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 This program evaluation builds upon the three previous reports. Previous reports cited the importance of program evaluation and overviewed the basic elements of an evaluation. The literature review for those reports is relevant currently and will be summarized next.

The need for program evaluation in higher education generally (Alkin, 2003; Alkin & Christie, 1999; Alkin & Taut, 2003; Astin, 1991; Banta, 1988, Crisp, 2004; Gray & Diamond, 1989; Hyde, Lamb, & Chavis, 2008; Jennings, 1989; Loots, 2008; Mizikaci, 2006; Praslova, 2010; Venter & Bezuidenhout, 2008) and counselor education specifically (Bradley & Fiorini, 1999; Engels & Wilborn, 1984; Gaubatz & Vera, 2002; Hadley & Mitchell, 1995; Hansen, 2004; Hayes & Paisley, 2002; Kerri, Garcia, & McCullough, 2002; Loesch, 2001; Lusky & Hayes, 2001; Miller, 2004; Osborne & House, 1995; Sayers, Carroll, & Loesch, 1996; Whiston & Aricak, 2008) has been well-documented. In the above manuscripts, the authors document the importance of systematic program evaluation. Although program improvement was the most frequently cited rationale for conducting program evaluation, other frequently mentioned reasons include (a) accountability required by accreditation bodies, (b) compliance with state departments of education, (c) information to make available to administrators, (d) information to make available to students (prospective and current), (e) identification of strengths and weaknesses, (f) curriculum changes, and (g) the opportunity to have feedback from graduates of the program and the employers of the graduates of the program.

 Although total consensus does not exist regarding all aspects of program evaluation, researchers (Cooksy, 2008; Durlak, 2008; Gondolf, 2008; Jacobs, Roberts, & Vernberg, 2008; Jerry, 2005; Matsuba, Elder, Petrucci, & Marleau, 2008) do agree on the importance of program evaluation. Further, many researchers agree on the basic components. For example, Astramovich and Coker (2007), Carone and Burker (2007), Ewell (1997), Jerry (2005), Hansen (2004), and Lusky and Hayes (2001) suggest that the quality of a program must contain more than the perceptions of the faculty. They advocated that program evaluation must include information from the graduates of the program and the employers of the graduates. Further, Engles and Wilborn (1984), Hayes and Paisley (2002), Loesch (2001), Osborne and House (1995), and Sayers, Carroll, and Loesch (1996) concluded that effective program evaluation must not only include the systematic collection of data from students and graduates, but in addition, it must include data from other sources.

 In addition to the universal need for program evaluation, the counseling program (EPCE) at Texas Tech University (TTU) has a mandate to conduct evaluations from The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and from the College of Education (COE). To achieve consistency with the two previous evaluations, questionnaires were completed by current students, by graduates from the fall of 2008 to the fall of 2011, and by employers of graduates. This questionnaire, the Program Graduate Survey, is based on assessment inventories developed by Sayers, Carroll, and Loesch (1996). It consists of demographic information, 16 items pertaining to general aspects of the program, 20 items on knowledge areas from the program, and 13 items on skill development in the program. Items were rated on a 10-point Likert Scale with a 1=low/poor and 10=high/very good.

This evaluation will first consider findings relevant to the admission process, followed by a summarization of student evaluations of faculty instruction, outcomes for students who exit the program, and for students who seek LPC licensure and school counseling certification in the state of Texas.

**Evaluation Findings for the Master’s and Doctoral Degree Programs**

**Admissions**

 In the evaluation report of 2004-2008, Dr. Eugene Wang analyzed students' GRE scores in terms of their ability to predict their performance on the Master's Comprehensive Examination. The Master's Comprehensive Examination is a national exam, the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE), which is developed and scored by the Center for Credentialing and Education (CCE), a branch of the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC). Dr. Wang (personal communication) found that 40% of the variance on the CPCE could be explained by the students' GRE scores (Verbal plus Quantitative). The following graph depicts percentage of students who would pass the CPCE based on the GRE scores below and above 730.

*Tree Predicting Performance on the CPCE Based on GRE Scores*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Node 0 |  |
| Category | % | n |
| Fail | 10.07 | 15 |
| Pass | 89.93 | 134 |
| Total | (100.00) | 149 |

GRE\_TOTAL

Adj.P-value =0.0004, Chi-square = 19.7160, df=1

>730

<=730

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Node 2 |  |
| Category | % | n |
| Fail | 4.92 | 6 |
| Pass | 95.08 | 116 |
| Total | (100.00) | 122 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Node 1 |  |
| Category | % | n |
| Fail | 33.33 | 9 |
| Pass | 66.67 | 18 |
| Total | (100.00) | 27 |

 This flow chart indicates that a third of students with a combined Verbal and Quantitative score on the GRE of less than 730 are likely to fail the Master's Comprehensive Exam one-third of the time whereas those with a combined score of 730 or higher are likely to pass the Exam ninety-five percent of the time. Thus, GRE scores should and do weight heavily in admission decisions along with other factors in the program's review of applications for admissions.

