

**Department of Counselor Education  
Program Evaluation  
2005-2006**

The Department of Counselor Education developed a self-assessment plan as it completed its CACREP self study in the spring of 2004. The plan provides the department with feedback from students and alumni that can be used to improve the three counselor education programs. This evaluation consists of two parts which are student/alumni satisfaction and student/alumni performance. The department has been reviewing this data since 2004 and programmatic changes have been implemented. This report will detail the results of the program evaluation and steps that have been taken or will be taken to continue to improve the counselor education programs.

**Counselor Education Student/Alumni Satisfaction**

**Practicum/Internship Satisfaction**

Practicum and Internship students complete the *Practicum/Internship Evaluation Form* to evaluate their field site, site supervisor and university supervisor at the completion of their practicum. Internship students complete the survey again at the completion of their internship. This assessment tool was first utilized in 2004. The survey involves rating satisfaction with 1 being very dissatisfied and 4 being very satisfied. Results indicated a general trend of an increase in satisfaction from 2004-2006. The average ratings ranged from 3.3 to 3.8 indicating that students seem satisfied with their internship sites and supervisors as well as their university supervisor. See Table 1 for 2004-2006 results.

Just before graduation students complete the *Completer Survey (CS)*. This survey was designed by the School of Education and is used for all School of Education graduate students. The survey involves rating satisfaction with 1 being very dissatisfied and 4 being very satisfied.

The Department of Counselor Education also utilizes a graduate follow-up study which is referred to as the *Alumni Survey*. This instrument was designed by the department as it prepared for its CACREP self-study. The survey involves rating satisfaction with 1 being very dissatisfied and 4 being very satisfied. This instrument was sent to alumni two years after graduation via the alumni email list serve and through regular mail. The internship experience is evaluated on both the *CS* and the *Alumni Survey*. On the *CS*, the internship experience average yearly ratings ranged from 3.6 to 3.8. The *Alumni Survey* was also used to probe satisfaction with the internship experience and on that survey the average yearly ratings for internship averaged 3.73. See Table 2 and 4. These results indicate that generally the students were pleased with their internship experience. Alumni with the added benefit of work experience continued to be pleased with their

internship experience and rated the experience as effectively preparing them for the counseling profession.

### **Coursework Satisfaction**

On the CS students evaluate their satisfaction with course offerings, instructors and instruction. Table 2 provides CS results for 2003-2006 for completers. These results indicate a high level of satisfaction with average yearly ratings ranging from 3.5 to 3.75 for course offerings, 3.4 to 3.8 for instructors and 3.3 to 3.8 for instruction.

In addition, the department received feedback from alumni on a course by course basis from the *Alumni Survey*. Alumni were asked about the effectiveness of each of their courses for the work they had encountered as counselors. Ratings ranged from 3.01 for psychosocial (CON 5331) to 3.73 for practicum/internship (CON 5372/CON 5390). These ratings were similar to the 1998-2002 self-study results. See Table 3.

The *Alumni Survey* was used to obtain feedback with this statement: "Please identify and list any areas of study that were not offered as part of your counselor education program that you think are needed in your job/position as a counselor." The most prevalent comments from community agency counseling alumni indicated a need for more coursework about psychopathology, the DSM-IV and/or psychopharmacology. There were also comments from community agency alumni recommending that the family counseling elective become a required course. Some career counseling students made comments about another specialty career class that would address career techniques more thoroughly. These results were consistent with anecdotal feedback faculty had received from students and alumni.

### **Overall Satisfaction**

Student and alumni overall satisfaction was also assessed. The CS assessed the satisfaction with advising, Praxis preparation, and preparation for working with counselees. For all four years (2003-2006), all of the average yearly ratings were 3.0 or above with the exception of Praxis preparation. Praxis preparation received ratings ranging from 2.75 to 3.0 indicating this is an area the Department needs to address.

Results from the *Alumni Survey* indicated that alumni felt they were prepared effectively to perform counseling duties with average yearly ratings ranging from 3.3 to 3.5. See Table 4. Alumni were also asked about their level of satisfaction with support issues. All of the average yearly ratings were between 3.0 and 3.3. Ratings from the previous self-study were included to aid with comparison in Table 5.

