

**Walsh University**  
**Counseling & Human Development Program**  
**Three-Year Evaluation Report**  
**2011-2014**

**I. Admissions Data Summary**

CHD faculty members review admissions data annually; additionally, they have reviewed admission data over the course of the three-year program evaluation period in comparison to the prior three-year program evaluation period. Comparisons with the prior evaluation period admissions examinations data are limited because of the significant changes in the organization of the scoring of both the GRE and MAT admissions exams, and by the fact that, during this evaluation period, the faculty changed the admissions criteria to eliminate the requirement for the GRE or MAT (provided the applicant brought a Bachelor's degree with a 3.0 overall GPA or another Masters degree) beginning in Fall 2012. Comparing mean and median GRE and MAT scores between 2011-12 and the previous evaluation period shows no significant differences but a slight decline in both GRE and MAT score. This continues only very slightly a trend from the previous evaluation period. There are no significant changes or trend in the range, mean and median GPA scores between the previous and current evaluation period.

What is more striking is the increase of the earlier trend in the decline in conversion from admissions to enrolled students. Whereas there was an 8 average student difference between admissions and enrollment during the previous evaluation period, by 2013-14 that difference had increased to 13 average student difference, with a 22 student difference in 2013-2014 academic year. Applicants are much slower to commit to enrollment and faculty continue to note the increasingly fluidity of career commitment among applicants. This speaks to the need for increased marketing and admissions follow through, and results in greater faculty time spent in working with candidates. Additionally, admissions continue the previous trend of primarily local (Canton area and 70 mile radius in northeast Ohio) applicants. To retain the small increases in overall program enrollment, there continues to be a need to increase marketing beyond northeast Ohio.

The summary of admissions data (per student report) also demonstrates that the CHD student body continues to remain primarily European-American and more female than male (39% male), with an average of 13% of admitted students representing Hispanic and non-white populations (including Native American; Non-Resident Africans; African Americans; Hispanic Americans; and Biracial). The lack of meaningful cultural diversity among the CHD student body reflects, in part, broader issues within the university as a whole. Retaining diverse students remains difficult despite the creation of CHD tutors and more intense efforts of faculty (including efforts to assist homeless students) to address the complexities

in the lives of culturally diverse students. Unlike the undergraduate programs at Walsh, there is no organized support program for conditionally admitted graduate students.

As part of the 2009 CACREP reaccreditation curriculum revision process, the faculty reviewed Walsh admissions standards in comparison to admissions standards of other counselor education and training programs in northeastern Ohio. Walsh admissions standards were found to be far more restrictive than other institutions, and as a result, faculty determined to remove the GRE/MAT admissions tests requirement for all students and require an admissions test only if the applicant's GPA was below 3.0; in compensation for this change, faculty determined that greater emphasis should be placed on the writing sample. Accordingly, writing samples now must be completed on campus in conjunction with the interviewing process (or in a testing center). As noted in the discussion of data above, this change does not seem to have adversely affected the general academic characteristics of applicants but was followed with a slight increase in African-American students.

## **II. Comprehensive and Licensure Examinations; Field Competency Ratings**

### **A. Comprehensive Examinations**

The CHD program continues to use the nationally-normed Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE), produced and managed by NCC Inc., as the comprehensive examination for the core counseling curriculum areas, and locally-determined case study discussion questions as the comprehensive examination for the specialty areas of School Counseling and Clinical Mental Health Counseling. Faculty members have reviewed CPCE and comps case study exams both annually and for the three-year evaluation period. Three-year CPCE data for overall mean CPCE scores show that overall mean scores for Walsh students were above the national overall mean CPCE scores in all three years of the evaluation period. More specifically, the Walsh overall mean scores are, on the average, 8.64 points above the national mean across the evaluation period. It is also important to note that in Spring 2009, NBCC segregated entrance from exit exam scores; thus, the CHD program now compares Walsh students to other exiting counselor education students. In Fall, 2013, which had the lowest overall mean score for Walsh students in this evaluation period, there were three core knowledge areas, Social & Cultural Diversity, Helping Relationships and Group, in which the Walsh means were very slightly below the national means for these areas. In Fall 2011, the Walsh mean score for the Research area was very slightly below the national mean. No clear pattern emerges from this data; it more likely reflects individual student differences. In fact, the consistent pattern of somewhat lower scores in research and

assessment, which characterized annual reports in the previous evaluation cycle data, has disappeared.

In regard to the case study discussion portion of the overall comprehensive exam, annual faculty reviews of student products have resulted in continued fine-tuning in the design of cases and questions and instructions to focus student efforts on case conceptualization and interventions. While internship site supervisors generally report that both School Counseling and Clinical Mental Health Counseling students have very good skills in case conceptualization and the use of counseling interventions, faculty have continued to seek ways to improve students' skills.

#### **B. License Examinations**

In the 2011-2014 evaluation period, per the OCSWMFTB report, Walsh mental health students continue to have a 100 % pass rate on the NCE, the exam required for the initial, limited practice license in Ohio. Walsh is one of 9 of the 22 counselor education programs statewide with a 100% pass rate on the NCE. This pass rate is significantly above the national mean for the NCE. Per the OCSWMFTB reports on the NCMHCE, the state examination for the independent practice clinical license in Ohio, Walsh alumni had a 85% overall pass rate during the three-year evaluation period. These result places Walsh in the top 9 among 22 counselor education programs in Ohio. Finally, it is important to note that, unlike several other Ohio counselor education programs, Walsh has not directly "taught to" these exams, particularly the NCMHCE exam or required attendance at license examination preparation programs.

#### **C. Field Competency Ratings**

School Field Competency Ratings. Internship site supervisors from Fall 2011 through Spring 2014 (N = 42) rated forty (40) students at "exceeds expectations" (rated above 3.5, with a rating of 3 as "meets expectations") and two (2) students at "meets expectations" (rated from 3.0 to 3.4).

Clinical Mental Health Competency Ratings. Internship site supervisors from Summer 2011 through Spring 2014 (N = 48) rated forty-three (43) students "exceeds expectations" (rated above 3.5, with a rating of 3 as "meets expectations", five (5) students "meets expectations" (rated from 3.0 to 3.4).

### **III. Student Learning Outcome and Developmental Theme Data**

The CHD program assessment plan requires analysis of two student learning outcomes (SLO) each academic year, utilizing two measures for each SLO.

#### **2011-2012**

The academic year of 2011-2012 evaluated SLO 1: CHD graduates will demonstrate core knowledge competencies in counseling (8 core CACREP areas) and SLO 4: CHD graduates will demonstrate the specialized skills required to practice as Mental Health or School Counselors. As this occurred before TaskStream was implemented data was used from existing resources reported elsewhere in this report.

### **2012-2013**

The academic year 2012-2013 evaluated SLO 2: CHD graduates will combine core counseling skills in practice and in practicum/field experiences and SLO 5: CHD graduates will comply with their ethical, legal and professional responsibilities. The 2012-2013 assessment year also included the first evaluation of these SLOs utilizing the 2009 CACREP standards, and a student developmental theme (i.e., counseling skills).

Data for SLO 2: Practicum site supervisors rated sixty-six (66) students at “exceeds expectations” and two (2) students at “meets expectations” (N = 68). Practicum instructors rated all students at the “exceeds expectations” level (N = 68). Evaluation of SLO 2 via the 2009 CACREP standards demonstrates that students are successfully meeting the outcome target. CHD remediation efforts are successfully targeting students struggling with basic skills. Multicultural scores demonstrate growth between data gathered at the entry level compared to data gathered at the practical application level, and career scores meet the outcome target but are relatively lower scores. As a result of the SLO 2 data, an action plan was developed that included 1) improvement in the design of artifact assignments to more effectively capture the standard being addressed, 2) improvement in descriptive categories in evaluation rubrics to enhance the match between the artifact and the standard, 3) increased clarity of instructions in course syllabi, and 4) improvement of inter-rater reliability through training/orientation to assessment rubrics/tools.

