Adria Dunbar, Assistant Professor

Edwin F. Gerler, Jr., Professor, Coordinator of Doctoral Program

Marc A. Grimmett, Associate Professor, Coordinator of Clinical Mental Health Counseling Program

Patrick T. Jeffs, Teaching Assistant Professor

Helen S. Lupton-Smith, Assistant Professor, Coordinator of Clinical Experiences

Sylvia C. Nassar-McMillan, Professor, Program Coordinator

Monica Osburn, Teaching Assistant Professor

Jose A. Picart, Senior Faculty Fellow and Professor of Education

Angie Smith, Assistant Professor

Rhonda Sutton, Teaching Assistant Professor

Richard Tyler-Walker, Teaching Assistant Professor

Siu-Man R. Ting, Professor, Coordinator of College Counseling Program, Director of Graduate Program

E. Scott Warren, Lecturer Summer School

Hala G. Young, Lecturer Summer School

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION
2014-2015 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 2015 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 2015, surveys were distributed electronically to each of the 28 graduating master's program students. They were completed anonymously and submitted via the electronic form. Of the 28 distributed surveys, 24 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 appendix.

Results

All Graduating Students

24 responses were received and analyzed. The findings of the overall graduating student responses, remained relatively consistent with historical trends. Means and standard deviations for each of the items are presented below. The range of the means was from a high of 4.33 to a low of 4.20, indicating that all averages were in the above average to excellent category.

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. (n = 20) *M = 4.20; SD = .616*

Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 24) *M = 4.33; SD = .637*

Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 24) *M = 4.25; SD = .897*

Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 23)
M = 4.26; SD = .689

Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 24) *M = 4.33; SD = 1.007*

College Counseling Students

Six responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.17 to a low of 3.67, indicating that they were all in the 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 = 4.00; SD = .816*

Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 6) *M = 4.17; SD = .408*

Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 6) $M = 3.67; SD = .816$

Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 6)
 $M = 4.00; SD = .632$

Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 6) $M = 4.33; SD = 1.033$

Clinical Mental Health Counseling Students

Six responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations are presented below. The range of means was from a high of 4.33 to a low of 3.67, indicating that they were all in the 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 = 6) $M = 4.33; SD = .816$

Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 6) $M = 4.33; SD = 1.033$

Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 6) $M = 4.33; SD = 1.211$

Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 5)
 $M = 4.20; SD = .837$

Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 6) $M = 3.67; SD = 1.211$

School Counseling Students

Twelve 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 4.2, indicating that they were all in the above average to excellent 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 = 10) $M = 4.20; SD = .422$

Rate the adequacy of the faculty in general. (n = 12) $M = 4.42; SD = .515$

Rate the adequacy of your advisor. (n = 12) $M = 4.50; SD = .674$

Rate the curricular experiences in which you participated overall. (n = 12)
 $M = 4.42; SD = .669$

Rate how well your internship met its objectives. (n = 12) $M = 4.67; SD = .778$

Discussion

The number of survey respondents increased ($n=9$) compared to last year ($n=13$). This could be reflective of the second round utilizing the electronic survey administration method.

The findings of the overall graduating student responses remained relatively consistent with historical trends; with overall increases for this academic year in each of the areas surveyed, yet still lower than previous years. Adequacy of faculty ($M=4.33$) and internship experience ($M=4.33$) continued to receive the highest mean scores. Student comments about the adequacy of faculty included appreciation of their support, knowledge, and openness to new ideas. Student comments about the adequacy of their internship included their appreciation of the experience it provided them in regards to the types of clientele and settings worked in, as well as skills that they were able to apply, build, and develop.

The rating for adequacy of program objectives found within the student handbook ($M=4.20$) increased from last year. Four ratings of "0", indicating "Not Qualified to Respond" was removed from the data set for this item. Student comments however indicated conflicting information regarding program objectives. While the majority of students reported that the program objectives were appropriate, well outlined, and easily understood; other students reported not being informed of the program objectives and a difficulty to locate them within the Student Handbook.