**Student Evaluation of Faculty Instruction**

Unlike previous evaluations, this evaluation looked at student evaluations of instruction in counselor education classes. The data are based on a required evaluation form used at Texas Tech University. The form consists of sixteen items on a five-point scale with higher scores indicating positive perceptions of the course and instructor. Full-time faculty members (N=6) in counselor education over the period of fall 2008 through fall 2011 obtained a mean rating of 4.68. This mean exceeds the mean ratings for the College of Education (COE) and Texas Tech University (TTU), which typically fall near a mean of 4.5. Mean rating for faculty members ranged from a low of 4.39 to a high of 4.9. The mean rating for adjuncts (N=4) equaled 4.14. Means for adjunct ranged from a low of 3.79 to a high of 4.58. A *t*-test revealed that the difference between the ratings of full-time faculty members compared to adjuncts was significant, *t*(53) = 5.03,  *p* < .001. In addition, to determine if class size was related to ratings of instruction, the correlation was computed and was determined to be non-significant, *r*(53) = .052, *p* = .707. These analyses point to several conclusions and recommendations. First, full-time faculty members receive very favorable student evaluations of their classes. Second, adjunct faculty fair less well and on average are rated below the mean of the COE and TTU. Finally, class size appears unrelated to how well students rate faculty instruction. Thus, whenever administratively possible, instruction should be delivered by full-time, tenured or tenure-acquiring faculty rather than adjunct faculty.

**Master's Comprehensive Examination Performance**

 Table 1 provides the mean percentile equivalents of our graduates on the CPCE Exam. Percentile equivalent scores were calculated using national and normative values provided by the CCE. The scores span semesters beginning in the fall of 2008, and ending in the spring of 2011.

Table 1

*TTU Graduate’s Percentile Equivalents on CPCE Exam*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  Aspect of the program 2011 Percentile Rank (n=51) | 2008 Percentile Rank (n=118) |
| Human Growth and Development  | 65 | 56 |
| Social and Cultural Foundations  | 54 | 40 |
| Helping Relationships  | 69 | 56 |
| Group Work  | 72 | 60 |
| Career and Lifestyle Development  | 79 | 73 |
| Appraisal  | 66 | 60 |
| Research and Program Evaluation  | 74 | 57 |
| Professional Ethics  | 81 | 58 |
| *Overall Mean* | *70* | *58* |

 The relative performance of students taking the CPCE exam from the fall of 2008 through the spring 2011 indicates strengths in content areas related to ethics, career, research, and groups while relative weakness was evident in the area of social foundations. This relative pattern was also evident in the 2008 evaluation. It is highly noteworthy, however, that gains in every area on the CPCE exam were made by students in the current evaluation period. Similarly, the overall mean percentile equivalent score of our students placed them in the upper 1/3 of all students taking this exam. These data support the conclusion that masters-level students exit the program with high levels of knowledge in the major areas of counseling.

**Licensed Professional Counseling (LPC) Scores**

 Graduates majoring in the community-counseling track take an exam to obtain licensure as professional counselors (LPCs). Table 2 summarizes the results of TTU graduates, compared to graduates of other training programs in Texas, on the licensure exam used by the Texas Board of Examiners of Licensed Professional Counselors. The exam is developed and scored by the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC). The NBCC uses several forms, and the following tables report the results for the various forms of the exam. Results are reported for both our graduates and graduates of the other training programs in Texas.

Table 2(a)

*Summary of Percent Correct Scores on the NCE Exam for Licensure in Texas*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic areas | Form 146105TTUMean Scores(n=11) | Form 146105StatewideMean Scores(N=906) | Form 146204TTUMean Scores(n=8) | Form 146204StatewideMean Scores(n=897) |
| Human Growth & Dev.  | 76 | 70 | 65 | 66 |
| Social & Cultural Found | 72 | 67 | 58 | 59 |
| Helping Relationships | 76 | 75 | 76 | 74 |
| Group Dynamics | 79 | 75 | 78 | 77 |
| Career Development | 68 | 64 | 60 | 61 |
| Appraisal | 68 | 70 | 61 | 64 |
| Research & Evaluation | 61 | 57 | 69 | 61 |
| Professional Orientation | 84 | 78 | 79 | 80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Overall mean* | *73.9* | *70.9* | *70.2* | *69.6* |
| *Passing rate* | *100%**(11 of 11)* | *85%**(768 of 906)* | *88%**(7 of 8)* | *89%**(796 of 897)* |

Table 2(b)

*Continuation of Table 2(a)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic areas | Form 146108TTUMean Scores(n=10) | Form 146108StatewideMean Scores(N=906) | Form 146204TTUMean Scores(n=8) | Form 146204StatewideMean Scores(N=897) |
| Human Growth & Dev.  | 71 | 72 | 77 | 73 |
| Social & Cultural Found | 74 | 71 | 80 | 72 |
| Helping Relationships | 71 | 72 | 85 | 72 |
| Group Dynamics | 74 | 71 | 80 | 73 |
| Career Development | 66 | 65 | 76 | 65 |
| Appraisal | 62 | 64 | 78 | 68 |
| Research & Evaluation | 63 | 62 | 76 | 62 |
| Professional Orientation | 80 | 79 | 80 | 72 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Overall mean* | *70.6* | *70.1* | *79.8* | *69.6* |
| *Passing rate* | *80%**(8 of 10)* | *84%**(638 of 760)* | *100%**(8 of 8)* | *89%**(723 of 816)* |

Taken together, for the period spanning the fall of 2008 through the spring of 2011, thirty-four of thirty-seven students passed the LPC exam for licensure in Texas, for a pass rate of ninety-two percent. By comparison, the pass rate at the state level for the same period was eighty-seven percent. The relative performance of our students by area compared to other students in Texas indicated strength in the following areas: professional orientation, human growth and development, research and evaluation, career, and group. Unlike the results on the CPCE, graduates did well on the NCE Exam in the area of social and cultural foundations.

