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**The Program**

The Counselor Education Program (EPCE) is one of six degree programs in the Department of Educational Psychology and Leadership (EP&L) in the College of Education (COE) at Texas Tech University. The program was established to prepare professional counselors at the master’s (MEd) and doctoral (PhD) levels. The master’s-level program in counselor education offers two counseling tracks, School Counseling and Clinical Mental Health Counseling. The doctoral level (PhD) has one track, a basic counselor education program. The degree programs are accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). The EPCE has a Program Coordinator who received a stipend of $7000, with an additional $3000 merit pay for tasks being accomplished as specified by the Dean. EPCE also employs an administrative assistant who works one half time (20 hours/week).

**The Department**

The EP&L Department consists of six programs, including the EPCE Program, with each offering degrees at the masters and doctoral levels and with some programs offering certificates. It houses sixteen full professors, 10 associate professors, six assistant professors, three professors of record, and two instructors. Adjuncts are employed as needed each semester. It is staffed by a full-time chair and an administrative assistant.

**The College**

The College of Education (COE) is home to 1900+ students with two bachelors degrees, eight doctoral programs, twelve masters degrees and a variety of specialization and certification options. The college is accredited by the [National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Council_for_Accreditation_of_Teacher_Education) (NCATE). The COE employs 95 academic staff members. The [education program](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/School_of_Education) has existed at Texas Tech University since 1925.

**The University**

TTU is a [public](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public_university) research university. It is the leading institution of the four-institutions in the [Texas Tech University System](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Tech_University_System). As of fall, 2014, the university's student enrollment is the [sixth-largest](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_universities_in_Texas_by_enrollment) in the state of Texas. The university shares its campus with [Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_Tech_University_Health_Sciences_Center), making it the only university campus in Texas to house an undergraduate university, [law school](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Law_school), and [medical school](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Medical_school) at the same location. The university offers degrees in more than 150 courses of study through 13 colleges and hosts 60 research centers and institutes. Texas Tech University has awarded over 200,000 degrees since 1927, including over 40,000 graduate and professional degrees. The [Carnegie Foundation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carnegie_Foundation_for_the_Advancement_of_Teaching) classifies Texas Tech as having "highest research activity". Though the majority of the university's students originate in the [southwestern United States](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Southwestern_United_States), the school has served students from all 50 states and more than 100 countries. Texas Tech University alumni and former students have achieved prominent careers in government, business, science, medicine, education, sports, and entertainment.

**The Evaluation’s Rationale**

This evaluation is designed to address the following Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Programs (CACREP) mandate, which follows:

**SECTION 4: EVALUATION IN THE PROGRAM**

*Evaluation in the program includes opportunities for counselor education program faculty to comprehensively evaluate overall program effectiveness. Assessment of students’ knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions is integral. Evaluation data will help program faculty reflect on aspects of the program that work well and those that need improvement and will inform programmatic and curricular decisions.*

The following Standards apply to all entry-level and doctoral-level programs for which accreditation is being sought unless otherwise specified.

**EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM**

1. Counselor education programs have a documented, empirically based plan for systematically evaluating the program objectives, including student learning. For each of the types of data listed in 4.B, the plan outlines (1) the data that will be collected, (2) a procedure for how and when data will be collected, (3) a method for how data will be reviewed or analyzed, and (4) an explanation for how data will be used for curriculum and program improvement.
2. The counselor education program faculty demonstrate the use of the following to evaluate the program objectives: (1) aggregate student assessment data that address student knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions; (2) demographic and other characteristics of applicants, students, and graduates; and (3) data from systematic
3. Follow-up studies of graduates, site supervisors, and employers of program graduates.
4. Counselor education program faculty provide evidence of the use of program evaluation data to inform program modifications.
5. Counselor education program faculty disseminate an annual report that includes, by program level, (1) a summary of the program evaluation results, (2) subsequent program modifications, and (3) any other substantial program changes. The report is published on the program website in an easily accessible location, and students currently in the program, program faculty, institutional administrators, and personnel in cooperating agencies (e.g., employers, site supervisors) are notified that the report is available.
6. Counselor education program faculty must annually post on the program’s website in an easily accessible location the following specific information for each entry-level specialty area and doctoral program: (1) the number of graduates for the past academic year, (2) pass rates on credentialing examinations, (3) completion rates, and (4) job placement rates.

**Current Masters Students**

**Application and Enrollment of Current Master’s Students**

Table 1 shows admission and enrollment information regarding current master’s students by gender, major, ethnicity, home location, and age.

Table 1

*Admission and Enrollment by Gender, Major, Ethnicity, Home Location, and Age*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Gender** | | **Major** | | **Ethnicity** | | | | **Home Location** | | | | **Age** | | | | |
| **M** | **F** | **C** | **S** | **W** | **B** | **H** | **O** | **L** | **TX** | **US** | **IN** | **20** | **30** | **40** | **50** | **60** |
| **Acc/Enr** | 41 | 69 | 96 | 14 | 64 | 9 | 32 | 5 | 68 | 34 | 6 | 2 | 65 | 21 | 17 | 6 | 1 |
| **Denied** | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| **W. After** | - | 14 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 11 | - | - | 13 | - | 1 | - | - |
| **W. Other** | - | 7 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 4 | - | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| **Nev. Enr.** | 3 | 15 | 13 | 5 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 3 | 2 | - | - |
| **Other** | - | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | - | - | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | - | 2 | 2 | - | - | 1 |

Legend:

M = Male/ F = Female/C = Clinical Mental Health/ S = School/ L = Local/ TX = Texas/ US = United States/ IN = International/Age categories 20-29; 30-39; 40-49; 50-59; 60 >

Acc=accepted/ Enr=Enrolled/ Denied/Withdraw never attended/Withdraw after some attendance/other

**Summary**

Table 1 indicates the following about current master’s students:

* Almost no applicant to the Program is denied admission
* The majority of the students are enrolled in the Clinical Mental Health Program
* Roughly half of the students are white
* The majority of students are from Lubbock
* The modal age category is 20-29

**Job Titles of Current Masters Students**

* Teacher (3)
* Probation Officer
* Center Coordinator
* Star care
* Residential Monitor
* Research Assistant
* Youth prevention/intervention specialist
* Assistant Director
* Graduate assistant
* Student-full time (3)
* Administrative Assistant
* Worker
* Receptionist
* Senior business assistant
* Crime Analyst

**Summary**

* The majority of current master’s students are employed
* The current jobs of students vary across many fields

**How Many Hours Have You Taken Thus Far?**

Mean = 18 hours

**Summary**

* The mean number of hours taken at the time of the survey appears adequate, given that students had the option to mark NA on the survey

**How Many semester Hours of Course Work Would You Like to Take in Fall and Spring**

* 9 or 12 hours = 1
* 9 hours = 11
* 6-9 hours = 4
* 6 hours = 3
* 3 hours = 1

**Summary**

* The vast majority of students prefer to take 9 semester hours of course work in the fall and spring semesters

**Which program are you majoring in?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | Clinical Mental Health Counseling | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 17 | 77% | | 2 | School Counseling | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 4 | 18% | | 3 | Both Dual Major | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 1 | 5% | |  | Total |  | 22 | 100% | |  |

**Summary**

* The vast majority of master’s students major in clinical mental health versus school counseling
* Few students elect the option of majoring in both school and clinical mental health

**Please briefly summarize why you decided to enroll the in the Counselor Education Program at Texas Tech University.** (The comments are in the students’ words.)

* *When I decided to become a counselor I wanted to go to a highly accredited school with a good reputation. I knew going to Tech would help me when applying for jobs in the future.*
* *I believe that Counselor Education lines up well with my future career goals and is an intriguing field of study as well.*
* *To pursue counseling*
* *I have always wanted to work in helping people. I love helping people and the rewarding feeling I get when making a difference.*
* *It is one of the few CACREP programs in Texas. More importantly I knew that I would receive a solid educational experience and be well prepared for life as a counselor.*
* *I wanted to enter a school far from home and where it would be a lot calmer. Also they did not require the GRE. The staff was very welcoming too when I would email them and ask about the program.*
* *I want to because a Licensed Professional Counselor and I got my undergrad at Texas Tech.*
* *I have a passion for helping people, especially veterans. I'm an alumni of Texas Tech as well. I've heard Texas Tech has an outstanding program.*
* *I enrolled in the Counselor Education Program because of the appeal the program had provided with information and was matching up to what my future goals I wanted to do towards future career. Along with the recognition with the accreditation to where I feel that I what I'm being prepared to have success*
* *It’s the best program in the country.*
* *I would like to counsel in high school.*
* *I have been teaching for six years and was looking for a way to further my education and to help students on a more personal level. I did my undergrad at TTU and heard that it has one of the best counseling programs in the nation. It only made sense to go to TTU.*
* *I have a desire to help individuals to change their lives. I found that people are willing to ask for help sometimes quickly, sometimes not until they have hit a bottom that is painful and destructive and can only get better if they ask for help. Others are will to seek help in the beginning due to fear, uncertainty, or just to gather information. I am creating program for family reunification and know that with the education and guidance I will receive from the Counselor Education Program, my success will be unlimited and effective in rebuilding individuals, families, and their communities.*
* *I wanted to obtain my LPC and I was already living in Lubbock. I wanted to stay where I was, so I applied to the counselor education program at Tech. I also knew several people who had been through the program and become successful counselors.*
* *I decided to enroll is the Counselor Education Program at Texas Tech University because I would really like to be able to help children who are struggling with personal matters to deal with them in order to achieve more academically.*
* *The program is not only accredited, but also one of the best programs in Texas.*
* *This program will allow me to do the work that I always wanted to do.*
* *I decided to enroll in the Counselor Education Program at Texas Tech because I would like to get become an LPC and this program is CACREP Accredited.*
* *It's what interests me.*
* *Counseling has been very beneficial to me personally. Helping others in the same manner is something that I wish to pursue. Working full-time at Texas Tech allows me to take advantage of the Employee Tuition Assistance program and work towards a Master's degree.*
* *In my current job now I did not feel happy at the time. I did not feel I was making a difference and I wanted to change that. It was not until I was helping to coach a summer basketball team in the summer that I liked working with the kids and helping them out where I knew I wanted to change what I was doing. I knew Tech is a good school and I knew they would help me reach my goal.*
* *This program has a good reputation.*