The rating of student advisors ($M=4.25$) also increased from the previous year. Comments by students indicated an appreciation for faculty advisors to be knowledgeable, responsive and supportive throughout their coursework; including planning for matriculation as well as professional development. Other comments by students included recommendations for creating a greater presence of some advisors within the graduate environment and milieu.

The rating for curricular experiences ($M=4.26$) also increased from last year. One rating of "0", indicating "Not Qualified to Respond" was removed from the data set for this item. Student comments included appreciation for the ability to apply classroom learning to experiences in Practicum and Internship. Other student comments included recommendations to include more appropriate and applicable elective courses, such as a marriage and family counseling course and an ethics course.

Looking across tracks, we see an overall decrease in ratings based on data collected in the past. The ratings for adequacy of program objectives decreased across all three tracks; School Counseling ($M=4.20$), Clinical Mental Health ($M=4.33$) and College Counseling ($M=4.0$), with Clinical Mental Health continuing to receive the highest of the three tracks. The rating for adequacy of faculty in general also decreased; School Counseling ($M=4.42$), Clinical Mental Health ($M=4.33$), and College Counseling ($M=4.17$); with Clinical Mental Health Counseling receiving the highest. The rating for the adequacy of advisors also decreased across all three tracks; School Counseling ($M=4.50$), Clinical Mental Health ($M=4.33$), and College Counseling ($M=3.67$), with School Counseling receiving the highest of the three tracks. The rating of curricular experiences also showed a slight decrease; School Counseling ($M=4.42$), Clinical Mental Health ($M=4.0$), and College Counseling ($M=4.20$), with School counseling receiving the highest ratings. Finally, in regards to

the internship experience, there was a decrease in both Clinical Mental Health (M=3.67) and College Counseling (M=4.33), however there was an increase in School Counseling (M=4.67). While the overall trend had dipped from previous years, the ratings still indicate a positive experience for students.

Overall, the ratings were in the above average to excellent categories, indicating that students are generally pleased with the program. Based on track however, we see that only School Counseling continues this trend, while both College Counseling and Clinical Mental Health Counseling are in the average to above average categories. Recommendations made by students indicate the desire for a more rigorous academic experience and more application of classroom learning.

Recommendations for future consideration across master's program are based on suggestions and ratings from student respondents. One area of recommendations include options for elective courses; which could include the developing of new courses within the master's program, as well as advising current students on the option of enrolling in cross discipline or intern-institutional courses. Another area of recommendation includes the application of classroom learning; while internship is still highly ranked, it may be helpful to include projects throughout various courses over the entire program with the goal of getting students to engage with individuals in the community. A final area of recommendation includes the increased presence of all advising staff within the master's environment. While students ranked the faculty, and their support, highly, it may be beneficial to weave the non-master's teaching faculty into the master's program in a more intentional way to promote the sense of community within the program.

*Survey of Internship Site Supervisors
(i.e. Site Supervisor Survey of NCSU Counselor Education's Internship Process)*

Method

Surveys were distributed electronically to 30 Internship Site Supervisors. They were completed anonymously and submitted via the electronic form. Of the 30 distributed surveys, 27 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 appendix.

Results

All Site Supervisors

27 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 4.44 to a low of 4.41, indicating that all averages were in the above average to excellent categories.

How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern? (n = 27) *M = 4.41; SD = .694*

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 27) *M = 4.44; SD = .751*

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 27) *M = 4.41; SD = .694*

College Counseling Site Supervisors

Nine 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 4.56 to a low of 4.22, indicating that all averages were in the above average to excellent categories.

How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern? (n = 9) *M = 4.22; SD = .833*

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 9) *M = 4.56; SD = .527*

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 9) *M = 4.33; SD = .500*

Clinical Mental Health 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 4.00 to a low of 3.60, indicating that all averages were in the average to above average category.