Data for SLO 5: Seventy-three (73) student interns were rated at “exceeds expectations” by their site supervisors and four (4) were rated at “meets expectations” (N = 77). Practicum site supervisors rated sixty-nine (69) students “exceeds expectations” and one (1) student “meets expectations” (N = 70). Evaluation of SLO 5 via the CACREP standards demonstrates that students are successfully meeting the outcome target, although there are relatively lower scores in the application and adherence to ethical and legal standards within the specialty setting. As a result of the SLO 5 data, an action plan was developed that included 1) improvement of descriptive categories in evaluation tools to enhance the match between the artifact and the standard, 2) improvement of inter-rater reliability through training/orientation to assessment rubrics/tools, 3) building the sample size to improve statistical significance, 4) monitoring the difference between knowledge (as rated academic courses) and performance (as rated in Practicum) over time. Developmentally, this is an expected

finding since this is the first real experience with clients. If the trend continues, plans will be made to increase exposure to practical application.

Results of the counseling skills development theme found that students' development of counseling skills progressed from meeting the initial and mid-point target to approximating the professional practice target. There were relatively higher scores in seeking supervision, confirming the program's successful efforts to promote a culture of providing and seeking supervision and indicating that students recognized the need for supervision. There were relatively lower scores in self-awareness, which reflects a higher order skill. As a result of the theme data, an action plan was developed that included 1) building the sample size, 2) monitoring differences between subgroups (i.e., CMHC, School, and Dual) to see if the differences between specialties hold when the sample size increases (CMHC ratings were slightly higher than School ratings), and 3) examine the possibility of adding an analysis of data regarding age of student, to assess the level of self-awareness in younger students.

#### **2013-2014**

The academic year of 2013-2014 evaluated SLO 3: CHD graduates will integrate the core and the specialty knowledge and competencies required to practice as Mental Health Counselors and/or School Counselors, and SLO 6: CHD graduates will select the knowledge competencies, attitudes and skills necessary to work effectively with diverse populations in clinical and/or school counseling settings. The developmental theme was multicultural awareness.

Data for SLO 3: Internship site supervisors rated seventy (70) student interns at "exceeds expectations," and seven (7) at "meets expectations" (N = 77). Comprehensive exam case studies (as rated by faculty members in a blind evaluation) resulted in twelve (12) students "exceeds expectations," forty-two (42) "meets expectations," and nine (9) falling "below expectations" (N = 63). The comprehensive exam case study rating rubric had been revised during the assessment period, and as a result of the data, recommendations were made to clarify rating scores and train faculty to use the new rating system more effectively. Evaluation of SLO 3 via the CACREP standards indicate students are successfully meeting the outcome targets. As a result of the SLO 3 data, an action plan was developed which included 1) building the sample size for one artifact (the instructor made a change in the artifact, resulting in the loss of one semester of data), 2) enhancing the presence of substance issues and "disaster" level crises in CHD 777 Treatment, 3) increasing opportunities to practice choosing appropriate treatment mode/approach in CHD 777 Treatment, 4) increasing focus on models of program evaluation, and improve assignment instructions to better address standards in CHD 665 Foundations of CMH, and 5) increasing focus on psychopharmacological medications in the course content and improve exam questions in CHD 772 Abnormal.

Data for SLO 6: Data from the Multicultural Counseling Inventory ninety-two (92) students rated themselves as “exceeds expectations” and one student (1) as “meets expectations” (N = 93). The Comprehensive Exam Case Study was evaluated with a rubric developed to measure the students’ multicultural understanding of the case. Across categories, five (5) students were rated at “exceeds expectations,” twenty-nine (29) rated “meets expectations,” and twenty-nine (29) rated at “below expectations.” Evaluation of SLO 6 via the CACREP standards indicate that students are successfully meeting the outcome targets. Although a disparity between student self-perception of multicultural competence and the judgment of the faculty continues to exist, SLO 6 data indicates a reduction in the disparity. The action plan for SLO 6 includes 1) continuation of creating multicultural learning opportunities for counseling graduate students, exposing them more frequently to issues related to diversity, 2) creation of multiple opportunities to engage in self-reflection regarding diversity. The purpose of these activities is to continue building CHD graduate students’ competence, knowledge, and skill when working with diverse populations, 3) recommendation of institutional support at the graduate level to promote the success of diverse and/or first generation graduate applicants (i.e., supportive programming from admissions through the first year), 4) building sample sizes, and 5) clarification in the wording of some of the artifacts to more effectively match the expectations of the standards.

Results of the multicultural developmental theme indicate that there are two criteria rated lower than others (related to student awareness of his/her own identity). There was also only a small difference between the Initial and Mid-Point evaluation. As a result of the theme data, an action plan was developed which included 1) improving inter-rater reliability through faculty meetings to discuss and review rubric, and 2) evaluation of the artifact for the Mid-Point evaluation (CHD 730 Advocacy Poster) to ensure a good match for the developmental theme.

#### **IV. Three-Year Survey Data: Alumni, Employer and Site Supervisor Comparative Ratings**

##### **A. Alumni Survey Data (N=22)**

Sixty-one (61) Alumni surveys were sent; of these, twenty-two (22) or 36% were returned (15 CMHC students, 5 SC students and one Dual student). This return rate is similar to the return rate in the previous evaluation cycle. Review of the survey data resulted in the following summary:

University Resources and Services (1 – 5 scale: 1= poor; 2= fair; 3= satisfactory; 4= very good; 5= exceptional).

Overall, alumni rated university resources as satisfactory or above with two exceptions: 14% (N=3) rated financial aid services as “fair” and 5% (N=1) rated library services as “poor.” The university service with the highest overall average rating was counseling services and the service area with the lowest overall average rating was administrative offices (business office; registrar). No clear pattern emerges from a comparison with previous evaluation cycle reports.

#### Professional/Personal Development (same 1-5 scale as above)

All areas in this section were rated as “satisfactory” or above. The relatively lowest rated areas (at 3.73-3.75) were: “writing skills”; “involvement in professional organizations”; and “accessing, critiquing and using research literature in counseling practice”. The relatively highest rated areas (at 4.27-4.36) were: “individual development”; “self-awareness”; and “self-evaluation/openness to supervision and continued development”.

#### Overall Evaluation of the Counseling program

95% of respondents (N=21) reported that they recommended the program to others; 5% (N=1) reported that he/she did not recommend the program to others. 100% of respondents (N=22) reported that if they had the opportunity to recommend the program (again), they would do so. 100% (N=22) reported that the program met or exceeded their expectations; 32% (N=7) reported that the program met their expectations and 68% (N=15) reported that the program exceeded their expectations. These overall alumni evaluations of the Counseling program represent clear improvement over the last evaluation period. In the 2008-2011 evaluation period 82% of respondents had reported that they had recommended the program to other and 18% reported that they had not recommend the program to others. In the last evaluation cycle 86% of respondents had reported that, if they had the opportunity to recommend the program (again), they would do so and 14% of respondents had reported that they would not recommend the program again. In the last evaluation cycle 93% of respondents had reported that the program met or exceeded their expectations and 7% had reported that the program did not meet their expectations.

#### General Aspects of the Counseling Program (same 1-5 scale)

Overall, 100% of respondents reported overall ratings of the program as “satisfactory” or above, with 91% of respondents rating the program as “very good” or “exceptional.” In terms of specific items, items with the highest overall ratings were: “availability of faculty” (highest rating); “faculty members as role models/mentors”; “faculty members’ knowledge of subject matter”; and “faculty members’ clinical skills.” The item with the lowest rating was “orientation to Walsh University and the CHD program” and the second lowest rated item was “opportunity to be involved in research.” This last item does show some slight improvement in alumni rating over the 2008-2011 evaluation

period but remains an ongoing area of concern. This 2011-2014 evaluation period saw the last of the summer admissions to the program where less structured orientation was offered; nevertheless, the area indicates an area for improvement.