**Summary**

Themes from the question, “Please describe why you decided to enroll in the Counselor Education Program at TTU.”

* The Program’s excellent reputation (5 respondents)
* Graduates have better job prospects
* CACREP accreditation (3 respondents)
* Program did not require GRE for admission
* Graduated from TTU as an undergraduate (3 respondents)
* Lubbock was located away from home with its issues

**Master’s Student Performance on the Exit Exam**

All students enrolled in the Counselor Education Master’s Degree programs must pass a comprehensive examination prior to receiving their degree. Students are permitted to take the examination during their last semester of coursework. The examination is offered once each semester (usually March and October) and once during the summer (usually June). To be eligible to take the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE), students must be enrolled in at least one semester hour of coursework. Students must apply and pay $55 (make money orders payable to CCE, not TTU) to take the examination. Information and applications are available at the office of the COE Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research, (ED, Room 105). Because deadlines apply, students are encouraged to inquire about the procedures early in their last year of course enrollment.

The CPCE is a knowledge-based examination that reflects the eight core curriculum areas approved by the CACREP: (a) Human Growth and Development, (b) Social and Cultural Foundations, (c) Helping Relations, (d) Group Work, (e) Career and Lifestyle Development, (f) Appraisal, (g) Research and Program Evaluation, and (h) Professional Orientation and Ethics. The CPCE is designed as a summative evaluation of relevant knowledge obtained by students during their counselor preparation programs. Study materials for the CPCE are available from the publisher, the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC), and/or the College of Education Learning Resource Center (LRC) on 2nd floor of the Education Building.

The CPCE consists of 160 multiple-choice questions of which 136 questions are scored. The remaining 24 questions are not scored but are used as pilot questions that may be used as future test items. The examination administration time is four hours. Students are asked to select the best response to each question from four alternative responses. To pass the Master’s Comprehensive Examination, students must achieve a Z-score equivalent of -.524 or higher, (e.g., the score must be at or above the 30th percentile). Students may take the evaluation a maximum of two times. In certain instances to be determined by the TTU Dean of the Graduate School, a student may take the evaluation three times. Students who must re-take the exam must meet with their advisor to develop a remediation plan of study for the exam re-take. The student then presents this plan to the entire counseling faculty who will provide additional input and assistance. The entire exam is retaken with a passing score remaining at the 30th percentile. Any student failing the third administration of the exam will not be awarded a master’s degree. After the examination has been administered and scored, a letter indicating the examination results (Pass or Fail) will be sent to students by the COE Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research (please do not contact Counselor Education Program faculty regarding examination results). After students have received the letter from the COE Associate Dean regarding the results of their examination, they will receive a letter providing more specific feedback on their performance on the eight areas of the examination.

Students are responsible for completing the necessary paper work required for the Master's Comprehensive Examination. During the semester of graduation, students must be enrolled in at least one semester hour of graduate credit. All questions regarding applications for first and second administrations of the examination and graduation procedures should be directed to the COE Associate Dean's office ED Bldg. Room 105, (Phone 806-834-2751).

The following table presents the Counselor Education master’s students’ scores by area for the past seven semesters in percentile equivalents.

Table 2

*Percentile Equivalent of EPCE Students on the CPCE Exam by Year and Area*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content Areas** | **Fall**  **2013**  **N=10** | **Spring**  **2014**  **N=3** | **Summer**  **2014**  **N=11** | **Fall**  **2014**  **N=15** | **Spring**  **2015**  **N=8** | **Summer**  **2015**  **N=4** | **Fall**  **2015**  **N=7** | **Means\*** |
| C1: Human Growth and Development | 65.36 | 75.55 | 69.60 | 65.40 | 70.47 | 55.34 | 64.99 | 66.69 |
| C2: Social and Cultural Diversity | 52.17 | 88.50 | 57.62 | 57.62 | 68.20 | 34.59 | 72.19 | 61.56 |
| C3: Helping Relationships | 81.35 | 83.14 | 61.69 | 55.83 | 54.51 | 64.75 | 64.75 | 66.58 |
| C4: Group Word | 60.36 | 61.58 | 50.43 | 54.59 | 36.15 | 62.15 | 73.76 | 57.01 |
| C5: Career Development | 74.12 | 92.05 | 72.69 | 72.21 | 50.55 | 47.98 | 48.60 | 65.46 |
| C6: Assessment | 49.82 | 71.02 | 68.14 | 52.08 | 53.56 | 68.76 | 63.65 | 61.01 |
| C7: Research and Program Evaluation | 75.00 | 75.45 | 58.28 | 51.63 | 59.94 | 34.24 | 68.47 | 60.44 |
| C8: Professional Orientation and Ethical Practice | 57.75 | 60.67 | 60.55 | 65.59 | 66.48 | 47.89 | 68.57 | 61.08 |
| Overall Scores | 68.06 | 84.93 | 66.27 | 62.58 | 60.25 | 52.06 | 70.42 | 66.37 |

\*Means are reported in this column.

No students took the exit exam in spring 2016.

**Summary**

* The overall percentile equivalent scores of EPCE students ranged from 52 to 70
* The grand percentile mean over the reported semesters equals 66.37
* Although the mean percentile scores are fairly uniform, on a relative basis, the area of group work is lowest while human growth and development is highest

**Performance of Students on the LPC Exam**

Regrettably, the Texas Board of Examiners of Licensed Professional Counseling was unable to provide the state means by institution on the LPC Exam citing a lack of resources to assemble this information. The testing agency, The National Board of Certified Counselors, claimed they would provide this data only on the condition our program would agree to be a satellite site for them wherein we would promote this certification to our students. Thus, the following pass rates is the only information that can be included in this Report.

Table 3

*Comparison of Graduates of CACREP Accredited Universities Who Took the Texas LPC Examination, Between 2013 and 2015*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| University | 2013 | | | 2014 | | | 2015 | | | Totals | | |
| # Tested | # Passed | % Passed | # Tested | # Passed | % Passed | # Tested | # Passed | % Passed | # Tested | # Passed | % Passed |
| Sam Houston State University | 5 | 5 | 100% | 18 | 18 | 100% | 32 | 28 | 88% | 55 | 51 | 93% |
| St. Mary’s University | 4 | 3 | 75% | 6 | 4 | 67% | 10 | 7 | 70% | 20 | 14 | 70% |
| Stephen F. Austin University | 2 | 2 | 100% | 9 | 8 | 89% | 18 | 18 | 100% | 29 | 28 | 97% |
| Texas A&M University – Commerce | 9 | 9 | 100% | 31 | 27 | 87% | 27 | 26 | 96% | 67 | 62 | 93% |
| Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi | 4 | 3 | 75% | 8 | 5 | 63% | 25 | 19 | 76% | 37 | 27 | 73% |
| Texas A&M University – Texarkana | 2 | 2 | 100% | 6 | 5 | 83% | 4 | 3 | 75% | 12 | 10 | 83% |
| Texas State University | 2 | 2 | 100% | 10 | 10 | 100% | 5 | 4 | 80% | 17 | 16 | 94% |
| **Texas Tech University** | **8** | **8** | **100%** | **10** | **9** | **90%** | **28** | **25** | **89%** | **46** | **42** | **91%** |
| Texas Women’s University | 3 | 2 | 67% | 16 | 14 | 88% | 12 | 10 | 83% | 31 | 26 | 84% |
| University of Houston – Victoria | 5 | 2 | 40% | 22 | 21 | 95% | 27 | 27 | 89% | 54 | 47 | 87% |
| University of Mary Hardin Baylor | 2 | 2 | 100% | 11 | 11 | 100% | 18 | 17 | 94% | 31 | 30 | 97% |
| University of North Texas | 10 | 9 | 90% | 28 | 27 | 96% | 37 | 35 | 95% | 75 | 71 | 95% |
| University of Texas – Brownsville | -- | -- | -- | 12 | 10 | 83% | 24 | 23 | 96% | 36 | 33 | 92% |
| University of Texas – San Antonio | 4 | 3 | 75% | 24 | 23 | 96% | 27 | 23 | 85% | 55 | 49 | 89% |
| University of Texas –  Tyler | 3 | 3 | 100% | 20 | 19 | 95% | 31 | 29 | 94% | 54 | 51 | 94% |

**Summary**

* The passing rates of CACREP accredited counseling programs in Texas ranged from a low of 70% (St. Mary’s University) to a high of 97% (Stephen F Austin University and University of Mary Hardin Baylor)
* The mean passing rate for all programs equaled 89%, thus, TTU exceeded the state mean passing rate

**Performance of Students on the School Counseling Exam**

The following table presents how our graduates scored on the TExES Exam for school counseling certification.