**Certification of School Counselors in Texas**

 Results of TTU graduates of the school counseling track on the TExES Exam for certification in School Counseling shows a passing rate of 100 %. Table 3 depicts the mean scores of EPCE graduates (n=7) compared to the mean scores all Texas examinees (N=1243) across three domain areas.

Table 3

*TExES Mean Scores by Domain Areas for EPCE and State Graduates*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Domain Areas | EPCE Mean Scores | State Mean Scores |
| Understanding Students | 274.9 | 256.9 |
| Planning and Implementing the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program | 263.9 | 256.2 |
| Collaboration, Consultation, and Professionalism | 264.0 | 256.6 |
| *Overall Means* | *269.4* | *256.6* |

Table 3 clearly indicates that EPCE graduates perform well on the state examination for school counseling certification. Comparisons with state means show that EPCE graduates excelled in all domain areas of the TExES.

**Perceptions of Graduates Regarding the Counseling Program**

A questionnaire was completed by TTU graduates from the masters and doctoral programs for the period beginning in the fall, 2008, and ending in the spring, 2011. This questionnaire, the Program Graduate Survey, is based on assessment inventories developed by Sayers, Carroll, and Loesch (1996). It consists of demographic information, 16 items pertaining to General Aspects of the program, 20 items on Knowledge Areas from the program, and 13 items on Skill Development in the program. Items were rated on a 10-point Likert Scale with a 1=low/poor and 10=high/very good.

Table 4(a)

*Means and Standard Deviations by Item on the Survey for the 2008 and the 2011 Program Evaluation*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Year |
|   |   | 2011 |  |  | 2008 |  |
| Aspects of the Program | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| The duration (i.e., academic length) of the program(s) | 17 | 9.29 | 0.59 | 24 | 8.63 | 1.36 |
| The accessibility/availability of the program faculty | 17 | 9.41 | 0.62 | 25 | 8.79 | 1.17 |

Table 4(b)

*Continuation of Table 4(a)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Year |
|   |  | 2011 |  |  | 2008 |  |
| Aspects of the Program | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| The facilities and resources available for the program(s) | 17 | 8.88 | 1.17 | 25 | 8.39 | 1.45 |
| The supervised, field-based experiences (i.e., practica or internships) overall | 17 | 9.00 | 0.94 | 25 | 8.70 | 2.15 |
| The site host supervisors for supervised, field-based experiences | 17 | 8.82 | 1.01 | 25 | 8.79 | 1.26 |
| The on-campus, individual supervisors for supervised, field-based experiences | 17 | 9.35 | 1.00 | 25 | 9.07 | 1.94 |
| The program’s curriculum (i.e., the curriculum in general) | 17 | 9.18 | 0.64 | 25 | 8.71 | 1.08 |
| The academic/professional knowledge taught to you | 17 | 9.24 | 0.90 | 25 | 9.00 | 0.90 |
| The in-program, on-campus supervised practice experiences | 17 | 9.00 | 0.87 | 24 | 8.04 | 2.27 |
| The on-campus, group supervisors for supervised field-based experiences | 17 | 9.35 | 0.93 | 24 | 9.07 | 1.96 |
| The academic advisement you received | 17 | 8.18 | 2.21 | 25 | 7.54 | 2.19 |
| The professional competence of the program faculty | 17 | 9.35 | 0.86 | 24 | 9.07 | 1.96 |
| The in-program student evaluation procedures | 17 | 8.94 | 0.66 | 25 | 8.21 | 1.40 |
| The professional skills taught to you | 17 | 9.24 | 0.83 | 25 | 8.75 | 0.97 |
| The instructional, classroom (i.e., teaching) effectiveness | 17 | 8.88 | 0.70 | 24 | 8.44 | 1.84 |
| *Overall Mean and Standard Deviation* |  | *9.09* | *0.92* |  |  *8.59* | *1.65* |

Overall, it appears that the 2011 evaluation ratings trended higher than the 2008 evaluation, though both ratings indicate very positive perceptions of the program aspects by the graduates. On a relative basis, the lowest rating was given to academic advisement, which was somewhat puzzling, given that the two highest ratings were for faculty as mentors and for faculty availability/accessibility.