#### Counseling Knowledge and Skills (same 1-5 scale)

No alums rated any items in this area as less than satisfactory. Only one area "knowledge of systemic level structures governing practice" was rated at 3.00 (satisfactory); all the other areas were rated above satisfactory. It is important to note that most of the alums in this evaluation period would not have completed the revised 2009 curriculum which significantly strengthened this curricular area. The highest rated areas in this category were: "professional behavior" (highest rated); "ethical standards and legal issues"; "issues of diversity and their impact on the counseling process"; "group counseling theory and skills"; "basic counseling skills"; and "supervision of practicum and internship". All of these areas were rated "very good" or somewhat above.

#### Mental Health Specialization (same 1-5 scale)

All items in this section were rated "very good" or somewhat above; both "diagnosis" and "assessment and clinical appraisal" had the highest rating in this category.

#### School Counseling Specialization (same 1-5 scale)

All items in the section were rated "satisfactory" or somewhat above, the highest rated areas were "personal/social development" and "prevention and intervention plans". The relatively lowest rated area in this section was "knowledge of the ASCA model"; it is important to note that not all alums in this evaluation cycle may have benefitted from the 2009 curriculum revisions.

### **B. Employer Comparative Survey (N=11) (Scale: 1=lower; 2= comparable; 3=higher [than students from other university counseling programs])**

Of the 22 alumni surveys returned, only 15 included employer contact information; of the 15 employer surveys sent, 11 (73%) were returned (9 in mental health and 2 in school counseling). With the exception of one supervisor rating of one Walsh student in regard to "writing", all supervisors rated Walsh students as comparable or higher than students from other university counseling programs. Average ratings across all areas were "comparable" or "above" for Walsh students

#### Counseling Knowledge / Skills

The relatively lowest rated areas by employers were "research skills" (2.00) and "writing" (2.09); however these were "satisfactory." The research rating constitutes an area that has been cited as relatively weaker in previous evaluation cycles. The relatively highest areas as rated by employers were: "professional behavior" (highest at 2.73); "basic counseling skills" (2.64); "speaking/presentation skills" (2.56); "group



counseling theory and skills” (2.56); and “self-confidence/self-efficacy as a counselor” (2.55). The latter two ratings represent an improvement from previous evaluation cycles where these skill areas were rated relatively lower.

Mental Health specialization (N=9)

All ratings in this area were clearly rated above “comparable” in relation to graduates from other universities, with “assessment and clinical appraisal” being rated the highest (2.44) “psychopathology” being rated the lowest (2.22).

School Counseling (N=2)

All the average ratings in this area were clearly rated above “comparable” in relation to graduates from other universities. In view of the small number (N=2) further analysis is not possible.

**C. Site Supervisor Comparative Surveys (Scale: 1=lower; 2= comparable; 3=higher [than students from other universities])**

Mental Health N=21 of 51 sent – 41% return rate

All average ratings in this area across all students were clearly above “comparable” in relation to students from other universities. One student had an overall rating of 1.7 across all areas. Supplemental written comments note “language and cultural differences played a role in [her] preparedness. All of the other Walsh students I have supervised would’ve fallen in the “higher” category.” The relatively lowest rated counseling knowledge and skills area across all students was “systemic level structures governing practice” (2.19); this is part reflects the pre-2009 curricular changes. The relatively highest rated areas were: “professional behavior” (2.71); “understanding the use of consultation in practice” (2.57); “computer skills” (2.57); “assessment and clinical appraisal” (2.55) and then all rated at 2.52 were “ethical standards and legal issues”; “treatment planning”; recognition of developmental stages in assessment and treatment”; “speaking / presentation skills” and “ self-confidence/self-efficacy as a counselor.” These results are generally consistent with alumni and employer survey results.

School Counseling N=24 of 51 sent – 47% return rate

All average ratings in this area across all students were above “comparable” in relation to students from other universities. Two students had individual ratings of 1.5 and 1.7. The relatively lowest rated counseling knowledge and skills areas were “assessments used in school counseling” (2.13) and “understanding the use of educational and psychological instruments in assessment” (2.14). The relatively highest rated areas were: “ethical standards and legal issues” (2.54); “computer skills” (2.54); “writing skills” (2.52); “professional behavior” (2.50); “understands school counselor role/identity”

(2.50); “importance of school counselor accountability” (2.50); “issues of diversity” (2.50); “making appropriate referrals and community linkage” (2.50).

**V. Program Philosophy and Goals Review, Curriculum Review and Summary Outcomes**

**A. Program Philosophy and Program Goals Review**

Faculty members reviewed the program philosophy and goals in relation to the curriculum review undertaken in 2011-12 to bring the program into compliance with the 2009 CACREP standards. Faculty members determined that the overall program mission and philosophy did not need further modification. Program goals were also reviewed and determined to remain a good fit for graduate education philosophy at Walsh and the CHD program philosophy.

**B. Curriculum Review and Summary Outcomes (for the three-year data)**

CHD faculty members reviewed the assessment data over the three year evaluation period from the various sources within the assessment plan, as well as outcomes identified for action in the 2008-2011 Program Evaluation report. In this evaluation period, faculty members developed and implemented curriculum revisions based on the major curriculum review completed in the Spring, and Summer of 2011; these curriculum changes were designed to bring the program into compliance with the 2009 CACREP standards.

Action taken on 2008-2011 Program Evaluation Report Outcomes

1. Curriculum revisions, based on the 2009 CACREP standards, were implemented. This is evidenced in the completion of the comprehensive curriculum matrix; course syllabi revisions, etc.
2. A comprehensive Assessment Plan was developed which addresses both CACREP and University requirements for assessment of student learning outcomes and broader program evaluation requirements. This assessment plan has been implemented; two of the three evaluation cycles have been completed with data analyzed as indicated in the various sections of this Program Evaluation report.
3. Faculty members have worked to engage and retain diverse students who have applied and entered the program; however, university-wide strategies have not yet been developed.
4. Faculty members devised a “lead” faculty system for orienting and assisting adjunct faculty members. Lead faculty members, who are designated for each course, work actively with adjuncts to integrate them into the culture and processes of the CHD program.

5. An effort was made to use incentives to increase the return rate of alumni surveys, and then multiple contacts were made to alumni to encourage them to give their supervisors the employer surveys. This was only partly successful; this needs to be investigated further.
6. The results in this program evaluation report support faculty perceptions that students have improved in their professional behavior performance.

Outcomes Targeted for action on the basis of faculty analysis and Advisory Board discussion of the 2011-2014 Program Evaluation Report.