Table 4

*Results of the TExES for School Counseling Certification*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Ethnicity** | **Age** | **Admin Date** | **Test Name** | **Result** | **Overall Scaled Score** | **Scaled Score 1** | **Scaled Score 2** | **Scaled Score 3** |
| Female | Hispanic | 41 | 2/9/2012 | School Counselor | P | 263 | 88 | 78 | 83 |
| Female | White | 54 | 4/20/2012 | School Counselor | P | 269 | 79 | 84 | 92 |
| Male | Hispanic/  Latino | 48 | 5/8/2013 | School Counselor | P | 261 | 83 | 81 | 88 |
| Female | White | 35 | 10/24/2013 | School Counselor | P | 266 | 92 | 81 | 83 |
| Female | Hispanic/  Latino | 30 | 3/12/2014 | School Counselor | P | 249 | 79 | 72 | 75 |
| Female | Hispanic/  Latino | 47 | 4/19/2014 | School Counselor | P | 275 | 83 | 88 | 92 |
| Female | White | 28 | 8/22/2014 | School Counselor | P | 273 | 88 | 91 | 88 |
| Female | White | 26 | 10/24/2014 | School Counselor | P | 261 | 71 | 88 | 92 |
| Female | Hispanic/  Latino | 47 | 10/24/2014 | School Counselor | P | 247 | 71 | 78 | 71 |
| Female | White | 47 | 7/8/2015 | School Counselor | P | 287 | 100 | 91 | 92 |
| **Mean** |  |  |  |  |  | **265.1** |  |  |  |

Domain 1 = Understanding Students

Domain 2 =Planning and Implementation of the Developmental Guidance and Counseling Program

Domain 3 = Collaboration, Consultation, and Professionalism

Passing threshold = 240

State average score = 260.41

TTU = Z of .32 = 62.55 percentile equivalent

**Summary**

* All graduates majoring in school counseling passed the state certifying exam
* The overall scaled score of EPCE graduates equaled the 62nd percentile equivalent

**Survey Results of Current Master’s Students**

Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7 describe the responses of current master’s students regarding their knowledge of counseling areas, their skills in the same counseling areas, and their evaluation of TTU’s counseling master’s program.

Table 5

*Current Master’s Students’ Knowledge of Counseling Areas (Self-report)*

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

**Very Very Total**

**# Question Poor Poor Fair Good Good Responses Mean**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1 School Counseling (ASCA Model) 1 0 4 2 4 11 3.73

2 Clinical Mental Health Counseling 0 0 4 7 8 19 4.21

3 Group Counseling 1 0 4 0 9 14 4.14

4 Theories of Counseling 0 1 4 7 9 21 4.14

5 Career and Lifestyle Counseling 1 0 4 5 5 15 3.87

6 Multicultural Counseling 0 0 4 1 7 12 4.25

7 Human Growth and Development 1 0 5 5 6 17 3.88

8 Testing and Assessment 0 2 3 1 5 11 3.82

9 Crisis Counseling 2 0 2 2 5 11 3.73

10 Family Counseling 0 2 3 5 9 19 4.11

11 Dysfunctional Behavior 1 1 2 5 3 12 3.67

12 Consultation 0 1 3 2 3 9 3.78

13 Techniques of Counseling 0 1 2 3 8 14 4.29

14 Addictions 1 0 2 2 6 11 4.09

15 Supervision Given 1 0 3 2 6 12 4.00

16 Supervision Received 1 0 2 2 7 12 4.17

17 Research/Statistics/Evaluation 1 0 2 6 4 13 3.92

18 Diagnosis 2 0 3 2 3 10 3.40

19 Child and Adolescent Counseling 2 0 2 2 7 13 3.92

20 Special Needs Counseling 2 0 2 1 3 8 3.38

21 Ethical and Legal Matters 1 0 3 3 5 12 3.92

22 Advocacy 1 1 2 0 4 8 3.63

23 Treatment Planning/Case Management 2 0 2 1 4 9 3.56

24 Technology 0 0 3 3 4 10 4.10

25 Psychopharmacology 3 1 1 1 2 8 2.75

26 Couples/Marriage Counseling 0 2 4 5 6 17 3.88

27 Professional Credentialing 2 0 2 1 5 10 3.70

28 Professional Organizations 0 1 3 2 4 10 3.90

29 Individual Counseling 1 0 4 2 5 12 3.83

**Mean 3.85**

**Summary**

* Ratings regarding knowledge from subject matter ranged from a low of 2.75 (Psychopharmacology) to a high of 4.29 (Techniques of Counseling)
* Some areas were not rated as many students had not taken advanced coursework
* The overall mean rating equaled 3.85

Table 6

*Current Master’s Students’ Skill Development in Counseling Areas (Self-report)*

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

**Very Very Total**

# **Question Poor Poor Fair Good Good Response Mean**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1 School Counseling (ASCA Model) 1 0 4 3 3 11 3.64

2 Clinical Mental Health Counseling 0 1 4 6 8 19 4.11

3 Group Counseling 1 1 3 1 8 14 4.00

4 Theories of Counseling 0 2 3 10 7 22 4.00

5 Career and Lifestyle Counseling 1 1 2 9 3 16 3.75

6 Multicultural Counseling 0 1 3 1 8 13 4.23

7 Human Growth and Development 1 1 6 4 6 18 3.72

8 Testing and Assessment 0 2 2 2 3 9 3.67

9 Crisis Counseling 2 0 2 4 3 11 3.55

10 Family Counseling 1 1 4 5 9 20 4.00

11 Dysfunctional Behavior 1 1 2 6 2 12 3.58

12 Consultation 1 0 3 3 2 9 3.56

13 Techniques of Counseling 0 1 2 4 6 13 4.15

14 Addictions 1 1 1 2 6 11 4.00

15 Supervision Given 0 1 3 2 6 12 4.08

16 Supervision Received 0 1 2 2 7 12 4.25

17 Research/Statistics/Evaluation 0 1 4 6 2 13 3.69

18 Diagnosis 2 0 3 3 2 10 3.30

19 Child and Adolescent Counseling 2 0 3 3 5 13 3.69

20 Special Needs Counseling 2 0 2 2 2 8 3.25

21 Ethical and Legal Matters 0 1 3 3 5 12 4.00

22 Advocacy 1 1 2 0 4 8 3.63

23 Treatment Planning/Case 2 0 2 1 4 9 3.56

Management

24 Technology 0 0 3 3 4 10 4.10

25 Psychopharmacology 2 1 1 0 2 6 2.83

26 Couples/Marriage Counseling 0 2 4 4 7 17 3.94

27 Professional Credentialing 1 0 3 3 3 10 3.70

28 Professional Organizations 0 1 4 2 3 10 3.70

29 Individual Counseling 0 1 3 3 5 12 4.00

**Mean 3.78**

**Summary**

* The range of ratings regarding skills ranged from a low of 2.83 (Psychopharmacology) to a high of 4.25 (Supervision Received)
* The overall mean of ratings of skills equaled 3.78, which is somewhat lower than the rating for knowledge (3.85), possibly reflecting the challenges of translating knowledge into skills

Table 7

*Current Master’s Students’ Evaluation of General Program Attributes.*

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

**Very Very Total**

# **Question Poor Poor Fair Good Good Response Mean**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1 Comprehensiveness of the curriculum 0 0 0 10 10 20 4.50

2 Supervision received overall 0 0 0 4 9 13 4.69

(TTU + Site)

3 Site supervision from 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.80

practicum/internship

4 On-campus individual supervision 0 0 2 3 8 13 4.46

5 On-campus group supervision 0 0 2 4 6 12 4.33

6 Instructional classroom (i.e., teaching) 0 0 2 8 12 22 4.45

7 Professional competence of faculty 0 0 2 6 14 22 4.55

8 Accessibility/availability of the faculty 0 0 2 3 17 22 4.68

9 Academic advisement provided by 0 1 4 4 12 21 4.29

faculty

10 Facilities and resources 0 0 2 7 12 21 4.48

11 In class role-played practice with 0 1 5 3 10 19 4.16

feedback

12 Faculty as mentors 0 0 4 6 10 20 4.30

13 Evaluation/assessment of student 0 0 1 7 12 20 4.55

performance by faculty, e.g. use

of rubrics

14 Duration (i.e., academic length) 1 1 1 7 11 21 4.24

of the program(s)

15 Timely and meaningful feedback 0 0 0 10 10 20 4.50

on student work by faculty

16 Sequence of the curriculum 0 1 3 6 10 20 4.25

17 Identification of course trademark 0 0 0 7 14 21 4.67

outcomes

18 Offering remediation as needed 0 0 1 6 6 13 4.38

19 Offering role-played opportunities 0 1 2 5 9 17 4.29

as appropriate

20 Creating opportunities for a sense 0 0 4 9 8 21 4.19

of community among students

21 Overall rating of the Program 0 0 1 7 14 22 4.59

**Mean 4.45**

**Summary**

* The range of ratings on program attributes ranged from a low of 4.16 (In class role-played practice with feedback) to a high of 4.80 (Site supervision from practicum and/or internship)
* The overall rating of program attributes equaled 4.45, which is quite high on the five-point scale

**Site Supervisors Ratings of Current Masters Students**

Table 8 shows student ratings as determined by Site Supervisors in seven areas of student performance during practicum and internship classes.