Table 5(a)

*Descriptive Statistics from Ratings of Knowledge Based Items by Graduates*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Year |
|   |  | 2011 |  | 2008 |  |
| Knowledge Areas | N | Mean |  Standard Deviation | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Ethical and legal issues in your profession | 17 | 9.35 | 0.99 | 25 | 9.18 | 1.47 |
| Dysfunctional behavior (abnormal) | 17 | 8.53 | 1.07 | 22 | 7.75 | 3.06 |
| Small group dynamics and counseling | 17 | 9.18 | 1.01 | 25 | 9.00 | 0.9 |
| Career and lifestyle counseling | 17 | 8.00 | 1.77 | 25 | 7.54 | 1.84 |
| Family counseling | 17 | 8.76 | 1.03 | 25 | 7.86 | 1.41 |
| Human growth and development | 17 | 8.53 | 1.37 | 25 | 8.11 | 1.34 |
| Large group dynamics and counseling | 17 | 8.94 | 1.30 | 25 | 8.32 | 1.39 |
| Theories of counseling (or student development) | 17 | 9.35 | 0.70 | 25 | 8.29 | 1.44 |
| Research and statistics | 17 | 7.47 | 1.97 | 25 | 7.50 | 1.48 |
| Accountability procedures | 17 | 8.53 | 1.36 | 24 | 7.67 | 2.91 |
| Theories of personality | 17 | 8.75 | 1.18 | 24 | 7.48 | 2.03 |
| Multicultural counseling | 17 | 9.29 | 1.10 | 25 | 8.64 | 1.45 |
| Professional credentialing | 17 | 8.53 | 1.07 | 25 | 7.89 | 2.11 |
| Professional organizations | 17 | 8.00 | 1.94 | 25 | 8.00 | 1.89 |
| Psychological (i.e., clinical) diagnosis | 17 | 8.47 | 1.42 | 23 | 6.96 | 2.64 |
| Standardized (i.e. group) testing | 17 | 7.88 | 1.69 | 24 | 7.04 | 1.99 |

Table 5(b)

*Continuation of Table 5(a)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Year |
|   |  | 2011 |  |  | 2008 |  |
| Knowledge Areas | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Case planning/management | 17 | 8.06 | 1.14 | 24 | 6.93 | 2.58 |
| Crisis intervention/counseling | 17 | 8.00 | 1.32 | 25 | 7.5 | 2.19 |
| Counseling persons with special needs | 17 | 7.18 | 1.67 | 25 | 6.96 | 1.67 |
| *Overall Mean and Standard Deviation* |  | *8.43* | *1.34* |  | *7.79* | *1.91* |

 Similar to items on Aspects of the program, the 2011 evaluation on Knowledge yielded ratings that trended higher than those in the 2008 evaluation. Knowledge areas rated highest (>9.0) were ethical and legal issues, group dynamics, counseling theories, and multicultural counseling. Scores falling below ratings of 8.0, which indicate relative weakness, include research and statistics, standardized testing, consultation, and counseling persons with special needs. In some respects the findings about relative weakness in Knowledge areas is not surprising because coursework in the area of consultation and serving persons with special needs is not required. Faculty may wish to advise more students to consider taking electives in areas identified here as the program moves from forty-eight to sixty hours.

Table 6(a)

*Descriptive Statistics from Ratings of Skills-Based Items by Graduates*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Year |
|  | 2011 |  |  | 2008 |  |
| Skills | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Individual counseling | 17 | 9.24 | 0.83 | 25 | 8.71 | 1.18 |
| Small group counseling | 17 | 8.94 | 0.90 | 25 | 8.82 | 0.86 |
| Career and lifestyle counseling | 17 | 7.88 | 2.24 | 25 | 7.36 | 1.85 |
| Large group counseling/guidance skills | 17 | 8.65 | 1.11 | 25 | 7.96 | 1.97 |
| Family counseling | 17 | 8.41 | 1.42 | 25 | 7.75 | 1.62 |

Table 6(b)

*Continuation of Table 6(a)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Year |
|  | 2011 |  |  | 2008 |  |
| Skills | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Clinical (psycho) diagnosis | 17 | 8.06 | 1.56 | 23 | 7.04 | 2.76 |
| Consultation | 17 | 8.00 | 1.41 | 25 | 7.00 | 2.34 |
| Child and adolescent counseling | 17 | 7.94 | 1.64 | 25 | 7.41 | 2.45 |
| Crisis intervention/counseling | 17 | 8.12 | 1.05 | 25 | 7.32 | 2.29 |
| Assessment | 17 | 7.76 | 1.6 | 25 | 7.00 | 1.7 |
| Counseling persons with special needs | 17 | 7.12 | 1.65 | 25 | 7.00 | 1.68 |
| Case planning/management | 17 | 7.82 | 1.38 | 25 | 7.04 | 2.57 |
| *Overall Mean and Standard Deviation* |  | *8.24* | *1.37* |  | *7.6* | *1.88* |

 Again, the pattern evident for the area of Skills is that the 2011 evaluation received more favorable ratings regarding Skills than was evident in the 2008 evaluation. Skill areas of relative strength (>9) included individual counseling and multicultural counseling. The one Skill area identified as relatively weakest was counseling persons with special needs. The findings regarding Skills are consistent with those found for Knowledge.