1. Advocate for increased marketing: expand beyond NE Ohio
2. Improve orientation to CHD program and to university
3. Continue to encourage use of Writing Tutor services and CHD tutor services, and advocate for increased institutional support to promote the success of diverse/first generation graduate students
4. Evaluate the feasibility of providing an orientation to the NCMHCE exam for alums
5. Increase student opportunities for self-reflection re: diversity awareness and the impact on the of diversity on the counselor-client relationship
6. Increase student opportunities for becoming involved in faculty research
7. Increase opportunities for students to develop case –conceptualization and treatment-planning skills across the CMHC curriculum
8. Increase students’ knowledge regarding the use of educational and psychological instruments in school counseling
9. Improve assignment instructions; grading rubrics; examination questions and other course-specific recommendations in the report
10. Improve faculty inter-rater reliability re: assessment of artifacts in developmental themes
11. Evaluate match of assessment artifacts to evaluation rubrics in multicultural and case-conceptualization developmental themes and make necessary adjustments in designated artifacts

**Alumni Survey Summary - Summer 2011 - Spring 2014**

Items were rated on a scale from 1 - 5: 1=poor 2=fair 3=satisfactory 4=very good 5=exceptional

N = 22

16-MH, 1-Dual, 5-SC

PROGRAM EVALUATION	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	
<b>1. University Resources and Services</b>																							
a. Instruction facilities	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3.86
b. Library facilities	1	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3		3.48
c. Financial aid	4	5	4	2	3	4	4	2	5	4		3	3	4	3	4	4	4	5	2	4	3	3.62
d. Computer lab/computer services	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3.68
e. Counseling services	3	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	4		4	4	4	4	5	4	5	3	5		4.25	
f. Student disability services		3			5	3			4				3	4	3		3	4	5	4	4		3.75
g. Admin. offices (e.g. registrar's office, business office, etc.)	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4		4	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	4	3	3.52
<b>University Resources and Services: Average of student input</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>4.43</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>4.14</b>	<b>4.29</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>3.50</b>	

**2. Professional/Personal Development**

We are interested in knowing to what extent your experiences in the counseling program at Walsh University contributed to your development in the areas listed below. Please rate the program's contribution to your development in each area using a scale from 1-5:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	
a. Writing skills	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3.73
b. Self awareness	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	3	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	4.27
c. Analytic skills	4	5	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	5	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	3	4.05
d. Speaking/presentation skills	4	5	4	4	4	4	3	4	5	3	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	4.14
e. Advocacy activities	3	5	3	4	5	4	5	5	5	2	2	4	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4		3.90
f. Assessing, critiquing, and using research literature in your counseling practice	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	2	3	3.5	3	4	3	4	3	5	4	4	3	3	3.75
g. Social and cultural foundations, trends, issues	3	5	4	3	5	4	4	5	4	3	3	4	5	4	5	4	3	5	4	4	4	5	4.09
h. Self-evaluation/openness to supervision and continued development	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	3	4	4	5	4	3	4.36
i. Self-confidence and self efficacy as a counselor	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	5	4	5	3	4.23
j. Professional identity as a counselor	5	4	5	5	6	4	4	5	5	4	3	5	5	4	4	5	3	4	5	4	5	3	4.36
k. Involvement in professional associations (ACA, ASCA, AMCHA, OCA)	2	4	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	4	1	5	4	4	3	3	3	4	5	5	4	3	3.73
l. Individual development (moral, psychological, intellectual, vactional, etc.)	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	5	4	4	3	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	5	3	4	4	4.27
<b>Professional/Personal Development: Average of student input</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>4.58</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>4.75</b>	<b>4.08</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>4.42</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>4.38</b>	<b>4.58</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.42</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>3.45</b>	

**3. General Aspects of the Counseling Program**

We are interested in your feedback about all aspects of the counseling program, from your first inquiry about the program to post degree contacts. The following sections are designed to give you the opportunity to rate specific aspects of the program as well as offer input on any additional areas.

Please rate the following items in this section on a scale from 1-5:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	
a. Admissions process	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	5	4	4	3	3.82
b. Orientation of Walsh University and CHD program	3	3	4	4	4	2	3	3	4	3	4	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	2	3	4	3.27
c. Program overall/in general	3	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	3	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	4.41
d. Quality of supervision at internship sites	3	5	4	4	5	3	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	5	3	4.14
e. Environment for developing peer networks/ peer interaction/ peer support	1	5	3	5	5	4	3	3	5	4	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	3	4.00
f. Field-based practicum and internship sites	3	5	3	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	3	4	5	5	4	4	3.5	4.25
g. Accessibility/availability of faculty members	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	4	3	5	4	5	5	3	4.32
h. Faculty members as role models, mentors		4	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	5	3	5	3	4	5	4	4.29
i. Opportunities to be exposed to/ involved in research or presentation activities	2	4	4	4	5	4	5	2	4	3	1	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	2	3	2	3.45
j. Faculty members' knowledge of subject matter	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	3	4	3.5	4.11
k. Quality of instruction	3	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	5	3.5	4.16
l. Opportunities to evaluate instruction and supervision	2	4	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3.73
m. Flexibility of curriculum to accommodate individual differences among students	2	5	4	4	5	4	3	4	4	4		3.5	5	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	3	3.83
n. Faculty members' clinical knowledge and skills	3	4	4	5	5	4.5	5	4	4	3	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	3	4	3.5	4.18
o. Opportunities to obtain feedback from faculty about your progress in the program	3	3	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	3	4.23

<b>General Aspects of the Counseling Program - Average of student input</b>	2.64	4.20	3.67	4.47	4.87	4.17	4.40	3.73	4.20	3.53	4.07	4.43	4.40	4.00	4.00	4.33	3.40	4.20	4.13	3.87	4.20	3.27
---	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

<b>4. Counseling Knowledge and Skills</b>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	
a. Basic counseling skills	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	3	3	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	4.14
b. Counseling theories and their application with clients	3	4	4	4	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	3	3	4	3	4	5	3	5	2	3.86
c. Ethical standards and legal issues	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	3	5	3	4	5	5	4	4	4.36
d. Professional behavior	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	3	4	5	5	4	3	4.55
e. Group counseling theory and skills	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	4.38
f. Understanding and applying research results to counseling practice	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	5	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3.57
g. Developmental theories and their application with clients	4	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	3.86
h. Career development theories and their application with clients	3	3	2	4	3	5	4	4	5	2	4	3.5	5	4	3	4	2	4	4	3	3	3	3.52
i. Career Counseling	3	3	2	4	3	5	4	4	5	2	3	3.5	5	4	3	4	2	4	4	3	3	3	3.50
i. Issues of diversity and impact on counseling process (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, SES)	3	4	4	3	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	5	4	3	5	4	5	5	5	4.32
j. Evaluation of counseling interventions	4	3	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	2	4.05
k. Research and program evaluation methods	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	3	2	4	4	4	3	5	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3.71
l. Client advocacy	3	5	3	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	4	4.05
m. Systemic level structures governing curriculum practice (mental health and school admin., managed care)	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	3		2	3	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	2	3.00	
n. Supervision of Practicum and Internship courses	4	2	4	5	3	2	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	3	5	3	4	4	5	5	3	4.00

**For Mental Health Specialization:**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	
a. Diagnosis	4		4	5	5	5	5	4		4	4	5	5		4	5	3	5		5	4	3	4.39
b. Assessment and clinical appraisal (including MSE)	4		4	5	5	5	5	4		3	4	5	5		4	5	3	4		5	4	4	4.39
c. Case conceptualization and treatment planning	4		4	4	5	5	5	5		3	4	5	4		4	5	3	4		4	4	3	4.33
d. Clinical documentation	4		4	5	4	5	5	4		4	5	5	3		4	4	3	4		5	4	4	4.17

**For School Counseling specialization:**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	
a. Classroom guidance		4							4					2					3	4			3.40
b. Knowledge of the ASCA National Model		3							4					2					3	4			3.20
c. Consultation/collaboration		4							4					2					3	5			3.60
d. Student Assessment		4							4					3					3	3			3.40
e. Personal/social development		4							4					4					3	4			3.80
f. Prevention and Intervention plans		4							4					3					3	5			3.80
g. Making appropriate referrals		4							5					3					3	3			3.60

<b>Counseling Knowledge and Skills: Average of student Input</b>	3.64	3.77	3.58	4.42	4.16	4.63	4.68	4.16	4.27	3.58	4.00	4.26	4.32	3.50	3.74	4.58	2.89	4.11	3.77	4.12	3.89	3.26
--	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

**Overall Evaluation of the Counseling Program**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V		
<b>5. The program</b>																								
a. met my expectations	1							1		1	1			1			1	1					7	32%
b. exceeded my expectations.		1	1	1	1	1	1		1			1	1		1	1			1	1	1	1	15	68%
c. the program did not meet my expectations.																							0	
<b>6. Have you recommended Walsh University's Counseling Program to others?</b>																								
a. Yes	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	95%
b. No									1														1	5%
<b>7. If you had the opportunity to do so (or do so again), would you?</b>																								
a. Yes	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	22	100%
b. No																							0	