## **Changes Implemented**

During the 2004-2005 academic year the department submitted a CACREP self-study report. This resulted in departmental discussion regarding additional ways to enhance the counselor education programs. During the summer and fall of 2005, the department also reviewed all counselor education course syllabi. These processes as well as the results of ongoing programmatic evaluation led the department to implement changes in all three programs.

### **Advanced Career Counseling (CON 5325)**

The department determined that an additional career counseling specialty course would enhance the career counseling program. This led Dr. Chad Royal to design a new specialty course called *Advanced Career Counseling* (CON 5325) in December of 2004. In the spring of 2005, the course was approved by the School of Education Graduate Council, the School of Education faculty and the University Academic Planning Committee. The course became a requirement for students admitted for the spring of 2006. This course addition also addressed issues raised by career counseling alumni and students.

### **Community Agency Counseling**

The department determined that additional course work would enhance the community agency counseling program. These changes also addressed issues raised by community agency counseling alumni and students. In the summer of 2005, the department recommended requiring *Advanced Abnormal Psychology* (PSYG 5121) of community agency counseling students. In the fall of 2005, this request was approved by the School of Education Graduate Council, the School of Education faculty and the University Academic Planning Committee. The course became a requirement for students admitted for the fall of 2006.

In the summer of 2005 the department also recommended requiring *Introduction to Family Counseling* (PSYG 5121) of community agency counseling students. In the fall of 2005, this request was approved by the School of Education Graduate Council, the School of Education faculty and the University Academic Planning Committee. The course became a requirement for students admitted for the fall of 2006.

The additional requirement of these two courses resulted in a need to increase the number of hours required of community agency counseling students. The department recommended increasing the required hours that community counseling agency counseling students must take to 51. The request was approved by the School of Education Graduate Council, the School of Education faculty and the University Academic Planning Committee in the fall of 2005 and became a requirement for students admitted for the fall of 2006.

## **School Counseling**

During the summer of 2005 the department reviewed the syllabi of the coursework for the school counseling program. The department concluded that the program could be strengthened by the requirement of another school counseling specialty course. To address this issue, Dr. William Lawrence designed two courses to enhance the school counseling program: *Introduction to School Counseling* (CON 5303) and *Advanced School Counseling* (CON 5304). During the summer of 2005, the department recommended that these courses become a requirement for school counseling students. In the fall of 2005, this request was approved by the School of Education Graduate Council, the School of Education faculty and the University Academic Planning Committee. These courses became a requirement for students admitted for the fall of 2006.

## **Counselor Education Student/Alumni Competence**

### **Counseling Competence**

Prior to the summer of 2005, practicum and internship students were evaluated with the same generic evaluation tool by their site supervisors. During the summer of 2005, Dr. Chad Royal redesigned the *Practicum and Internship Evaluation* and created a tool for the career, community agency and school counseling students. These three tools evaluate the knowledge and skills students possess for the foundation of their area of study, the contextual dimensions for their area, and the skills of their area. This resulted in three effective tools for practicum and internship evaluation that provided more specific feedback to students and university supervisors. See Appendix.

In addition to completing an evaluation of the practicum and internship student skills, the practicum and internship site supervisors complete an evaluation of the counselor education program that their student is in. For example, these site supervisors evaluate how prepared their student was for conducting group counseling and other areas of professional development. The survey also provides the site supervisor with an opportunity to evaluate their interaction with the university supervisor.

Ratings range from 1 to 5 with 1 being very dissatisfied and 5 being very satisfied. Results from this survey indicate that supervisors were quite pleased with the preparation of our students with average yearly ratings ranging from 3.88 to 4.66. In 2005, the average rating for preparation for group counseling was 3.88 and the average rating for assessment of client/students was 3.95.

Regarding satisfaction with the faculty, site supervisors provided average yearly ratings ranging from 3.69 to 4.5. An average rating of 3.69 was obtained in 2006 for number of visits or contacts by the university supervisor and a rating for 3.8 (2004) and 3.9 (2006) were obtained for interactions with faculty.

Two years after graduation, alumni are asked to complete the *Alumni Survey*. During the summer of 2005, alumni who were mailed (and emailed) the survey were asked to assist the Department with getting their employer to complete the *Employer Survey*. Although the sample size may be small for this survey, we believe it provides rich information about our students.