**Perceptions of Current Doctoral and Masters Students Regarding the Counseling Program**

Table 7(a)

*Descriptive Statistics from Ratings of General Aspects of the Program by Current Students*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aspects of the program | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Professional skills | 16 | 8.81 | 1.52 |
| The on-campus, individual supervision | 14 | 9.00 | 1.47 |
| The Program's curriculum (i.e., the curriculum in general) | 16 | 9.00 | 1.37 |
|  The academic/professional knowledge taught to you | 16 | 8.94 | 1.44 |
| The supervised, field-based experience (i.e., practice or internship) overall | 15 | 8.67 | 1.91 |
| The site host supervisors for supervised, field-based experience | 14 | 9.00 | 1.24 |

Table 7(b)

*Continuation of Table 7(a)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aspects of the program | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| The instructional class-room (i.e., teaching) effectiveness | 16 | 8.75 | 1.44 |
| The professional competence of the program faculty | 16 | 9.38 | 1.15 |
| The accessibility/availability of the program faculty | 16 | 8.75 | 1.48 |
| The academic advisement you received | 16 | 8.31 | 2.12 |
| The facilities and resources available for the program(s) | 16 | 8.44 | 1.46 |
| The in-program, on-campus supervised practice experience | 15 | 8.67 | 1.99 |
| Faculty as mentors | 16 | 9.13 | 1.26 |
| The in-program student evaluation procedures | 16 | 8.44 | 2.31 |
| The duration (i.e., academic length) of the program(s) | 16 | 8.94 | 1.00 |
| *Overall Mean and Standard Deviation* |  | *8.81* | *1.55* |

 Overall, current students rated Aspects of the program very favorably with mean rating falling at 8.8. Students were especially favorable about faculty serving as mentors and the faculty’s professional competence. On a relative basis, students were less positive about advisement. It is unclear how to reconcile these findings in that one would typically see mentoring and advisement as highly correlated. One possible explanation for the relatively low ratings regarding advisement is that most students work full time and live off campus.

Table 8(a)

*Descriptive Statistics from Ratings of Knowledge Based Items by Current Students*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Knowledge Areas | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Ethic and Legal Issues in Counseling | 16 | 9.13 | 1.02 |
| Small Group Dynamics and Counseling | 15 | 9.20 | 1.01 |
| Theories of Counseling | 15 | 8.73 | 1.71 |
| Career and Lifestyle Counseling | 14 | 8.71 | 1.49 |
| Multicultural Counseling | 15 | 8.40 | 1.50 |
| Human Growth and Development | 15 | 8.40 | 1.50 |

Table 8(b)

*Continuation of 8(a)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Knowledge Areas | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Standardized (i.e., group) testing | 15 | 8.07 | 2.09 |
| Crisis Intervention/Counseling | 14 | 8.36 | 1.78 |
| Consultation | 15 | 7.73 | 2.74 |
| Psychological (i.e., Clinical) Diagnosis | 15 | 8.07 | 2.09 |
| Professional Credentials | 15 | 8.27 | 2.09 |
| Abnormal Psychology | 15 | 8.07 | 2.09 |
| Theories of Personality | 15 | 7.47 | 2.36 |
| Family Counseling | 16 | 7.81 | 2.34 |
| Case Planning/Management | 15 | 8.13 | 1.85 |
| Accountability Procedures | 15 | 8.33 | 1.91 |
| Counseling Persons with Special Needs | 15 | 8.47 | 3.12 |
| Professional Organizations | 15 | 8.80 | 1.37 |
| Research and Statistics | 15 | 8.33 | 1.63 |
| *Overall Mean and Standard Deviation* |  | *8.37* | *1.84* |

 The pattern evident for ratings of Knowledge areas by current students parallels that found for graduates, namely, that the areas of legal/ethics and group dynamics were rated very favorably while consultation was rated relatively less favorably. Theories of personality was rated less favorably than other Knowledge areas, which is not surprising because coursework in this area would only be taken as an elective.

Table 9(a)

*Descriptive Statistics from Ratings of Skill-Based Items by Current Students*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Skills | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Individual Counseling | 14 | 9.21 | 1.37 |
| Small Group Counseling | 14 | 9.00 | 1.04 |
| Multicultural Counseling | 14 | 8.79 | 1.25 |
| Large Group Counseling/Guidance skills | 14 | 8.79 | 1.31 |
| Career and Lifestyle Counseling | 14 | 8.57 | 1.79 |
| Crisis Intervention/ Counseling | 13 | 8.31 | 1.97 |
| Child Intervention/ Counseling | 14 | 8.36 | 1.82 |

Table 9(b)

*Continuation of Table 9(a)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Skills | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Consultation | 14 | 8.07 | 1.98 |
| Case Planning/ Management | 14 | 8.79 | 1.48 |
| Clinical (Psycho) Diagnosis | 14 | 7.93 | 2.59 |
| Counseling Persons with Special Needs | 14 | 8.57 | 1.55 |
| Assessment | 14 | 8.21 | 2.04 |
| *Overall Mean and Standard Deviation* |  | *8.50* | *1.72* |

The mean rating Skills by current students was very favorable with a mean of 8.5. Areas of relative strength (>9) included individual counseling and small group counseling. On a relative basis, students rated Skills related to clinical diagnosis below the overall mean.