## Alumni Survey Summary - Summer 2011 - Spring 2014

Items were rated on a scale from 1 - 5: 1=poor 2=fair 3=satisfactory 4=very good 5=exceptional

N=22

PROGRAM EVALUATION	1	2	3	4	5	N/A	Total
<b>1. University Resources and Services</b>	poor	fair	satisfactory	very good	exceptional		
a. Instruction facilities	0%	0%	18%	77%	5%	0%	100%
b. Library facilities	5%	0%	40%	45%	5%	5%	100%
c. Financial aid	0%	14%	23%	45%	14%	4%	100%
d. Computer lab/computer services	0%	0%	32%	68%	0%	0%	100%
e. Counseling services	0%	0%	9%	50%	32%	9%	100%
f. Student disability services	0%	0%	23%	23%	9%	45%	100%
g. Admin. offices (e.g. registrar's office, business office, etc.)	0%	0%	45%	50%	0%	5%	100%
<b>University Resources and Services: Average of student input</b>							

### 2. Professional/Personal Development

We are interested in knowing to what extent your experiences in the counseling program at Walsh University contributed to your development in the areas listed below. Please rate the program's contribution to your development in each area using a scale from 1-5:

	poor	fair	satisfactory	very good	exceptional		
a. Writing skills	0%	0%	27%	73%	0%	0%	100%
b. Self awareness	0%	5%	64%	31%	0%	0%	100%
c. Analytic skills	0%	0%	18%	59%	23%	0%	100%
d. Speaking/presentation skills	0%	0%	14%	59%	27%	0%	100%
e. Advocacy activities	0%	9%	18%	41%	27%	5%	100%
f. Assessing, critiquing, and using research literature in your counseling practice	0%	5%	27%	54%	14%	0%	100%
g. Social and cultural foundations, trends, issues	0%	0%	22%	46%	32%	0%	100%
h. Self-evaluation/openness to supervision and continued development	0%	9%	45%	46%	0%	0%	100%
i. Self-confidence and self efficacy as a counselor	0%	0%	14%	50%	36%	0%	100%
j. Professional identity as a counselor	0%	0%	14%	36%	50%	0%	100%
k. Involvement in professional associations (ACA, ASCA, AMCHA, OCA)	5%	5%	22%	50%	18%	0%	100%
l. Individual development (moral, psychological, intellectual, vactional, etc.)	0%	0%	9%	55%	36%	0%	100%
<b>Professional/Personal Development: Average of student input</b>							

### 3. General Aspects of the Counseling Program

We are interested in your feedback about all aspects of the counseling program, from your first inquiry about the program to post degree contacts. The following sections are designed to give you the opportunity to rate specific aspects of the program as well as offer input on any additional areas.

Please rate the following items in this section on a scale from 1-5:	poor	fair	satisfactory	very good	exceptional		
a. Admissions process	0%	0%	23%	72%	5%	0%	100%
b. Orientation of Walsh University and CHD program	0%	14%	45%	41%	0%	0%	100%
c. Program overall/in general	0%	0%	9%	41%	50%	0%	100%

d. Quality of supervision at internship sites	0%	0%	23%	41%	36%	0%	100%
e. Environment for developing peer networks/ peer interaction/ peer support	5%	0%	23%	36%	36%	0%	100%
f. Field-based practicum and internship sites	0%	0%	14%	45%	41%	0%	100%
g. Accessibility/availability of faculty members	0%	0%	14%	41%	45%	0%	100%
h. Faculty members as role models, mentors	0%	0%	14%	40%	41%	5%	100%
i. Opportunities to be exposed to/ involved in research or presentation activities	5%	18%	14%	54%	9%	0%	100%
j. Faculty members' knowledge of subject matter	0%	0%	14%	59%	27%	0%	100%
k. Quality of instruction	0%	0%	14%	54%	32%	0%	100%
l. Opportunities to evaluate instruction and supervision	0%	5%	23%	67%	5%	0%	100%
m. Flexibility of curriculum to accommodate individual differences among students	0%	5%	18%	58%	14%	5%	100%
n. Faculty members' clinical knowledge and skills	0%	0%	14%	50%	36%	0%	100%
o. Opportunities to obtain feedback from faculty about your progress in the program	0%	0%	14%	50%	36%	0%	100%
<b>General Aspects of the Counseling Program - Average of student input</b>							

#### 4. Counseling Knowledge and Skills

	poor	fair	satisfactory	very good	exceptional		
a. Basic counseling skills	0%	0%	14%	59%	27%	0%	100%
b. Counseling theories and their application with clients	0%	5%	27%	45%	23%	0%	100%
c. Ethical standards and legal issues	0%	0%	10%	45%	45%	0%	100%
d. Professional behavior	0%	0%	9%	27%	64%	0%	100%
e. Group counseling theory and skills	0%	0%	5%	50%	40%	5%	100%
f. Understanding and applying research results to counseling practice	0%	0%	45%	45%	5%	5%	100%
g. Developmental theories and their application with clients	0%	0%	18%	72%	5%	5%	100%
h. Career development theories and their application with clients	0%	14%	32%	40%	14%	0%	100%
i. Career Counseling	0%	14%	32%	35%	14%	5%	100%
i. Issues of diversity and impact on counseling process (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, SES)	0%	0%	0%	14%	41%	45%	100%
j. Evaluation of counseling interventions	0%	5%	9%	64%	22%	0%	100%
k. Research and program evaluation methods	0%	5%	27%	54%	9%	5%	100%
l. Client advocacy	0%	0%	23%	50%	27%	0%	100%
m. Systemic level structures governing curriculum practice (mental health and school admin., managed care)	0%	9%	45%	41%	0%	5%	100%
n. Supervision of Practicum and Internship courses	0%	9%	18%	36%	37%	0%	100%

#### For Mental Health Specialization:

a. Diagnosis	0%	0%	9%	32%	41%	18%	100%
b. Assessment and clinical appraisal (including MSE)	0%	0%	10%	36%	36%	18%	100%
c. Case conceptualization and treatment planning	0%	0%	14%	41%	27%	18%	100%
d. Clinical documentation	0%	0%	9%	46%	27%	18%	100%

#### For School Counseling specialization:

a. Classroom guidance	0%	20%	20%	60%	0%	0%	100%
b. Knowledge of the ASCA National Model	0%	20%	40%	40%	0%	0%	100%

c. Consultation/collaboration	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	0%	100%
d. Student Assessment	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	0%	100%
e. Personal/social development	0%	0%	20%	80%	0%	0%	100%
f. Prevention and Intervention plans	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	0%	100%
g. Making appropriate referrals	0%	0%	60%	20%	20%	0%	100%
<b>Counseling Knowledge and Skills: Average of student input</b>							

**Overall Evaluation of the Counseling Program**

5. The program							
a. met my expectations	46.43%						
b. exceeded my expectations.	46.43%						
c. the program did not meet my expectations.	7.14%						
	100.00%						
6. Have you recommended Walsh University's Counseling Program to others?							
a. Yes	82.14%						
b. No	17.86%						
	100.00%						
7. If you had the opportunity to do so (or do so again), would you?							
a. Yes	85.71%						
b. No	14.29%						
	100.00%						



## Alumni/Employee Survey Results Fall 2014

## Overall Evaluations of the Counseling Program

The Counseling program \_\_\_\_\_ my expectations.