Table 8

*Site Supervisor Evaluation*

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Areas N Mean**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1. **Basic Work Requirements**
   1. Arrives on time consistently 40 4.28
   2. Uses time effectively 40 4.38
   3. Informs supervisor and makes arrangements for absences 40 4.30
   4. Completes requested or assigned tasks on time 40 4.28
   5. Completes required total number of hours or days on site 40 4.40
   6. Is responsive to norms about clothing, language, etc., on site 40 4.40
2. **Ethical Awareness and Conduct**
   1. Exhibits knowledge of general ethical guidelines 40 4.43
   2. Exhibits knowledge of ethical guidelines of internship/  
      practicum 40 4.45
   3. Demonstrates awareness and sensitivity to ethical issues 40 4.48
   4. Exhibits personal behavior consistent with ethical   
      guidelines 40 4.48
   5. Consults with others about ethical issues if necessary 40 4.46
3. **Knowledge and Learning**
4. Exhibits knowledge about the client population 40 4.43
5. Exhibits knowledge of treatment setting and approach 40 4.33
6. Is receptive to learning new information 40 4.43
7. Actively seeks new information from staff or supervisor 40 4.48
8. Exhibits ability to learn and understand new information 40 4.38
9. Exhibits understanding of counseling concepts, theories,   
   and skills 40 4.33
10. Exhibits ability to apply new information in clinical/  
    school setting 40 4.35
11. Evidence has been demonstrated to show increased   
    achievement, improved behavior, and other documented   
    needs in a K-12 setting. 25 4.38
12. Exhibits knowledge of all components of the ASCA Model 20 4.45
13. **Response to Supervision**
    1. Actively seeks supervision when necessary 40 4.45
    2. Is receptive to feedback and suggestions from supervisor 40 4.50
    3. Understands information communicated in supervision 40 4.43
    4. Successfully implements suggestions from supervisor 40 4.40
    5. Is aware of areas that need improvement 40 4.35
    6. Is willing to explore personal strengths and weaknesses 40 4.38
14. **Work Products**
    1. Records are accurately kept and are completed on time 40 4.38
    2. Written or verbal reports are accurate and factually correct 40 4.38
    3. Written or verbal reports are presented in a professional manner 40 4.33
    4. Reports are clinically and/or administratively useful 40 4.30
    5. Treatment Plan was correctly developed and included parent   
       involvement if appropriate 36 4.22
    6. Treatment Plan brought about positive outcomes for the client 35 4.17
    7. Postsecondary options instructional strategies and other   
       components of the ASCA Model were implemented effectively 21 4.38
15. **Interactions with Clients**
    1. Appears comfortable interacting with clients 40 4.43
    2. Initiates interactions with clients 40 4.48
    3. Communicates effectively with clients 40 4.55
    4. Builds rapport and respect with clients 40 4.55
    5. Is sensitive and responsive to client’s needs 40 4.50
    6. Is sensitive to issues of multicultural counseling 40 4.45
    7. Is sensitive to issues of diversity including but not limited   
       to race/ethnic group, age, gender, physical challenges, SES 40 4.53
16. **Interactions with Coworkers**
    1. Appears comfortable interacting with other staff members 40 4.63
    2. Initiates interactions with staff 40 4.53
    3. Communicates effectively with staff 40 4.53
    4. Effectively conveys information and expresses own opinions 40 4.53
    5. Effectively receives information and opinions from others 40 4.55

**Grand Mean 4.42**

Ratings based on the three most recent years

Five point scale with 5 being far above expectations

**Summary**

* The mean rating of student interns by site supervisors ranged from a low of 4.2 (appears comfortable interacting with clients) to a high of 4.6 (communicates effectively; builds rapport).
* The mean rating over all areas equaled 4.42. which had a rubric rating entitled above expectations
* The variability of ratings was low

**Students’ Strengths and Areas for Improvement as Identified by Site Supervisors**

**Strengths**

* *Communication skill*
* *Good skills*
* *Willingness to challenge self*
* *Level-headed; skills*
* *Ability to reach clients*
* *Positive regard/rapport*
* *Learning about population*
* *Initiative/willingness to grow*
* *Dependable*
* *Organization*
* *Willingness to challenge self*
* *Very skillful*
* *Confrontation skills*
* *Proactive approach*
* *Integrity; work ethic*
* *Use of techniques*
* *Dependable*
* *Initiative*
* *Calming ability*
* *Companionate*
* *Ability to work with clients*
* *Willingness to challenge self*
* *Ethical/knowledgeable*
* *Professional identity*
* *Client interaction*
* *Shows field readiness*
* *Theoretical application*
* *Works well with clients*
* *Works well with children*
* *Desire to learn*
* *Hard working*
* *Sensible approach*
* *Works well with clients*
* *Works well with children*
* *Excellent people skills*
* *Excellent*

**Summary**

* Supervisors viewed interns as skilled, open to improvement, ethical, professional, hard- working, and dependable

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Areas needing Improvement** |  |
| * *Time to learn assessments* |  |
| * *Counseling techniques* |  |
| * *Needs experience* |  |
| * *Needs experience* |  |
| * *Needs experience* |  |
| * *Needs confidence* |  |
| * *Experience with population* |  |
| * *Theoretical application* |  |
| * *Needs experience* |  |
| * *Technical application* |  |
| * *Experience with other groups* |  |
| * *Boundaries* |  |
| * *Letting go of client issues* |  |
| * *Counseling skills* |  |
| * *Confidence/assertiveness* |  |
| * *Theoretical application* |  |
| * *Personal transparency* |  |
| * *Diagnostic criteria* |  |
| * *Expand client base* |  |
| * *Needs experience* |  |
| * *Treatment team dynamics* |  |
| * *Prioritize self-care* |  |
| * *Test interpretation* |  |
| * *Assessments* |  |
| * *Needs more experience* |  |
| * *Needs more experience* |  |
| * *Time management* |  |
| * *Needs more experience* |  |

**Summary**

* The most salient area mentioned by site supervisors as needing improvement is more experience in counseling clients from a variety of backgrounds

**Current Doctoral Students**

**Application and Enrollment of Current Doctoral Students**

Table 9

*Application and Enrollment of Current Doctoral Students by Gender, Ethnicity, Home Location and Age*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Gender** | | **Ethnicity** | | | | **Home Loc.** | | | **Age** | | | | |
| **M** | **F** | **W** | **B** | **H** | **O** | **L** | **TX** | **US** | **20** | **30** | **40** | **50** | **60** |
| **Adm/Enr** | 11 | 26 | 28 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 18 | 11 | 8 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| **Denied** | - | 4 | 4 | - | - | - | 3 | - | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| **W A** | - | 3 | 2 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| **W O** | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | - | - | - |
| **Never Enr** | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - |

**Summary**

* The majority of doctoral applicants are admitted
* The majority of doctoral students female
* The majority of doctoral students are white
* Roughly half of the doctoral students are from Lubbock
* The modal age range of doctoral students is in the range of 30-39

**Demographics of Current Doctoral Students**

Table 10

*Demographics of Doctoral Graduates by Gender, Ethnicity, Home Location, and Age for Fall 2014-Spring 2016*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Gender** | | **Ethnicity** | | | | **Home Location** | | | | **Age** | | | | |
| **M** | **F** | **W** | **B** | **H** | **O** | **L** | **TX** | **US** | **IN** | **20** | **30** | **40** | **50** | **60** |
| **Graduates** | 13 | 34 | 37 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 21 | 16 | 10 | - | 13 | 17 | 12 | 4 | 1 |

**Summary**

* The majority of doctoral graduates are female
* The majority of doctoral graduates are white
* The majority of graduates are from Lubbock
* The modal age range of graduates are in the range of 30-39

**Job Titles of Current Doctoral Students**

* Senior Academic Advisor
* Community Mental Health Clinician
* Full-time student.(3)
* Research Assistant
* Licensed Professional Counselor (11)
* Instructor
* Unemployed
* Associate Academic Dean: Associate Dean for Student Life, School of Law
* Executive Director

**Summary**

* The majority of current doctoral students function as LPCs, which reflects the fact all doctoral students have completed a master’s degree