**Perceptions of Employers/Supervisors and Advisory Board Members (constituents) of TTU Graduates**

Table 10(a)

*Descriptive Statistics from Ratings of General Attributes of the Program by Employers/Supervisors/Board Members*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Year |
|  | 2011 |  | 2008 |
| Attributes of the Program | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Dependability, conscientiousness and responsibility | 17 | 9.53 | 0.80 | 15 | 9.13 | 1.20 |
| Responsiveness to supervision, feedback, and/or suggestions | 17 | 9.65 | 0.70 | 15 | 9.07 | 1.18 |
| Professional, ethical and legal behavior | 17 | 9.29 | 0.77 | 15 | 9.40 | 0.95 |
| Professional development | 17 | 9.35 | 0.79 | 15 | 9.27 | 1.12 |
| General work attitude and enthusiasm | 17 | 9.65 | 0.70 | 15 | 9.20 | 1.11 |

Table 10(b)

*Continuation of 10(a)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Year |
|  | 2011 |  | 2008 |
| Attributes of the Program | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Relationships with other employees | 16 | 9.44 | 0.73 | 15 | 9.13 | 1.09 |
| Professional demeanor | 17 | 9.47 | 0.94 | 15 | 9.27 | 0.93 |
| Overall competence | 17 | 9.06 | 0.83 | 15 | 9.33 | 0.79 |
| Multicultural and gender sensitivity | 15 | 9.20 | 0.94 | 15 | 9.20 | 0.91 |
| *Overall Mean and Standard Deviation* |  | *9.40* | *0.80* |   | *9.22* | *1.03* |

 Although the mean ratings on program Attributes by constituents was somewhat higher for the 2011 evaluation than that for the 2008 evaluation, the pattern of ratings by item yields a variable pattern of favorability. For the 2011 evaluation, students’ responsiveness to supervision, feedback, and suggestions was rated very positively with all other areas also achieving high ratings.

Table 11(a)

*Descriptive Statistics from Ratings of Skill-Based Items by Employers/Supervisors*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Year |
|  |   |  | 2011 |  |  | 2008 |
| Skills | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Child and adolescent counseling | 15 | 8.53 | 1.55 | 13 | 9.15 | 0.86 |
| Consultation | 15 | 8.73 | 0.96 | 14 | 8.57 | 1.40 |
| Individual counseling | 17 | 9.18 | 0.88 | 15 | 9.20 | 1.22 |
| Crisis intervention/counseling | 15 | 8.87 | 0.74 | 15 | 8.93 | 1.00 |
| Large group counseling and guidance skills | 15 | 8.67 | 1.40 | 14 | 8.79 | 1.08 |
| Small group counseling | 17 | 8.82 | 1.07 | 15 | 9.07 | 0.93 |
| Case planning and management | 15 | 8.60 | 1.12 | 15 | 8.53 | 1.20 |

Table 11(b)

*Continuation of Table 11(a)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Year |
|  |  | 2011 |  |  | 2008 |
| Skills | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Family counseling Assessment | 14 | 8.36 | 1.22 | 14 | 8.29 | 1.03 |
| Clinical (psycho) diagnosis | 14 | 8.43 | 1.16 | 11 | 8.00 | 1.21 |
| Assessment | 16 | 8.56 | 1.31 | 15 | 8.80 | 1.17 |
| Multicultural counseling | 16 | 9.06 | 0.93 | 15 | 8.47 | 1.15 |
| Career and lifestyle counseling | 16 | 8.63 | 1.26 | 13 | 8.69 | 1.26 |
| Couples/marriage counseling | 13 | 8.08 | 1.44 | 9 | 7.67 | 1.05 |
| *Overall Mean and Standard Deviation* | *15.21* | *8.65* | *1.15* |  | *8.64* | *1.12* |

No significant overall mean differences were evident in how constituents rated Skills over the two evaluation periods. For the 2011 evaluation, individual and multicultural counseling Skills were rated very favorably. On a relative basis for the 2011 evaluation, Skills related to couples and marriage counseling were rated as less favorable. The same relative strengths and weakness were evident in the 2008 evaluation.

Table 12(a)

*Descriptive Statistics from Ratings of Professional Knowledge Items by Constituents*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Year |
|  |  | 2011 |  |  | 2008 |  |
| Professional Knowledge Areas | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Ethical and legal issues | 17 | 9.06 | 0.97 | 15 | 9.33 | 0.87 |
| Professional credentialing | 17 | 8.65 | 1.17 | 13 | 8.62 | 1.33 |
| Theories of counseling (or student development) | 17 | 8.71 | 1.10 | 15 | 8.80 | 0.91 |
| Crisis intervention/counseling | 15 | 8.87 | 0.74 | 15 | 8.73 | 1.12 |
| Counseling persons with special needs | 15 | 9.00 | 0.76 | 13 | 8.92 | 1.00 |

Table 12(b)

*Continuation of Table 12(a)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Year |
|  |  | 2011 |  | 2008 |
| Professional Knowledge Areas | N | Mean | Standard Deviation | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Small group dynamics and counseling | 17 | 8.53 | 1.12 | 15 | 9.13 | 0.88 |
| Case planning and management | 16 | 8.88 | 0.96 | 15 | 8.80 | 0.91 |
| Accountability procedures | 15 | 9.20 | 0.86 | 15 | 8.80 | 1.38 |
| Large group dynamics and counseling | 15 | 8.53 | 1.46 | 14 | 8.93 | 1.10 |
| Human growth and development | 16 | 8.56 | 1.15 | 14 | 8.71 | 1.16 |
| Abnormal psychology | 16 | 8.44 | 1.15 | 13 | 8.69 | 1.20 |
| Professional organizations | 15 | 8.67 | 1.11 | 12 | 8.75 | 1.16 |
| Theories of personality | 17 | 8.47 | 1.23 | 14 | 8.79 | 0.94 |
| Psychological (i.e., clinical) diagnosis | 15 | 8.33 | 1.05 | 13 | 8.15 | 1.35 |
| Multicultural counseling | 16 | 8.81 | 0.98 | 15 | 8.60 | 0.95 |
| Career and lifestyle counseling | 16 | 8.31 | 1.40 | 14 | 8.50 | 1.18 |
| Family counseling | 15 | 8.53 | 1.36 | 14 | 8.50 | 1.05 |
| Standardized (e.g., group) testing | 16 | 8.56 | 1.46 | 13 | 8.85 | 1.23 |
| Research and statistics | 15 | 8.20 | 1.37 | 12 | 8.58 | 1.11 |
| *Overall Mean and Standard Deviation* | *15.75* | *8.67* | *1.11* |  | *8.76* | *1.10* |