Met	Exceeded	Did Not Meet	No Answer	Total
7	15	0	0	22

## Please explain your answer:

- "I feel my educational experience was very good. It would be have been much more helpful to have more guidance on the process of becoming a counselor (CT-PC-PCC) and expectations for prac., as well as more concrete/visual representation of what counseling looks like (e.g. actually applying a theory in session)"
- "I learned so much in the course work and my experiences outside the classroom prepared me for life after grad school and made me confident in my abilities."
- "I felt very prepared when I left Walsh and in my professional experience I find Walsh enters among the most prepared."
- "I learned more and got more practical experience than I thought I would when I entered the program. "
- "I had been in the field for years but the program brought me "up to date" on current issues.
- "Because I graduated and got my license. "
- "Compared to some peers @ other universities, I felt as if I had excellent supervision + instruction, as well as preparation for working in the field after graduation."
- "I initially was unsure how I would like the program due to Walsh being a catholic university. The CHD program was very accepting and an obvious great educational experience."
- "Was a great start."
- "By the time we reached internship, it was clear that my peers + I were more prepared than many other program's students. We come out of the gate knowing what to do, ready to learn what we need to do our job."
- "Gave a well-rounded education w/ higher standards than competing programs. Challenged me to work harder than anticipated – but w/ a positive reward."
- "Some professors were great and truly enhanced my experience in the program (Ober, Anderson, Coventry, Maxon-Kann). The experience they were able to speak of was invaluable.
- "Provided me with a challenging but great learning experience."
- "The program is highly respected in the counseling community."
- "I learned so much more about life, other people, myself – not just counseling."
- "The program allowed me to learn about myself and the counseling process in order for me to become a professional counselor that could be genuine and effective."
- "Found self to be more prepared for clinical practice than graduates from other programs. Received this feedback from supervisors and co-workers."

- "Program provided me with a firm foundation of clinical skills."
- "The opportunities for hands on and real world experiences allowed me to process to my current level."

**What were you significant learning experiences outside the classroom?**

- "My internship experience provided me with real-life experience where I grew substantially professionally and personally."
- "My personal interactions with faculty members and other students."
- "Attending AA meetings, working in the counseling center, internship."
- "Diagnostic assmt from internship."
- "Hands-on clinical experience through assignments in the prac. Lab + opportunities to speak with professors one-on-one about concerns and options regarding internship + post-grad work."
- "Accepting, scholarly, positive, inspirational."
- "Internship was great."
- "The Uganda trips – huge! Presenting @ state level conferences."
- "Attending conferences; prof. personal examples/conversations."
- "Internship + practicum."
- "Internship was the best learning experience."
- "My one on one with students and discussions with others in the field."
- "Opportunity to travel to Uganda was life changing."
- "Doing group practicum outside Walsh – great experience."
- "The best think I experienced outside the classroom was bonding with fellow classmates. We still keep in contact and do peer supervision!"
- "Attending ACA conference in 2011; CEU presentations even while in the program."
- "Faculty were supportive of me volunteering at and presenting at the AOCC in Columbus."
- "State assessments and testing, developing relationships with students/staff in a school setting."
- "Internships & relationships with some faculty."

**In 3-5 descriptive words, I would characterize the counseling program at Walsh University as:**

- "Supportive, encouraging"
- "comprehensive, supportive, challenging"
- "Complete"
- "Comprehensive, accommodating to working parents"
- "Challenging; practical; motivational"
- "Caring; learning; in-depth"
- "Comprehensive, challenging, empowering"
- "Informative, worthwhile, inspiring, + expensive"
- "Encouraging, strong, the Best, rigorous, supportive"
- "Exceptional, renowned, challenging, sought-after"
- "Clinical, applicable"

- "Effective, challenging"
- "Challenging, worthwhile, engaging"
- "Prepared me for real world experiences."
- "Comprehensive, intense, thorough, considerate"
- "Compassionate, quality, helpful, challenging, rewarding"
- "Thorough, professional, intensive"
- "Stringent, purposeful, solid"
- "Geared towards success in field."
- "Strickted, sometimes crazed, stressful"

**Have you recommended Walsh University's counseling program to others?**

Yes	No	No Answer	Total
21	1	0	22

**If you had the opportunity to do so (or do so again), would you?**

Yes	No	No Answer	Total
22	0	0	22

**Please explain:**

- "Overall, I had a positive experience in the program. Most of my professors appeared very knowledgeable and down-to-earth."
- "I have recommended the program to a friend and a co-worker."
- "I was well prepared to be a school counselor. The program was challenging and enjoyable."
- "Because it's a good program"
- "I believe that Walsh's program provided exceptional instruction + fostered personal + professional growth in its students, far beyond that of other local universities' programs."
- "I would recommend the Mental Health Track because I have a excellent educational experience. I would not recommend the school counseling program because during the time I was a dual student I did not feel I had a mediocre educational experience."
- "Great program!"
- "Had a great experience there – learned a lot – supportive faculty and continued support throughout."
- "In comparison to conversations held with those from other programs felt more prepared + supervisor/employer also acknowledges this."
- "Walsh is a great program. Please keep experienced/working faculty on staff. They are what made the program effective. If a professor cannot bring personal/professional experience to a lecture – it is not helpful."

- "I enjoyed my experience. Hoping to enter field soon to use my skills. Assistance and connections to jobs after graduation would be helpful."
- "It was great preparation to work in the counseling field."
- "I would love for others to attend Walsh. I would feel comfortable that they would leave the program competent individuals that could positive impact the community. I can't say enough about how helpful this program is. The staff helped me become a counselor I am proud of. Thank you all! Dr. Anderson, Dr. Barclay, Will ☺ Dr. Karajic-Siwiec you all rock and guided my class to success ☺"
- "I am proud to say that I am a Walsh graduate and I often recommend to associates or students thinking about a master's degree in counseling."
- "Overall an excellent program with many networking opportunities."

## Employer Survey Fall 2014

Items were rated on a scale from 1 - 3: 3=Higher; 2=Comparable; 1=Lower; NA=not applicable

Employer Identifiers	N=11					9-MH		2-SC		10	11	AVG
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			
<b>Employee's level of counseling knowledge and skills compared to other counselors at the same experience level:</b>												
<b>Counseling Knowledge and Skills</b>												
1. Basic counseling skills	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2.64
2. Knowledge of counseling theories and their applications	3	NA	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2.40
3. Ethical standards and legal issues	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2.45
4. Issues of diversity (e.g., race ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, SES)	3	3	3	2	NA	2	2	3	2	2	3	2.50
5. Writing	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	2.09
6. Research skills	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	2	NA	2.00
7. Speaking/presentation skills	2	3	NA	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	NA	2.56
8. Self-confidence/self-efficacy as a counselor	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	2.55
9. Program development	3	3	2	NA	NA	3	2	2	2	3	NA	2.50
10. Program evaluation	3	NA	2	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	3	NA	2.29
11. Professional behavior	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2.73
12. Understanding and applying research results to counseling practice	2	3	NA	NA	NA	2	2	2	2	3	NA	2.29
13. Group counseling theory and skills	2	3	3	2	NA	NA	2	2	3	3	3	2.56
14. Human development theories and their application with clients	2	NA	2	2	NA	2	2	2	2	3	2	2.11
15. Career development theories and career counseling	NA	3	NA	NA	NA	2	2	NA	2	2	2	2.33
16. Evaluation of counseling interventions	2	3	2	2	NA	2	2	2	2	3	2	2.20
17. Systemic-level structure governing counseling practice (mental health and school counseling, managed care)	2	NA	2	2	NA	2	NA	2	2	3	2	2.13
<b>Mental Health (MH) specialization</b>												
18. Psychopathology	3	NA	2	2	2		2	2	2	3	2	2.22
19. Treatment planning	3	NA	3	2	2		2	2	2	3	2	2.33
20. Case conceptualization and clinical hypothesis formation	2	NA	2	2	3		3	2	2	3	2	2.33
21. Assessment and clinical appraisal (including MSE for MH counseling)	3	NA	2	2	3		3	2	2	3	2	2.44
<b>School Counseling specialization</b>												
22. Classroom guidance		3			NA	2			NA			2.50
23. Knowledge of the American School Counseling Association National Model for School Counseling programs		3			NA	2			NA			2.50
24. Ability to consult/collaborate with other professionals		3			NA	2			NA			2.50
25. Advocacy (students, parents, program, etc.)		3			NA	2			NA			2.50
26. Engages parents, guardians, and family when needed		3			NA	2			NA			2.50
27. Makes appropriate referrals to school and/or community resources		3			NA	2			NA			2.50
28. Develops measurable program outcomes		3			NA	2			NA			2.50
29. Implementation of prevention and intervention programs		3			NA	2			NA			2.50
<b>AVERAGE</b>	2.58	2.95	2.35	2.13	2.64	2.17	2.25	2.05	2.29	2.81	2.06	2.44