How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern? (n = 5) *M = 4.00; SD = .707*

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 5) *M = 3.60; SD = .894*

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 5) *M = 3.80; SD = 1.095*

School Counseling Site Supervisors

Thirteen responses were received and analyzed. Means and standard deviations for each of the items are presented below. The means across all responses remained constant at 4.69, indicating that all averages were in the above average to excellent category.

How adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern? (n = 13) *M = 4.69; SD = .480*

How well did our faculty supervisor work with you during the internship process? (n = 13) *M = 4.69; SD = .630*

How did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor? (n = 13) *M = 4.69; SD = .480*

Discussion

The return rate ($n=27$) was higher than last year ($n=16$). The increase in response rate could possibly be attributed to follow-up by the Counselor Education faculty and staff, as well as the continued use of electronic administration of the survey. Overall the site supervisor findings for this year continue to be higher than the historical trends of previous years' findings.

Ratings for 'how well did our faculty prepare you for performing as a site supervisor' was the highest ($M=4.44$). Broken down by track, an increase was seen in both School Counseling ($M=4.69$) and College Counseling ($M=4.56$), but there was a decrease in Clinical Mental Health ($M=3.60$). Comments left by site supervisors indicated that the orientation was helpful, as well as the dependable communication between sites and NCSU Counselor Education faculty. Additional comments left by

site supervisors included recommendations for more detailed review of their expectations in terms of evaluation of student progress and observing of sessions.

Ratings for 'how adequately trained by our program was your intern prior to becoming your intern' increased overall ($M=4.41$) from the previous year. Broken down by track, an increase was again seen in both School Counseling ($M=4.69$) and College Counseling ($M=4.22$), with a decrease in Clinical Mental Health ($M=4.00$). Supervisor comments highlighted intern attributes such as counseling knowledge, use of micro-skills, and professional behavior. Other comments reflected confidence of interns, and various discrepancies that can be found in different worksites.

Ratings for 'how well the faculty supervisor worked with the site supervisor' also increased overall ($M=4.41$) from the previous year. Broken down by track, an increase was again seen in both School Counseling ($M=4.69$) and College Counseling ($M=4.33$), with a decrease in Clinical Mental Health ($M=3.80$). Supervisor comments overall reflected the availability and accessibility of Counselor Education Faculty during the internship process.

Recommendations for future consideration across master's program are based on suggestions and ratings from site supervisors. One area of recommendation includes the continued use of the practicum and internship orientation. Site supervisors reported that while these orientations were helpful in defining their roles, it would also be beneficial to provide a more detailed review of their expectations as it relates to evaluating, supervising, and observing. One possible way to address this would be to add a "case" or example within the internship orientation. The other area for recommendation included continuing to work with both faculty and site supervisors to ensure timely communication. This could be improved by requesting the both the site supervisor and faculty supervisor to indicate their preferred methods of communication to be used throughout the internship experience.

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 clients.	4.50	.58

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, a few items were slightly higher than the last survey including items 10, 13, 17 about administrative duties, practice in ethics, and improvement in professional development. It was also found that some items were slightly lower than last survey, including items 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 15, and 16. However, the low response rate does not allow for generalizations to be made.

Recommendations for future considerations include a more thorough and developed follow up process of engaging our graduates to increase employer response rate. Possible options here include the discussion of the use and importance of the employer survey while students are still enrolled in the program, consistent engagement of the alumni community to gather updated information regarding their contacts and employment status, as well as asking graduating students to indicate a non-NCSU email address they preferred to be contacted with if no longer choosing to use their NCSU generated email.

APPENDX

Student Survey

Site Supervisor Survey

Employer Survey

**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 Track:

- 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

**Counselor Education Program
North Carolina State University**

**Site Supervisor Survey
(i.e. Site Supervisor Survey of NCSU's Counselor Education Internship Process)**

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 track 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

**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