The ratings for students range from 1 to 3 with 1=fair, 2=good and 3=excellent. Employers were asked to evaluate alumni employed by them skills, competence and demeanor. The average for the group ranged from 2.2 to 3. These preliminary findings indicate research skills need to be addressed. However, alumni received excellent ratings for professionalism, ethical behavior, working with individuals and relationships with colleagues. See Table 7.

### **Coursework Competence**

The Department has been using the *Counseling Preparatory Comprehensive Examination* (CPCE) as the comprehensive examination since 2002. This examination is used by over 100 counselor education programs throughout the United States as a comprehensive examination. For the purpose of this report, mean scores were obtained from the results of all 155 counseling students who had taken the examination. Those NCCU counseling student means were compared to the fall 2005 national means for this examination. See Table 8. NCCU students were below the spring 2005 national norms in every area except for *career & lifestyle development*. However, they were within the standard deviation of the spring 2005 national norm on every area.

Low CPCE scores were observed soon after the department implemented the CPCE. To address this issue, steps were made to implement examinations that included multiple choice assessments. Faculty also began advising students to take the examination later in the program. Student CPCE scores have significantly increased over time. An ANCOVA was used to analyze the data for this population with the covariate being time. The results were significant,  $f=2.36$ ,  $p=.02$  indicating over time (from 2002-2005) student CPCE results have significantly increased. Indeed, these changes are somewhat reflected after comparing 2002 results to 2005. See Table 9.

### **Professional Competence**

How are counselor education students doing two years removed from completing their programs? Results from the *Alumni Survey* provide valuable information about this question. In the *Alumni Survey*, 52% of the respondents were alumni of the school counseling program, 44% completed the community agency program and 4% were alumni of the career program. Eighty-nine percent were female and 11% were male. Seventy percent were working in a full time counseling position, 11% in a part-time counseling position, 15% in a non

counseling full-time position and 4% indicated being a stay at home parent. The respondents reported completing their program of study in a mean of 3.24 years.

Forty-one percent of the respondents were currently receiving counselor supervision. Four percent were licensed in North Carolina as a Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC), 7% were National Certified Counselors (NCC) and 37% were licensed school counselors. Thirty-three percent were members of the American Counseling Association, 44% were members of the North Carolina Counseling Association, 7% were members of the American Mental Health Counseling Association and 12% were members of the American School Counseling Association. Regarding income, 4% reported earning 0-\$10,000, 4% earned \$10,000-\$20,000, 12% earned \$20,000-\$30,000, 44% earned \$30,000-\$40,000, 22% earned \$40,000-\$50,000, and 7% earned \$50,000 or more and 7% did not respond.

On the Praxis, 83% of the school counseling students passed the Praxis on their first attempt. The NCCU average Praxis score was 618.88. In North Carolina, the Praxis passing score is 570.

### **Concerns Identified**

The results of this evaluation indicate concerns that require the attention of the department of counselor education. We suspect lower ratings by the site supervisors of the university supervisors is an indication that site supervisors desire more interaction and contact with university faculty. This has been hard to fulfill in the past due to a large number of practicum and internship students but will need attention by the department. In the fall of 2006, the department will have two new faculty members. We believe these faculty in conjunction with adjunct faculty will allow for more consistent site supervision by university faculty.

The initial school counseling pass rate of 83% for school counseling students needs to be addressed. Students also indicated on the CS that they desired more assistance with Praxis preparation. The department needs to address this issue this year and develop a plan for assisting students with Praxis preparation.

On the *Alumni Survey*, only 4% of the respondents indicated they were LPC's in North Carolina and only 7% were NCC's. It should be noted that there is nearly a two year supervision requirement after graduation before one can become a LPC or NCC. However, we would like to see an increase in this area. The department has already taken steps to address this concern. The National Counselor Examination is required for one to become a LPC in North Carolina or an NCC. The department has taken steps to become a NBCC testing site for our students and alumni. During the spring of 2006, the department implemented a policy where NCCU students who passed the CPCE would be allowed to take the NCE before graduation. This results in students graduating as LPC-eligible in North Carolina or NCC-eligible upon graduating from NCCU. We believe this

will impact the number of NCCU alumni who become NCC's and LPC's in North Carolina.

The department believes providing students with an opportunity to take the NCE will also assist in raising CPCE scores. The department has made progress with the increase of CPCE scores; however more needs to be done in this area. The department will continue to study the issue and consider raising the passing score of the CPCE.