### Employer Survey Fall 2014 Percentages

Items were rated on a scale from 1 - 3: 3=Higher; 2=Comparable; 1=Lower; NA=not applicable

N=11

	Lower 1	Comparable 2	Higher 3	N/A 4	Total
<b>Employee's level of counseling knowledge and skills compared to other counselors at the same experience level:</b>					
<b>Counseling Knowledge and Skills</b>					
1. Basic counseling skills		36%	64%		100%
2. Knowledge of counseling theories and their applications		54%	36%	10%	100%
3. Ethical standards and legal issues		54%	46%		100%
4. Issues of diversity (e.g., race ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, SES)		45%	45%	10%	100%
5. Writing	10%	72%	18%		100%
6. Research skills		46%		54%	100%
7. Speaking/presentation skills		36%	46%	18%	100%
8. Self-confidence/self-efficacy as a counselor		46%	54%		100%
9. Program development		36%	36%	28%	100%
10. Program evaluation		46%	18%	36%	100%
11. Professional behavior		27%	73%		100%
12. Understanding and applying research results to counseling practice		46%	18%	36%	100%
13. Group counseling theory and skills		36%	46%	18%	100%
14. Human development theories and their application with clients		72%	10%	18%	100%
15. Career development theories and career counseling		46%	9%	45%	100%
16. Evaluation of counseling interventions		72%	18%	10%	100%
17. Systemic-level structure governing counseling practice (mental health and school counseling, managed care)		64%	9%	27%	100%
<b>Mental Health (MH) specialization</b>					
18. Psychopathology		77%	23%		100%
19. Treatment planning		67%	33%		100%
20. Case conceptualization and clinical hypothesis formation		67%	33%		100%
21. Assessment and clinical appraisal (including MSE for MH counseling)		56%	44%		100%
<b>School Counseling specialization</b>					
22. Classroom guidance		50%	50%		100%
23. Knowledge of the American School Counseling Association National Model for School Counseling programs		50%	50%		100%
24. Ability to consult/collaborate with other professionals		50%	50%		100%
25. Advocacy (students, parents, program, etc.)		50%	50%		100%
26. Engages parents, guardians, and family when needed		50%	50%		100%
27. Makes appropriate referrals to school and/or community resources		50%	50%		100%
28. Develops measurable program outcomes		50%	50%		100%
29. Implementation of prevention and intervention programs		50%	50%		100%

Employer responses to Questions from Survey of Fall 2014

*Have you noted any areas in the employee's counseling knowledge or training that are deficient? Please explain:*

- “N/A”
- “Learning to utilize scheduling programs through ACCESS – county program.”
- “More training in the area of interventions w/ children, little to no preparation in parenting, Treatment Plan + documentation could be strengthened.”
- “no”
- “A common concern is understanding about school assessments, graduation requirements, college entrance exams, and College Plus Programs. Most of this knowledge is obtained during internship, which adds to the interns already overwhelming experience.”
- “no”
- “no”
- “maintaining – keeping on top of paperwork demands”

*Are there any areas in which the employee seems unusually knowledgeable and well trained? Please explain:*

- “\_\_ is very confident and professional.”
- “collaboration + people skills, calm + great listener - ”
- “Commitment to professionalism, ethical decision making generally solid clinical preparation (i.e., Dx categories + types of interventions)”
- “see above”
- “\_\_ had a good understanding of counseling practices + ethics. Unfortunately, high school counselors spend more time on administrative tasks that aren't covered in the school counseling program – scheduling, testing, graduation, college prep, ect. Overall – I'd work with Walsh again – it's a solid program + I like how it is structured.”
- “\_\_ came with a background in understanding the issues of LGBT population which is rare.”
- “Good utilization/application of counseling interventions.”
- “opiate dependency, public speaking”
- “very well versed in diagnosis and documentation”

*Do you believe that the employee was well prepared by his/her graduate school program?*

\_\_\_\_ 11 \_\_\_\_ Yes                      \_\_\_\_\_ No

*If given the opportunity to hire a candidate with the same educational background as this employee, would you do so?*

\_\_\_\_ 11 \_\_\_\_ Yes                      \_\_\_\_\_ No

If no, please explain:

Are you currently an internship site for our students? \_\_\_\_\_9\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_2\_\_\_ No

If no, would you like information regarding internships for our students?

\_\_\_\_\_1\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_1\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_9\_\_\_ No Answer

Misc. comments:

- “We hire a number of Walsh graduates + are generally very happy with them. If possible, increased training in interventions with children + more developmentally relevant E-B interventions would be a plus.

i.e., Incredible Years for children + parents

Transition to Independent Process (TIP)

Motivational Interviewing

Play Therapy

We need more job candidates interested in working w/ children + families.”

- “I would be interested in another intern during the 2015 – 2016 school year. I’m now at the K-8 level, but would work with \_\_\_ @ the high school to ensure K-12 experiences. Please keep me in mind.

I will only work with students that have a flexible or consistent schedule.”



## CHD Internship Site Supervisor Survey 2014 - School Counseling

Please rate items on a scale from 1 - 3: 3 = Higher; 2 = Comparable; 1 = Lower

N=24

Intern's level of counseling knowledge and skills compared to other interns at the same experience level:																									
Counseling Knowledge and Skills	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Total
1. Basic counseling skills	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2.48
2. Knowledge of counseling theories and their application	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2.42
3. Ethical standards and legal issues	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2.54
4. Professional behavior	3	3	1	2	3	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2.50
5. Assessments used in school setting	3	3	1	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2.13
6. Understanding and applying research results to counseling practice	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	3		2	2	2	3	2	1	3	2	2	3	2.17
7. Understanding use of educational and psychological instruments in assessment	3	3		2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	3	2	1		2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2.14
8. Case conceptualization and hypothesis formation	3	3	2	1	2	3	3	3		2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	3	2	2	3	3	2.36
9. Understands school counselor role/identity	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	1	2	3	2.50
10. Importance of school counselor accountability	3	3	1	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2.50
11. Leadership skills	3	3	1	2	2	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	3	1	3	3	2.38
12. Advocacy skills	3	3	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	1	2	3	2.46
13. Classroom guidance development	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	1	2	3	2.29
14. Group counseling theory and skills	2	3		2	2	2	2	3	1	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	3	2	2	3	2.26
15. Consultation theory and skills	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	1	2	3	2.29
16. Human development theories and their application with students	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3		2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	1	3	2	2	3	2.39
17. Career development theories and career counseling	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2		2	2	3	2.39
18. Evaluation of counseling interventions (e.g. collecting, evaluating, assessing data)	3	3	2	2	2	1	3	3	1	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2.38
19. Systemic-level structure governing school counseling practice (school administration and school counseling)	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3		3	2	1	3	3	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2.39
20. Issues of diversity (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, SES, etc.)	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2.50
21. Writing	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3		3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	3	2.52
22. Computer skills	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	3	2.54
23. Research skills	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2		1	2	3	2.39
24. Speaking/presentation skills	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	2	1	2	3	2.38
25. Classroom management	3	3	1	2	2	2	3	3	1	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	3	1	2	2	2.21
26. Self-confidence/self-efficacy as a counselor	3	3	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	1	3	1	3	3	2.38
27. Program development	3	3	2		2	2	2	3	1	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	1	2	3	2.39
28. Program evaluation and outcome assessment	3	3	1		2	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2.26
29. Making appropriate referrals/community linkages	3	3	2	1	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2.50
	2.97	3	1.70	2	2	2	3	3	1	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	0	3	2	3	2	2	3	