**Cohort Identification of Current Doctoral Respondents**

* 2009 = 1
* 2010 = 0
* 2011 = 1
* 2012 = 1
* 2013 = 0
* 2014 = 7
* 2015 = 9

**Summary**

* The majority of current doctoral students who completed the survey where associated with the 2014 or 2015 cohort group

**Please briefly summarize why you decided to enroll the in the Counselor Education Program at Texas Tech University (information below is verbatim from student comments)**

* *The faculty is the reason that I decided to stay at TTU. I believe that we have the best faculty a program could possibly offer. Also, I feel that graduating from a CACREP school is very important.*
* *CACREP accredited hybrid-distance program.*
* *I wished to continue pursuing my education in order to reach my goal of achieving a doctoral degree.*
* *Strong program and have same research interest with professors.*
* *To become a more knowledgeable counselor and to teach at the university level.*
* *Location, quality of professors and format of program.*
* *I decided to enroll in the Counselor Education Program at Texas Tech University because of the faculty and staff.*
* *I wished to further my knowledge and obtain the highest degree available in my field.*
* *I wanted to obtain a CACREP degree that would allow me to teach.*
* *The ability to continue my education and fulfill my desire to seek a position in academia.*
* *The convenience of the online/hybrid format and the access to the resources and faculty of a large university*
* *I was encourage by Dr. Bradley to enter the doctoral program.*
* *Faculty research interests, CACREP accreditation, ranking as military friendly school.*
* *To enhance my counseling skills and expand my future career in the field of academia.*
* *Because I could do it while working a full time job*
* *Outstanding faculty, outstanding and successful alumni, and convenience/proximity*
* *The excellent faculty were critical in my decision.*
* *I knew some of the professors in the Counselor Education Department through my professional association, and respected them very much.*
* *I heard a lot great things about the program. I felt the program could help me accomplish a number of goals I have.*

**Summary**

* CACREP accreditation was a key factor in attracting current doctoral students to the program
* The reputation of the faculty attracted respondents to the program.
* The program served the career goals of the students
* The hybrid delivery method attracted some students

**Which degree(s) have you received from the counselor education program at TTU? Check all that apply.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Answer** | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | **Response** | **%** |
| 1 | MEd-school counseling | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 2 | MEd-Clinical mental health | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 6 | 50% |
| 3 | Other: | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 6 | 50% |
|  | Total |  | 12 | 100% |

**Other:**

* MS - Marriage and Family Therapy
* N/A
* None
* PhD Counselor Ed in progress
* None
* BA Psychology

**Summary**

* The academic backgrounds of current doctoral students varied considerably

**Did you present a program or a poster session at a local, state, national, or international conference? If yes, how many?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Answer** | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | **Response** | **%** |
| 1 | Yes | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 13 | 68% |
| 2 | No | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 6 | 32% |
|  | Total |  | 19 | 100% |

**Have you submitted a manuscript for publication since working on your doctorate?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Answer** | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | **Response** | **%** |
| 1 | Yes | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 9 | 47% |
| 2 | No | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 10 | 53% |
|  | Total |  | 19 | 100% |

**Do you belong to a professional organization? At the local, state, or national level?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Answer** | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | **Response** | **%** |
| 1 | Yes, if so which ones | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 18 | 95% |
| 2 | No | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 1 | 5% |
|  | Total |  | 19 | 100% |

**Yes, if so which ones**

* ACA, TCA, Chi Sig, NACADA, KDP
* CAMFT
* AAMFT
* Chi Sigma Iota, TAADA, TCA
* TACES, ACA, TCA
* ACA, TCCA, TCA, Chi Sig, ASAR
* No currently, but have been an active member of ACA and TCA
* ACA and multiple divisions
* TCA
* TCA
* ACA, APT, Alabama Counseling Association, Alabama Play therapy, Alabama drug & alcohol abuse association
* AAMFT and AASECT
* ACA, NASPA, ASCA
* ACA, TCA, ASERVIC
* All three.
* APA, ASERVIC

**Summary**

* About half of current doctoral students are active in making conference presentations and/or submitting manuscripts for publication
* Almost all current doctoral students belong to professional organizations

**Based on your experience in the Counselor Education Doctoral Program thus far, what are its strengths?**

* *Faculty, online resources, communication, and my cohort is amazing.*
* *Trust in students, and including students in opportunities*
* *How cohesive the staff is and how they truly have the best interests of the students in mind.*
* *Diverse research interests within faculty*
* *The professors*
* *Format of program*
* *The faculty and the students*
* *Excellent professors with varying expertise who are leaders in the field. Good variety of course options.*
* *Excellent relationships between students and faculty*
* *Encouragement of Social Justice and Advocacy.*
* *Flexibility for students who don't live in Lubbock to be able to complete the program*
* *Faculty*
* *Faculty, research, program rigor, opportunities to present & be involved with national and state organizations*
* *Faculty student engagement, practical experience*
* *Convenience*
* *Strong faculty, practitioner + scholar focus, faculty who care about me both inside and outside of the classroom.*
* *Weekend format is excellent and faculty are excellent*
* *Outstanding instruction and support for student success.*
* *The experiential component - hands on - I learn better this way.*

**Summary**

* The three most cited strengths mentioned by current doctoral students include faculty- student relationships; course delivery system and hybrid scheduling; and the cohesiveness of the cohort unit

**Based on your experience in the Counselor Education Doctoral Program thus far, what are its weaknesses?**

* *NA*
* *Certain faculty don't seem to fully understand that we also have full time jobs.*
* *I have not been upset with any aspect of the program thus far*
* *Composition of students is not diverse*
* *The lack of course/educational material at the doctoral level*
* *Busy work*
* *technology*
* *None I'm aware of.*
* *I have no concerns*
* *internal politics*
* *none*
* *Not enough funding for students*
* *I have not learned much. Most of my cohort agrees that we have not learned much.*
* *I would like a community counseling clinic for Lubbock residents and doctoral students.*
* *I don't really see weaknesses.*
* *None that I've identified.*
* *I feel like the program is experiencing a transition to new expectations - not a true weakness but it presents some challenges*

**Summary**

* Although several students couldn’t identify weakness, those who did cited: a lack of rigor; lack of a clinic; and undercurrents of change that may be political in nature

**Survey Results of Current Doctoral Students**

Table 11, Table 12, and Table 13 describe the responses of current doctoral students regarding their knowledge of counseling areas, their skills in the same counseling areas, and their evaluation of TTU’s counseling doctoral program.

Table 11

*Current Doctoral Students’ Knowledge of Counseling Areas (Self-report)*

*\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

**Very Very Total**

**# Question Poor Poor Fair Good Good Responses Mean**

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

1 Counseling Theory 0 0 0 4 11 15 4.73

2 Methods to Evaluate 0 0 2 7 3 12 4.08

Counseling Effectiveness

3 Group Counseling 0 0 0 4 11 15 4.73

4 Legal and Ethical Issues 0 0 0 5 10 15 4.67

5 Supervision Received 0 0 1 4 7 12 4.50

6 Supervision Theory/Application 0 1 0 2 7 10 4.50

7 Multicultural Counseling 0 0 0 4 11 15 4.73

8 social Justice/Advocacy 0 0 0 4 11 15 4.73

9 Teaching/Pedagogy 0 1 0 4 5 10 4.30

10 Research Methods/Statistics 0 1 2 6 3 12 3.92

11 Program Evaluation 0 1 2 8 2 13 3.85

12 Professional Writing 0 0 2 4 5 11 4.27

13 Consultation 0 1 0 6 7 14 4.36

14 Leadership for Advocacy/ 0 0 1 4 8 13 4.54

Professional Organizations

15 Practicum 0 0 0 3 6 9 4.67

16 Internship 0 0 1 1 7 9 4.67

17 Professionalism/Professional 0 0 0 3 8 11 4.73

Identity

18 Opportunities to Collaborate 0 0 0 5 9 14 4.64

with Professors and

Classmates

19 Scholarship/Grant Writing/ 0 1 4 0 5 10 3.90

Publications

20 Professional Credentialing 0 0 3 2 5 10 4.20

**Mean 4.44**

**Summary**

* The ratings regarding knowledge ranged from a low of 3.85 (Program Evaluation) to a high of 4.73 (Theory, Group, Multicultural Counseling, Social Justice/Advocacy, and Professionalism)
* The overall mean rating of all knowledge items equaled 4.44

Table 12

*Current Doctoral Students’ Skill Development in Counseling Areas (Self-report)*

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

**Very Very Total**

**# Question Poor Poor Fair Good Good Responses Mean**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1 Counseling Theory 0 0 0 8 7 15 4.47