Results from the *Alumni Survey* regarding professional involvement suggest that the department needs to take steps to help students develop a stronger professional identify. Perhaps, partnering with the student chapter of *Chi Sigma Iota* could assist with increasing this professional identification.

The department has made great progress on its three programs over the past three years. Close examination of this report and the implementation of continuous improvement activities will result in better programs and students who are better equipped for their roles as professional counselors.

Table 1

## Student Evaluation of Practicum/Internship Site

		<u>Year</u>	
	2004	2005	2006
<b>The Site</b>			
Opportunities to conduct Individual and group counseling	3.4	3.64	3.72
Opportunities to observe	3.3	3.64	3.78
Opportunities to work with Diverse populations	3.6	3.71	3.5
Appropriateness of facilities	3.4	3.5	3.61
<b>The Site Supervisor</b>			
Availability	3.6	3.57	3.78
Effectiveness of Supervision	3.4	3.6	3.7
Assistance with working with Diverse populations	3.8	3.64	3.5
<b>University Supervisor</b>			
Availability	3.6	3.89	3.78
Effectiveness of Supervision	3.3	3.57	3.78
Assistance with working with Diverse populations	3.3	3.67	3.61
<i>Note:</i> 4=Very Satisfied, 3=Somewhat Satisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 1=Very Dissatisfied			



Table 2

## Program Completer Survey

---

Satisfaction with...	2003	2004	2005	2006
Course offerings	3.6	3.5	3.75	3.75
Instructors	3.4	3.8	3.75	3.5
Advisement	3.2	3.7	3.5	3.5
Instruction	3.3	3.8	3.63	3.55
Internship	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.8
Preparation for Praxis	3.0	3.0	2.75	2.8
General support & accommodation	3.34	3.8	3.38	3.65
Prepared to...				
Enter profession	3.5	3.6	3.62	3.55
Deal with clients	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.55
Put theory into practice	3.62	3.75	3.3	3.26
Use appropriate techniques	3.5	3.78	3.4	3.3
Integrate technology	3.3	3.4	3.23	3.35
Handle issues of diversity	3.4	3.65	3.8	3.389

---

Note: 4=Very effective, 3=Somewhat effective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 1=Very ineffective

---

Table 3

## Alumni Satisfaction with Coursework

---

Please indicate how well each of the following courses prepared you to be a counselor

Course	1998-2002	2003-2005
Counseling Theories	3.14	3.33
Group Counseling	3.34	3.22
Vocational Theory	3.16	3.39
Cultural Diversity	3.26	3.56
School Course	3.31	3.06
Introduction to Agency	3.07	3.37
Psychosocial	3.26	3.01
Consultation	3.2	3.15
Assessment	3.32	3.59
Pre-practicum	3.45	3.46
Practicum/ Internship	3.5	3.73

---

Note: 4=Very effective, 3=Somewhat effective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 1=Very ineffective

---

Table 4

## Alumni Satisfaction with Preparation

---

How well did your counseling program prepare you in the following areas?

---

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Counseling Theories	3.33	0.78
As a practitioner	3.47	0.51
For your professional interests	3.33	0.62
For clinical experiences	3.36	0.56
Diverse Cultural settings	3.55	0.57

---

Note: 4=Very effective, 3=Somewhat effective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 1=Very ineffective

---

Table 5

## Alumni Satisfaction with support issues

---

Please indicate how well each of the following courses prepared you to be a counselor

Satisfaction with...	1998-2002	2003-2005
Quality of advising	3.76	3.3
Electives offered	2.8	3.07
Availability of electives	3.0	3.19
SOE Graduate Office	2.76	3.12
Benefits of thesis	3.06	3.0

---

*Note:* 4=Very effective, 3=Somewhat effective, 2=Somewhat ineffective, 1=Very ineffective

---

Table 6

## Site Supervisor Survey

Criteria	2004	2005	2006
<b>Satisfaction with NCCU student</b>			
Preparation for individual counseling	4.4	4.23	4.66
Preparation for group counseling	4.0	3.88	4.39
Preparation for assessment of client/students	4.2	3.94	4.44
Preparation for consultation	4.3	4.05	4.38
Ethical and Professional preparation	4.5	4.41	4.6
Preparation for working with diverse Populations	4.2	4.41	4.8
Professional Demeanor	4.6	4.56	4.57
<b>Satisfaction with NCCU faculty</b>			
Information received	4.5	4.43	4.0
Number of visits/contacts	4.1	4.13	3.69
Interactions with faculty	3.8	4.24	3.93
Internship/practicum process	4.4	4.25	4.1