 Constituents from the two evaluation periods, on average, tended to rate Knowledge areas at the same level. For the 2011 evaluation period, ethics and accountability were rated as relatively best. Diagnosis and research/statistics were rated less favorably in 2011.

**Scholarly Productivity of Doctoral Students**

Eight students were awarded a Ph.D. from the EPCE Program from 2008 through May 2011. Current students report having thirty publications over this period. In addition, they made sixty-five presentations at professional meetings or conferences during this time. Only one student failed to pass the qualifying exam on the first try and all completed this requirement with one re-take.

**Employment of Doctoral Students**

Of the eight graduates, six are teaching at the college/university level. One graduate is the director of a private health foundation, and the other graduate is continuing to search for a position in academia.

**Summary and Conclusions**

**Program Strengths**

 Overall, the 2011 evaluation results compared favorably to the results of the 2008 evaluation. CPCE mean percentile scores in 2011 (70) surpassed the mean percentile scores in 2008 (58) by 12 points. In addition, the perceptions of current students and graduates of the EPCE Program as measured by the Program Graduate Survey tended to be higher in 2011 than in 2008 in program Aspects, Knowledge, and Skills, although the absolute values from both evaluation periods were very positive. The pass rate on the exam for licensure as a LPC in Texas for both evaluation periods was quite high, achieving rates above 90%. All graduates who took the Texas state exam for certification as a school counselor passed in both evaluation periods. Student evaluations of regular faculty members were very favorable, exceeding the College and University mean ratings. Employers, site supervisors, and board members from both evaluation periods rated students and the program in a very positive light in both evaluation periods.

**Program Weaknesses**

On a relative basis, evaluations from both 2011 and 2008 indicated weakness in the following areas: research and statistics, standardized testing, consultation, diagnosis, and counseling persons with special needs. The findings also suggested that advisement was rated somewhat less favorably than most other areas, but this seemed incongruent with the finding that students viewed the faculty as highly competent and excellent mentors.

**Recommendations**

The aforementioned areas of relative weakness might be addressed through offering one-hour seminar courses as the program moves from forty-eight hours to sixty hours for mental health counseling. Elective coursework, in Special Education for example, outside the program could be encouraged to augment core course requirements. The topic of diagnosis could be addressed more directly in the course in dysfunctional behavior and the course in testing. Given the very favorable outcomes evident in this and the previous evaluation, perhaps the program should insure that it preserves those aspects which produce such stellar outcomes. Specifically, future hires should show evidence of outstanding teaching, as well as solid scholarship and professional involvement with the American Counseling Association.
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**Appendix A**

**Program Graduate Survey**

***TTU Counselor Education Program***

***Survey***

*Please provide the following information as appropriate:*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 (OPTIONAL)

Age: \_\_\_\_\_ Gender: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Race/Ethnicity: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Degree(s) you are working toward from the counselor education program. For masters degree graduates, please indicate your major emphasis of study (school or community agency). For doctoral graduates, there is one major emphasis (counselor education).

1. Degree sought (x):

 Ph.D.:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 ME.D.: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Community Counseling)

 ME.D.: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (School Counseling)

2. How many hours have you completed in your program to date? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. In regard to your ***current*** employment, what is (are) your:

 Job Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Agency/Institution name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 City/State Location: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Primary Clientele: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Primary Job Functions: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

4. What professional certifications and/or licensures do you currently hold? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Please complete this questionnaire in class, and return it.

Thank you for your participation.

***General Aspects of the Program***

Please use a scale of **1 = low/poor to 10 = high/very good** to indicate your personal evaluation of each of the following *general aspects* of the counselor education program:

\_\_\_\_\_ The program's curriculum (i.e., the curriculum in general)

\_\_\_\_\_ The academic/professional knowledge taught to you

\_\_\_\_\_ The professional skills taught to you

\_\_\_\_\_ The supervised, field-based experiences (i.e., practice or internships) overall

\_\_\_\_\_ The site host supervisors for supervised, field-based experiences

\_\_\_\_\_ The on-campus, individual supervisors for supervised, field-based experiences

\_\_\_\_\_ The on-campus, group supervisors for supervised field-based experiences

\_\_\_\_\_ The instructional, classroom (i.e., teaching) effectiveness

\_\_\_\_\_ The professional competence of the program faculty

\_\_\_\_\_ The accessibility/availability of the program faculty

\_\_\_\_\_ The academic advisement you received

\_\_\_\_\_ The facilities and resources available for the program(s)