2 Methods to Evaluate 0 0 2 7 3 12 4.08

Counseling Effectiveness

3 Group Counseling 0 0 1 3 11 15 4.67

4 Legal and Ethical Issues 0 0 0 4 11 15 4.73

5 Supervision Received 0 0 1 4 7 12 4.50

6 Supervision Theory/Application 0 1 0 1 8 10 4.60

7 Multicultural Counseling 0 0 1 5 9 15 4.53

8 social Justice/Advocacy 0 0 0 4 11 15 4.73

9 Teaching/Pedagogy 0 1 2 3 4 10 4.00

10 Research Methods/Statistics 0 1 3 5 3 12 3.83

11 Program Evaluation 0 3 1 7 2 13 3.62

12 Professional Writing 0 0 2 4 5 11 4.27

13 Consultation 1 0 2 5 6 14 4.07

14 Leadership for Advocacy/ 0 0 2 4 7 13 4.38

Professional Organizations

15 Practicum 0 0 0 3 6 9 4.67

16 Internship 0 0 1 1 7 9 4.67

17 Professionalism/Professional 0 0 0 3 8 11 4.73

Identity

18 Opportunities to Collaborate 0 0 0 4 10 14 4.71

With Professors and Classmates

19 Scholarship/Grant Writing/ 0 1 4 1 4 10 3.80

Publications

20 Professional Credentialing 0 0 3 3 4 10 4.10

**Mean 4.36**

**Summary**

* The range regarding skills ranged from a low of 3.62 (Program Evaluation) to a high of 4.73 (Legal and Ethical Issues; Social Justice/Advocacy; Professionalism)
* The mean rating of all skill areas equaled 4.36, which is lower than the mean rating of all knowledge items (4.44), which is consistent with pattern found for master’s students and may reflect that skill execution is more complex than knowledge acquisition

Table 13

*Current Doctoral Students’ Evaluation of Program Attributes of the Counseling Doctoral Program*

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

**Very Very Total**

**# Question Poor Poor Fair Good Good Responses Mean**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1 Comprehensiveness of the 0 0 0 3 10 13 4.77

curriculum

2 Supervision received overall 0 0 0 5 4 9 4.44

(TTU + Site)

3 Site supervision from 0 0 0 4 4 8 4.50

practicum/internship

4 On-campus individual 0 0 0 2 7 9 4.78

supervision

5 On-campus group supervision 0 0 0 2 7 9 4.78

6 Instructional classroom 0 0 0 3 9 12 4.75

(i.e., teaching)

7 Professional competence of 0 0 0 1 12 13 4.92

faculty

8 Accessibility/availability 0 0 0 2 11 13 4.85

of the faculty

9 Academic advisement 0 0 2 1 10 13 4.62

provided by faculty

10 Facilities and resources 0 0 0 4 9 13 4.69

11 In class role-played practice 0 0 0 1 12 13 4.92

with feedback

12 Faculty as mentors 0 0 0 1 12 13 4.92

13 Evaluation/assessment of 0 0 0 2 11 13 4.85

student performance by

faculty

14 Duration (i.e., academic 0 0 0 2 11 13 4.85

length) of the program(s)

15 Timely and meaningful 0 0 1 1 11 13 4.77

feedback on student

work by faculty

16 Sequence of the curriculum 0 0 0 2 11 13 4.85

17 Identification of course 0 0 0 2 11 13 4.85

trademark outcomes

18 Offering remediation as 0 0 0 2 7 9 4.78

needed

19 Offering role-played 0 0 0 2 11 13 4.85

opportunities as

appropriate

20 Creating opportunities for a 0 1 0 1 11 13 4.69

sense of community

among students

21 Providing action research 0 0 1 1 9 11 4.73

opportunities

**Mean 4.77**

**Summary**

* The ratings by current doctoral students on the program attributes ranged from a low of 4.44 (Supervision received overall at TTU + site) to a high of 4.92 (Competence of Faculty; In-Class Role-Playing with Feedback; and Faculty Mentorship
* Surprisingly, doctoral students rated role-playing much higher, relatively, than did master’s students
* The overall mean rating of all program attributes equaled 4.77, which is very high on a five-point scale

**Scholarly Performance of Current Doctoral Students**

**Survey Results of Doctoral Graduates**

Eight doctoral students graduated between fall 2013 and spring 2016. Seven of those students responded to the doctoral graduate survey. The following information was derived from those responses.

Table 14

*Doctoral Graduates*

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

**# Age Gender Ethnicity**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1 38 Male Asian

2 53 Female Caucasian

3 49 Female Caucasian

4 55 Male Caucasian

5 60 Male Caucasian

6 26 Female Caucasian

7 34 Female Caucasian

**Mean 45**

**Summary**

* The mean age of doctoral graduates equaled 45 years
* Four graduates were female while three were male
* Six graduates were Caucasian while one was Asian

**Which degree(s) have you received from the counselor education program at TTU? Check all that apply.**

**# Answer Response %**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | MEd - School Counseling | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 1 | 14% |
| 2 | MEd - Clinical Mental Health / Community | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 3 | PhD - Counselor Education and Supervision | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 7 | 86% |

**When did you first enter your doctoral program in the Counselor Education Program in the College of Education at Texas Tech University?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Answer** | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | **Response** | **%** |
| 1 | 2016 | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 2 | 2015 | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 3 | 2014 | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 4 | 2013 | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 5 | 2012 | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 6 | 2011 | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 4 | 57% |
| 7 | 2010 | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 8 | 2009 | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 3 | 43% |
| 9 | 2008 | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 10 | 2007 | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
|  | Total |  | 7 | 100% |

**Which semester did you begin the program?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Answer** | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | **Response** | **%** |
| 1 | Fall | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 7 | 100% |
| 2 | Spring | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 3 | Summer | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |

**Summary**

* Few of the graduates received their master’s degree at TTU
* Survey respondents graduated in 2011 or 2009
* All respondents entered the program in the fall

**Did you present a program or a poster session at a local, state, national, or international conference since working on doctoral program? If so, where?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Answer** | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | **Response** | **%** |
| 1 | Yes | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 7 | 100% |
| 2 | No | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
|  | Total |  | 7 | 100% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Yes** |
| * TYU conference, TCA conference |
| * TSCA;TCA |
| * TSCA, TCA |
| * ACA, Cincinnati, OH |
| * ACA, TCA, TTU Counselor Ed. Conference |
| * Several state and national conference programs |

**Have your submitted a manuscript for publication since working on your doctorate? If yes, how many?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Answer** | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | **Response** | **%** | |
| 1 | Yes | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 6 | 86% | |
| 2 | No | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 1 | 14% | |
|  | Total |  | 7 | 100% | |
|  | | | | |

**Do you belong to a professional organization? At the local, state, or national level?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Answer** | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | **Response** | **%** |
| 1 | Yes, if so which ones | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 6 | 86% |
| 2 | No | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 1 | 14% |
|  | Total |  | 7 | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Yes, if so which ones** |
| * ACA, TCA, ASCA, |
| * ATSA |
| * ACA, TCA, TAASA, NCAC |
| * ACA, TCA |
| * TCA, TAADA, WTCA (I have belonged to ACA in the past; however, it is too expensive for me currently). |
| * ACA, ACES, AHC, ASJ, TCA, WCA   **Summary**   * Graduates were active in belonging to professional associations and making presentations at annual conferences * Almost all graduates submitted manuscripts for publication since graduating |

Table 15

*Doctoral Graduates’ Current Employment*

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Job title** | **Agency/ Institution name** | **Agency/ Institution City/State Location** | **Primary clientele** | **Primary job functions** |
| **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | | | | |
| Assistant Professor | Wichita State University | Wichita/KS | Graduate students | Teaching/research/ service |
| LSOTP | Community supervision & correction department | Snyder, TX | Sex offenders | Therapist |
| Counselor/ Adjunct Prof | Jennings Counseling Services/TTU | Amarillo, TX/ Lubbock, TX | Children/ Adolescents/ Adults | Counseling, expert witness/teaching |
| Counselor/ Adjunct Professor | Jennings Counseling Services/TTU | Amarillo, TX/ Lubbock, TX | Adults | Counseling/teaching |
| Adjunct Professor | Wayland Baptist University & Texas Tech University | Wichita Falls, TX & Lubbock, TX | Master level students | Teach counseling courses: theories, marriage & family, group, field experience, and career |
| Assistant Director/Lead Counselor | Texas Tech University Career Center | Lubbock, TX | Undergraduate and Graduate students, Alumni | Individual career counseling, class presentations, event planning, marketing, website development, research, recruiting employers, liaison between professors and advisors and career center |
| Not working at this time |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

**What professional certifications and/or licensures do you currently hold and for how many years? Check all that apply.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Answer** | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | **Response** | **%** |
| 1 | Certified School Counselor | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 2 | LPC | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 3 | 50% |
| 3 | LPC-Intern | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 4 | LPC-Supervisor | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 4 | 67% |
| 5 | LPCC | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 6 | NCC | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 2 | 33% |
| 7 | LMFT/LMFT-A | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0% |
| 8 | LCDC | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 1 | 17% |
| 9 | Other | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 4 | 67% |

**Summary**

* Graduates hold positions as professors, adjunct faculty, private practitioners, and agency counselors
* Graduates hold licensure as LPCs, LPC-Supervisors, and LCDCs