*Note:* 5=very satisfied, 4=satisfied, 3=neutral, 2=dissatisfied, 1=very dissatisfied

Table 7

## Employer Survey Results

Professionalism	Mean	3
	SD	0
Ethical Behavior	Mean	3
	SD	0
Working with Families	Mean	2.8
	SD	0.422
Working with Individuals	Mean	3
	SD	0
Working with Groups	Mean	2.667
	SD	0.5
Working with Children	Mean	2.778
	SD	0.441
Administrative Skills	Mean	2.5
	SD	0.527
Time Management	Mean	2.7
	SD	0.483
Counseling Skills	Mean	2.8
	SD	0.422
Research Skills	Mean	2.222
	SD	0.441
Assessment Skills	Mean	2.6
	SD	0.516
Career Counseling	Mean	2.286
	SD	0.488
Ability to be Supervised	Mean	3
	SD	0

Relationship	Mean	3
W/ colleagues	SD	0

Table 7  
continued.....

Professional	Mean	2.9
Development	SD	0.316

Leadership	Mean	2.8
	SD	0.422

---

Note: 3=Excellent, 2=Good, 1=Fair

---

Table 8

## CPCE Results 2002-2005

Area	NCCU Norms	Spring 2005 National Norms
Human Growth & Development	<i>M</i> =9.98 <i>SD</i> =2.7	<i>M</i> =11.45 <i>SD</i> =2.33
Social & Cultural Foundations	<i>M</i> =10.16 <i>SD</i> =2.37	<i>M</i> =10.33 <i>SD</i> =2.29
Helping Relationships	<i>M</i> =10.43 <i>SD</i> =2.57	<i>M</i> =12.01 <i>SD</i> =2.10
Group Work	<i>M</i> =10.25 <i>SD</i> =2.7	<i>M</i> =11.62 <i>SD</i> =2.44
Career & Lifestyle Development	<i>M</i> =9.63 <i>SD</i> =2.24	<i>M</i> =9.45 <i>SD</i> =1.98
Appraisal	<i>M</i> =9.25 <i>SD</i> =2.14	<i>M</i> =10.43 <i>SD</i> =1.89
Research & Program Evaluation	<i>M</i> =9.34 <i>SD</i> =2.61	<i>M</i> =10.61 <i>SD</i> =2.24
Professional Orientation & Ethics	<i>M</i> =10.8 <i>SD</i> =2.41	<i>M</i> =12.09 <i>SD</i> =1.89
Total	<i>M</i> =80.03 <i>SD</i> =13.22	<i>M</i> =87.99 <i>SD</i> =11.55



Table 9

## 2002-2005 CPCE Progress

Area	Spring 2002	Fall 2005
Human Growth & Development	<i>M=8.37</i> <i>SD=2.6</i>	<i>M=9.8</i> <i>SD=2.5</i>
Social & Cultural Foundations	<i>M=9.37</i> <i>SD=2.12</i>	<i>M=9.48</i> <i>SD=2.4</i>
Helping Relationships	<i>M=9.12</i> <i>SD=2.5</i>	<i>M=10.4</i> <i>SD=1.58</i>
Group Work	<i>M=10.06</i> <i>SD=2.2</i>	<i>M=8.4</i> <i>SD=2.4</i>
Career & Lifestyle Development	<i>M=9.1</i> <i>SD=2.06</i>	<i>M=9.8</i> <i>SD=2.0</i>
Appraisal	<i>M=9.0</i> <i>SD=2.5</i>	<i>M=10.0</i> <i>SD=1.6</i>
Research & Program Evaluation	<i>M=8.1</i> <i>SD=2.9</i>	<i>M=10.0</i> <i>SD=2.4</i>
Professional Orientation & Ethics	<i>M=10.4</i> <i>SD=2.81</i>	<i>M=11.9</i> <i>SD=1.6</i>
Total	<i>M=77.15</i> <i>SD=15.68</i>	<i>M=79.9</i> <i>SD=10.4</i>