\_\_\_\_\_ The in-program, on-campus supervised practice experiences

\_\_\_\_\_ The faculty as mentors to you

\_\_\_\_\_ The in-program student evaluation procedures

\_\_\_\_\_ The duration (i.e., academic length) of the program(s)

***Knowledge Areas in the Programs(s)***

Please use a scale of **1 = low/poor to 10 = high/very good** to indicate your personal evaluation of your preparation in each of the following knowledge areas in the EPCE program:

\_\_\_\_\_ Ethical and legal issues in your profession

\_\_\_\_\_ Small group dynamics and counseling

\_\_\_\_\_ Theories of counseling (or student development)

\_\_\_\_\_ Career and lifestyle counseling

\_\_\_\_\_ Multicultural counseling

\_\_\_\_\_ Human growth and development

\_\_\_\_\_ Large group dynamics and counseling

\_\_\_\_\_ Standardized (i.e., group) testing

\_\_\_\_\_ Crisis intervention/counseling

\_\_\_\_\_ Consultation

\_\_\_\_\_ Psychological (i.e., clinical) diagnosis

\_\_\_\_\_ Professional credentialing

\_\_\_\_\_ Abnormal psychology

\_\_\_\_\_ Theories of personality

\_\_\_\_\_ Family counseling

\_\_\_\_\_ Case planning/management

\_\_\_\_\_ Accountability procedures

\_\_\_\_\_ Counseling persons with special needs

\_\_\_\_\_ Professional organizations

\_\_\_\_\_ Research and statistics

***Skills Development in the Program***

Please use a scale of **1 = low/poor to 10 = high/very good** to indicate your personal evaluation of the level of *skills areas* in your EPCE training program:

\_\_\_\_\_ Individual counseling

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Small group counseling

\_\_\_\_\_ Multicultural counseling

\_\_\_\_\_ Large group counseling/guidance skills

\_\_\_\_\_ Career and lifestyle counseling

\_\_\_\_\_ Crisis intervention/counseling

\_\_\_\_\_ Child and adolescent counseling

\_\_\_\_\_ Family counseling

\_\_\_\_\_ Consultation

\_\_\_\_\_ Case planning/management

\_\_\_\_\_ Clinical (psycho) diagnosis

\_\_\_\_\_ Counseling persons with special needs

\_\_\_\_\_ Assessment

What are the major strengths of your current counseling program?

In what ways could the counseling program be improved?

**Appendix B**

**Employer/Supervisor of**

**Program Graduate Survey**

***Employer/Supervisor of a TTU Program Graduate Survey***

Please provide the following information as appropriate:

Name of the person being evaluated:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of your agency/institution:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

What is/are the primary clientele served in your agency/institution\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

How many counselors (or student development specialists) other than the person being evaluated are employed at your agency/institution? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Program Graduate’s Professional Knowledge**

Please use a scale of 1 = **low/poor to 10** = **high/very good** to indicate your personal evaluationof the level of **knowledge** held by the program graduate being evaluated in each of the following areas:

\_\_\_\_\_Ethical and legal issues

\_\_\_\_\_Small group dynamics and counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Theories of counseling (or student development)

\_\_\_\_\_Career and lifestyle counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Multicultural counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Human growth and development

\_\_\_\_\_Large group dynamics and counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Standardized (i.e., group) testing

\_\_\_\_\_Crisis intervention/counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Consultation

\_\_\_\_\_Psychological (i.e., clinical) diagnosis

\_\_\_\_\_Professional credentialing

\_\_\_\_\_Abnormal psychology

\_\_\_\_\_Theories of personality

\_\_\_\_\_Family counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Case planning/management

\_\_\_\_\_Accountability procedures

\_\_\_\_\_Counseling persons with special needs

\_\_\_\_\_Professional organizations

\_\_\_\_\_Research and statistics

**Program Graduate’s Professional Skills**

Please use a scale of **1** = low/poor to **10** = high/very good to indicate your personal evaluation of the level of ***skill*** held by the program graduate being evaluated in each of the following areas:

\_\_\_\_\_Individual counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Small group counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Multicultural counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Large group counseling/guidance skills

\_\_\_\_\_Career and lifestyle counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Crisis intervention/counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Child and adolescent counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Family counseling

\_\_\_\_\_Consultation

\_\_\_\_\_Case planning/management

\_\_\_\_\_Clinical (psycho) diagnosis

\_\_\_\_\_Counseling persons with special needs

\_\_\_\_\_Assessment

\_\_\_\_\_Couples/marriage counseling

**Program Graduate’s Attributes**

Please use a scale of 1 = **low/poor** to **10** = high/very good to indicate your personal evaluation of the level of the **attribute** held by the program graduate being evaluated for each of the following attributes:

\_\_\_\_\_Overall competence

\_\_\_\_\_Professional/ethical/legal behavior

\_\_\_\_\_Responsiveness to supervision, feedback, and/or suggestions

\_\_\_\_\_Professional demeanor

\_\_\_\_\_Multicultural and gender sensitivity

\_\_\_\_\_Relationships with other employees

\_\_\_\_\_General work attitude/enthusiasm

\_\_\_\_\_Dependability/conscientiousness/responsibleness

\_\_\_\_\_Professional development

What are the major professional strengths of the person being evaluated?

In what ways could the professional preparation of the person being evaluated be most improved?