**Do you provide professional (e.g., counseling or development) services other than in your primary employment setting (e.g., in a private practice)? If so, please briefly describe your activities in this capacity:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Text Response** |
| * *No* |
| * *Yes, in private practice and for the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, same clientele* |
| * *Presenting at conferences* |
| * *Presentations* |
| * *No* |
| * *I have trained different groups on Human Trafficking, most recently I trained school counselors in Austin Texas about human trafficking.* |

**Based on your experiences in the Counselor Education Doctoral Program, what were the strengths of the Program (please describe briefly):**

|  |
| --- |
| **Text Response** |
| * *Outstanding faculty team providing students with support on research, teaching, leadership, and clinical supervision* |
| * *Personal attention from committee and diversity of professors* |
| * *The content, instruction and faulty* |
| * *Content; faculty* |
| * *The vast counseling & research knowledge of the professors; professors willingness to include PhD students on publications, CACREP accreditation, professors willingness to help students achieve their goals to the ethical extent possible.* |
| * *The TTU Counselor Education program strength is anything and everything counseling related. After completing the program, students are extremely prepared to provide counseling to individuals, conduct treatment plans, conceptualize cases, advocate for clientele, to follow the ACA Code of Ethics and the ASCA National Model.* |
| * *The real strength of the program is in the cohort system. We bond together as a group and continue to support each other throughout. I would also say the commitment to working with state and national professional organizations was a real strength. The junior faculty were also a huge strength of the program.* |

**Summary:**

* Graduates view the faculty in a very positive light
* Graduates appreciated CACREP accreditation
* Graduates valued the cohort structure of the program
* Graduates feel the program prepared them well as counselors and scholars

**Based on your experiences in the Counselor Education Doctoral Program, what were the weaknesses of the Program (please describe briefly):**

|  |
| --- |
| **Text Response** |
| * *N/A* |
| * *I don't know* |
| * *NA* |
| * *NA* |
| * *I can't think of any weaknesses.* |
| * *The program does a great job of promoting professionalism among its students. The program might also describe more about marketing to obtain clients, and the business side involved in counseling.* |
| * *The program is mostly a retake of my master’s classes. In reality there was very little that prepared me for publication or actually teaching these classes. I could have really used more emphasis on best practices in teaching, creating courses from scratch and even how to find a faculty job. I went straight into teaching before even graduating and while I know my subjects well I was not well trained in how to teach them, design classes or integrate online technology into the programs. This would have been very helpful along with some discussion on how to navigate university politics.*   **Summary**   * Of the seven respondents, only one identified weakness in the doctoral program. This person seemed to express concern about not being adequately prepared for the scholarly and teaching duties of a faculty member. |

Table 16, Table 17, and Table 18 describe the responses of graduates of the doctoral program regarding their knowledge of counseling areas, their skills in the same counseling areas, and their evaluation of TTU’s counseling doctoral program.

Table 16

*Doctoral Graduates’ Knowledge of Counseling Areas (Self-report)*

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

**Very Very Total**

**# Question Poor Poor Fair Good Good Responses Mean**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Counseling Theory | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.80 |
| 2 | Methods to Evaluate Counseling Effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.60 |
| 3 | Group Counseling | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.80 |
| 4 | Legal and Ethical Issues | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.80 |
| 5 | Supervision Received | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5.00 |
| 6 | Supervision Theory/Application | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5.00 |
| 7 | Multicultural Counseling | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5.00 |
| 8 | Social Justice/Advocacy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.80 |
| 9 | Teaching/Pedagogy | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.20 |
| 10 | Research Methodology/Statistics | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.60 |
| 11 | Program Evaluation | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.20 |
| 12 | Professional Writing | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.40 |
| 13 | Consultation | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.20 |
| 14 | Leadership for Advocacy/Professional Organizations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.80 |
| 15 | Practicum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5.00 |
| 16 | Internship | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4.80 |
| 17 | Professionalism/Professional Identity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5.00 |
| 18 | Opportunities to Collaborate with Professors and Classmates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.20 |
| 19 | Scholarship/Grant Writing/Publications | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.40 |
| 20 | Professional Credentialing | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.20 |
|  | **Mean** |  |  |  |  |  |  | **4.64** |

**Summary**

* The mean ratings on knowledge ranged from low of 4.20 on collaboration with professors and classmates and professional credentialing to a high of 5.0 on many areas
* The mean rating for knowledge equaled 4.64

Table 17

*Doctoral Graduates’ Skill Development in Counseling Areas (Self-report)*

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **Very Poor** | **Poor** | **Fair** | **Good** | **Very Good** | **Total Responses** | **Mean** |
| **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Counseling Theory | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4.57 |
| 2 | Methods to Evaluate Counseling Effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4.57 |
| 3 | Group Counseling | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4.71 |
| 4 | Legal and Ethical Issues | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 5 | Supervision Received | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 6 | Supervision Theory/Application | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 7 | Multicultural Counseling | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.57 |
| 8 | Social Justice/Advocacy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4.71 |
| 9 | Teaching/Pedagogy | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.43 |
| 10 | Research Methodology/Statistics | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 4.71 |
| 11 | Program Evaluation | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.43 |
| 12 | Professional Writing | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.57 |
| 13 | Consultation | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.43 |
| 14 | Leadership for Advocacy/Professional Organizations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 15 | Practicum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 5.00 |
| 16 | Internship | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 17 | Professionalism/Professional Identity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 5.00 |
| 18 | Opportunities to Collaborate with Professors and Classmates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.43 |
| 19 | Scholarship/Grant Writing/Publications | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.57 |
| 20 | Professional Credentialing | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4.43 |
|  | **Mean** |  |  |  |  |  |  | **4.67** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Summary**

* The mean ratings on skills ranged from a low of 4.43 in program evaluation, opportunities for collaboration and professional credentialing to a high on practicum and professional identity

Table 18

*Doctoral Graduates’ Personal Evaluation of the Doctoral Program in Counseling*

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Question** | **Very Poor** | **Poor** | **Fair** | **Good** | **Very Good** | **Total Responses** | **Mean** |
| **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Comprehensiveness of the curriculum | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 4.71 |
| 2 | Supervision received overall (TTU + Site) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 3 | Site supervision from practicum/internship | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 4 | On-campus individual supervision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 5.00 |
| 5 | On-campus group supervision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 6 | Instructional classroom (i.e., teaching) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 7 | Professional competence of faculty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 8 | Accessibility/availability of the faculty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 9 | Academic advisement provided by faculty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 10 | Facilities and resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4.71 |
| 11 | In class role-played practice with feedback | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4.86 |
| 12 | Faculty as mentors | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4.71 |
| 13 | Evaluation/assessment of student performance by faculty, (e.g., use of rubrics) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.67 |
| 14 | Duration (i.e., academic length) of the program(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4.57 |
| 15 | Timely and meaningful feedback on student work by faculty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4.71 |
| 16 | Sequence of the curriculum | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4.57 |
| 17 | Identification of course trademark outcomes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.67 |
| 18 | Offering remediation as needed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4.50 |
| 19 | Offering role-played opportunities as appropriate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4.71 |
| 20 | Creating opportunities for a sense of community among students | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4.57 |
| 21 | Providing action research opportunities | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4.43 |
| **22** | **Overall rating** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **6** | **7** | **4.86** |

**Summary**

* Graduates rated program attributes from a low of 4.43 regarding action research opportunities to a high 4.86 for multiple areas
* The overall rating of program attributes equaled 4.86

**Scholarly Performance of Doctoral Graduates**

Table 19

*Job Placements and Scholarly Productivity of Doctoral Graduates by Gender, Ethnicity, and Graduation Date*

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Gender** | **Ethnicity** | **Graduation Date** | **First Job** | **Publications** | | **Presentations** | | |
| Rhode, K | F | WH | Dec 18, 2010 | University of Oklahoma | | 1 | | 3 |
| West, H. | F | WH | Dec 18, 2010 | Lindsey Wilson College | | 0 | | 3 |
| Merriman, J | F | WH | May 14, 2011 | Tarleton State University | | 1 | | 36 |
| Hennington, C. | M | WH | Aug 6, 2011 | Lubbock Christian College | | 2 | | 4 |
| Van Rensburg, E. | F | WH | Aug 6, 2011 | Private Practice | | 0 | | 1 |
| Johnston, G. | M | WH | May 19, 2012 | TTU-Human Sciences | | 1 | | 8 |
| Green, L | F | WH | Aug 11, 2012 | West Texas A&M | | 0 | | 4 |
| Berry, J | M | WH | May 18, 2013 | Central Texas A&M | | 3 | | 6 |
| Berry, St | M | WH | Aug 10, 2013 | Troy University | | 0 | | 5 |
| McClenagan, B. | M | WH | Aug 10, 2013 | Wayland Baptist University | | 2 | | 4 |
| Ritter, R | F | WH | Aug 10, 2013 | LISD/Private Practice | | 7 | | 22 |
| Kabell, D | M | WH | Dec 14, 2013 | Wayland Baptist University/Private Practice | | 5 | | 8 |
| Li, Jiaqi | M | NR | Dec 14, 2013 | Wichita State University | | 7 | | 19 |
| Dawson, L | F | WH | May 17, 2014 | Eastern New Mexico University | | 3 | | 13 |
| Noble, N | F | WH | Aug 9, 2014 | TTU-Career Center | | 1 | | 10 |
| Gaa, M | F | WH | Dec 13, 2014 | Tarleton State University | | 1 | | 12 |
| Jennings, S. | F | WH | May 16, 2015 | Private Practice/TTU Adjunct | | 0 | | 20 |
| Jennings, S. | M | WH | May 16, 2015 | Private Practice/TTU Adjunct | | 1 | | 6 |
| Torbert, S | F | WH | 11-Dec-15 | Private Practice | | 0 | | 10 |
| **Mean** |  |  |  |  | | **1.84** | | **10.21** |

**Summary**

* Doctoral graduates find careers as professors, adjunct professors, institutional counselors, and LPCs in private practice
* Doctoral graduates averaged about 2 publications and10 presentations since graduation

**Please share any comments you have about the Counselor Education Doctoral Program**

|  |
| --- |
| * *The above survey responses noted the master's program yet this final comment box states that we are discussing the doctoral program. I am confused because my responses were in regards to the master's program based on the wording above.* |
| * *Very glad that I am enrolled in this great program.* |
| * *Very comprehensive and professionally pertinent.* |
| * *Very pleased with decision to enter the program.* |
| * *I did not complete my Master's degree at TTI therefore could not answer the above questions about TTU Master’s program* |
| * *Truly outstanding.* |
| * *I have enjoyed the program very much.* |
| * *I'm very pleased so far with the doctoral program. I answered the questions about with reference to it.* |
| * *I received my master’s degree from another college - the approach at Texas Tech is exciting and creates a personalization of the education process - I am proud to be part of the program.* |

**Survey Results from the Advisory Board**

Table 20

*Advisory Board Ratings of Knowledge and Skills by Area*

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

Areas n Knowledge Skills

Mean Mean

School Counseling (ASCA Model) 11 4.89 4.78

Clinical Mental Health Counseling ` 09 4.67 4.63

Group Counseling 11 4.55 4.50

Theories of Counseling 11 4.64 4.70

Career and Lifestyle Counseling 11 4.27 4.20

Multicultural Counseling 11 4.64 4.30

Human Growth and Development 09 4.56 4.22

Testing and Assessment 11 4.27 4.10

Crisis Counseling 11 4.55 4.40

Family Counseling 11 4.64 4.56

Dysfunctional Behavior 10 4.60 4.56

Consultation 10 4.60 4.56

Techniques of Counseling 11 4.91 4.80

Addictions 10 4.50 4.33

Supervision Given 10 4.80 4.67

Supervision Received 11 4.82 4.70

Research/Statistics/Evaluation 11 4.64 4.50

Diagnosis 07 4.57 4.43

Child and Adolescent Counseling 10 4.60 4.44

Special Needs Counseling 10 4.30 4.10

Ethical and Legal Matters 11 4.91 4.80

Advocacy 10 4.80 4.60

Treatment Planning/Case Management 09 4.56 4.44

Technology 09 4.44 4.22

Psychopharmacology 09 3.56 3.56

Couples/Marriage Counseling 08 4.38 4.29

Professional Credentialing 10 4.70 4.56

Professional Organizations 10 4.70 4.67

Individual Counseling 11 4.64 4.60

**Overall Mean (SD) 4.57 (.26) 4.45 (.27)**

Scale 1 = very poor; 2 = poor; 3 = fail; 4 = good; 5 = very good; NA = not applicable

**Summary**

* The Board rated knowledge from a low of 3.56 for psychopharmacology to a high of 4.91 regarding legal and ethical matters
* The Board rated skill areas from a low of 3.56 for psychopharmacology to a high of 4.80 for legal and ethical matters
* The Board’s mean rating of knowledge, 4.57, slightly higher than skill areas, 4.45

Table 21

*Advisory Board Ratings of Program Attributes of EPCE Students as Employees*

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

Attributes M n

Employee’s readiness for duties and responsibilities 4.73 11

Distinctiveness of the employee’s skills 4.91 11

Professionalism of the employee 4.82 11

Employee’s willingness to be a team player 4.82 11

Employee’s work ethic 4.82 11

Dependability of the employee 4.82 11

Initiative of the employee 4.73 11

Interpersonal skills of the employee 4.82 11

Overall rating of the employee 4.82 11

**Overall Mean (SD) 4.81 (.05)**

**Summary**

* The Board rated all areas quite high
* On a relative basis, the lowest ratings of attributes was a mean of 4.63 for readiness and initiative while the highest rating of 4.91 was for distinctiveness of skills.
* The mean rating of all attributes equaled 4.81

**Student Faculty Ratio**

The following table presents the student-faculty ratio for EPCE.

Table 22

*EPCE Student-Faculty Ratio by Year and Term*

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Year/Semester** | **Credit Hours** | **Ratio** |
| **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | | |
| 2009 spring | 383 | 6.55 |
| 2009 fall | 379 | 5.62 |
| 2010 spring | 380 | 6.49 |
| 2010 fall | 472 | 6.32 |
| 2011 spring | 461 | 8.54 |
| 2011 fall | 723 | 7.5 |
| 2012 spring | 582 | 9.94 |
| 2012 fall | 755 | 11.28 |
| 2013 spring | 770 | 12.22 |
| 2013 fall | 650 | 9.6 |
| 2014 spring | 610 | 10.42 |
| 2014 fall | 792 | 11 |
| 2015 spring | 788 | 9.7 |
| 2015 fall | 951 | 13.21 |
| 2016 spring | 107 | 12.64 |

**Summary**

* There is a clear trend of increasing credit hour generation since 2019
* The student-faculty ratio in the past two years exceeds the limit set by CACREP. A new faculty member has been hired beginning in the fall 2016, thus, this will help.

**Final Summary**

* **The return rate for doctoral graduates was high (80%); for masters graduates was so low (2%) it was not included in this report; for current doctoral students as moderate (33%); for current masters students was low (22%); for site supervisors was very high (nearly 100%); and for the advisory board was very high (nearly 100%).**
* **Masters students chose the Counselor Education Program at TTU because of the following: CACREP accreditation; consistent with career goals; and the Program’s reputation**
* **Masters students’ performance on the exit exam (CPCE) placed them in the 66th percentile equivalent when compared to national norms**
* **The past rate of masters graduates for licensure as an LPC equaled 91%, which exceeded the state average**
* **All masters students taking the school counseling certification exam passed and their mean percentile score equaled 63**
* **Survey of current masters students indicated an overall mean rating of 3.85 for knowledge and 3.78 for skills (5=high) while the attributes of the Program equaled a mean of 4.45**
* **The overall mean rating by site supervisors of interns equaled 4.4**
* **The strengths of interns identified by site supervisors was establishing rapport and communicating effectively while the area identified as needing improvement was more experience**
* **The rate of acceptance of applicants for both masters and doctoral students was very high (90% +)**
* **The ratio of female to male current doctoral students is about 3 to 1**
* **The modal age range of current doctoral students in in the 30s**
* **Current doctoral students decided to enroll at TTU because of CACREP accreditation, hybrid delivery, and the program’s reputation**
* **Current doctoral students are very active in professional organizations and conference presentations**
* **Current doctoral students view the program’s strengths as being the quality of faculty and the cohort configuration while the weaknesses identified concerned a lack of rigor, lack of clinic, and “busy” work**
* **The current doctoral students’ mean rating on the survey of knowledge and skills equaled 4.44 and 4.36, respectively**
* **Current doctoral students gave the Program’s Attributes mean rating of 4.77**
* **The majority (86-100%) of doctoral graduates have presented at professional conferences and submitted papers for publication**
* **Doctoral graduates hold positions as professors, therapists in private practice, and counselors/leaders with agencies**
* **Doctoral graduates rated the Program strengths in following areas: CACREP accreditation; the quality of faculty, and the cohort configuration while one respondent expressed the need for greater shift in doctoral work form masters-level work**
* **Doctoral graduates rated the mean knowledge and skill areas on the survey as 4.64 and 4.67, respectively**
* **Doctoral students’ overall rating of the Program’s attributes as equaling 4.86**
* **Doctoral graduates averaged 10 presentations and two publications since graduating**
* **Doctoral graduates offered very positive open comments about the Program**
* **The Program’s Advisory Board rated the means on knowledge and skills as 4.57 and 4.45, respectively, and they rated the mean Program’s attributes as 4.81**
* **The student-faculty ratio from the spring of 2009 to the spring of 2016 ranged from a low of 5.62 to the current ratio of 12.64**

**Recommendations**

The overwhelming majority of survey ratings and open-ended comments were quite positive about the Counseling Program. Thus, a compelling argument could be made for the Program to maintain current practices and policies. A glaring issue in this report concerns the student-faculty ratio that exceeds CACREP approval because CACREP was consistently cited as the reason students chose to enroll at TTU. Thus, continued support of CACREP is imperative. The return rate from several constituents was too low to justify definitive conclusions or recommendation, but the Counselor Education Program could strengthen the doctoral program by adding more rigor in its curriculum and by sharpening the distinction between doctoral work and masters-level work.