**CHD Internship Site Supervisor Survey Results 2014 - School Counseling  
Walsh University Interns compared to other Interns**

Items were rated on a scale from 1 - 3: 3=Higher; 2=Comparable; 1=Lower; N/A=No Answer

N=24

Intern's level of counseling knowledge and skills compared to other counselors at the same experience level:					
Counseling Knowledge and Skills					
	Lower 1	Comparable 2	Higher 3	N/A 4	Total
1. Basic counseling skills		50%	50%		100%
2. Knowledge of counseling theories and their application	4%	50%	46%		100%
3. Ethical standards and legal issues	4%	38%	58%		100%
4. Professional behavior	8%	34%	58%		100%
5. Assessments used in school setting	17%	54%	29%		100%
6. Understanding and applying research results to counseling practice	13%	54%	29%	4%	100%
7. Understanding use of educational and psychological instruments in assessment	13%	54%	25%	8%	100%
8. Case conceptualization and hypothesis formation	8%	8%	42%	42%	100%
9. Understands School Counselor role/identity	4%	42%	54%		100%
10. Importance of school counselor accountability	8%	33%	59%		100%
11. Leadership skills	17%	29%	54%		100%
12. Advocacy skills	8%	38%	54%		100%
13. Classroom guidance development	4%	63%	33%		100%
14. Group counseling theory and skills	8%	55%	33%	4%	100%
15. Consultation theory and skills	4%	63%	33%		100%
16. Human development theories and their application with clients	4%	50%	42%	4%	100%
17. Career development theories and career counseling	4%	58%	38%		100%
18. Evaluation of counseling interventions	8%	46%	46%		100%
19. Systemic-level structure governing school counseling practice (school administration and school counseling)	8%	42%	46%	4%	100%
20. Issues of diversity (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, SES)		50%	50%		100%
21. Writing	4%	38%	54%	4%	100%
22. Computer skills	4%	38%	58%		100%
23. Research skills	8%	42%	46%	4%	100%
24. Speaking/presentation skills	8%	46%	46%		100%
25. Classroom management	16%	46%	38%		100%
26. Self-confidence/self-efficacy as a counselor	25%	13%	62%		100%
27. Program development	8%	42%	46%	4%	100%
28. Program evaluation and outcome assessment	8%	55%	33%	4%	100%
29. Making appropriate referrals/community linkages	4%	42%	54%		100%

Comments from School Site Supervisors from  
Survey of Counseling Skills of  
School Counseling Walsh University Interns  
As Compared to Other Interns  
For Three-Year Program Review  
Summer 2011 – Spring 2014

- Her job as a college advisor helped.

**CHD Internship Site Supervisor Survey Results- Mental Health Counseling  
Walsh University Interns compared to other Interns**

Items were rated on a scale from 1 - 3: 3=Higher; 2=Comparable; 1=Lower; N/A=Not Applicable

N=21

<b>Intern's level of counseling knowledge and skills compared to other counselors at the same experience level:</b>					
<b>Counseling Knowledge and Skills</b>					
	<b>Lower 1</b>	<b>Comperable 2</b>	<b>Higher 3</b>	<b>N/A 4</b>	<b>Total</b>
1. Basic counseling skills	0%	50%	50%	0%	100%
2. Knowledge of counseling theories and their application	0%	85%	15%	0%	100%
3. Ethical standards and legal issues	0%	58%	42%	0%	100%
4. Professional behavior	0%	38%	62%	0%	100%
5. Assessment and clinical appraisal (including MSE for MH counseling)	0%	50%	38%	12%	100%
6. Understanding and applying research results to counseling practice	0%	50%	12%	38%	100%
7. Understanding use of clinical psychological instruments in assessment	0%	54%	19%	27%	100%
8. Case conceptualization and clinical hypothesis formation	0%	58%	35%	7%	100%
9. Psychopathology	0%	69%	31%	0%	100%
10. Diagnosis	0%	50%	50%	0%	100%
11. Treatment planning	0%	42%	58%	0%	100%
12. Group counseling theory and skills	0%	27%	35%	38%	100%
13. Consultation theory and skills	0%	73%	15%	12%	100%
14. Human development theories and their application with clients	4%	73%	23%	0%	100%
15. Career development theories and career counseling	4%	31%	8%	57%	100%
16. Evaluation of counseling interventions and best practices	4%	42%	42%	12%	100%
17. Systemic-level structures governing counseling practice (mental health service delivery, managed care, etc.)	0%	58%	4%	38%	100%
18. Issues of diversity (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, SES)	0%	38%	62%	0%	100%
19. Writing	0%	46%	54%	0%	100%
20. Computer skills	0%	46%	54%	0%	100%
21. Research skills	0%	19%	4%	77%	100%
22. Speaking/presentation skills	4%	42%	42%	12%	100%
23. Self-confidence/self-efficacy as a counselor	8%	34%	58%	0%	100%
24. Program development	0%	8%	34%	58%	100%
25. Program evaluation and outcome assessment	0%	23%	12%	65%	100%
26. Making appropriate referrals/community linkages	0%	65%	35%	0%	100%

CHD Internship Site Supervisor Survey 2014 - Clinical Mental Health

Please rate items on a scale from 1 - 3: 3=Higher; 2=Comparable; 1=Lower

N=21

Intern's level of counseling knowledge and skills compared to other interns at the same experience level:																						
Counseling Knowledge and Skills	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	Total
1. Basic counseling skills	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2.43
2. Knowledge of counseling theories and their application	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2.43
3. Ethical standards and legal issues	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.52
4. Professional behavior	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2.71
5. Assessment and clinical appraisal (including MSE for MH counseling)	3	3		3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2.55
6. Understanding and applying research results/best practices to counseling practice	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.24
7. Understanding when the use of clinical assessment instruments is warranted in Mental Health Counseling	3	3	2	2	2		3	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.25
8. Case conceptualization and clinical hypothesis formation	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2.48
9. Psychopathology	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2.33
10. Diagnosis	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2.48
11. Treatment planning	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.52
12. Group counseling skills		3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.40
13. Understanding the effective use of consultation in clinical practice	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2.57
14. Recognition of the impact of developmental stages/milestones in assessment and treatment	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2.52
15. Recognition of the role of career development in assessment/treatment	2	3	2		3	3	3	2	2	2	2		3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.37
16. Evaluation of counseling interventions	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2.33
17. Systemic-level structure governing counseling practice (mental health service delivery, managed care, etc.)	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.19
18. Issues of diversity (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, SES, etc.)	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.43
19. Writing	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2.48
20. Computer skills	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2.57
21. Research skills	3	3	2	2	2		2		2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2		2	3	3	3	2.33
22. Speaking/presentation skills	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2.52
23. Self-confidence/self-efficacy as a counselor	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2.52
24. Program development	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.29
25. Program evaluation and outcome assessment	3	3	2	2	2	2	2		2	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2.20
26. Making appropriate referrals/community linkages	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2.24
	2.9	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.1	2.8	2.4	2.2	2.5	2.0	2.0	1.7	3.0	2.4	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.2	3.0	2.9	2.5	

Comments from Site Supervisors from  
Survey of Counseling Skills of  
Mental Health Walsh University Interns  
As Compared to Other Interns  
For Three-Year Program Review  
Summer 2011 – Spring 2014

- I would like to add that, in my opinion, the language and cultural differences played a significant role in her “preparedness.” All of the other Walsh interns I have supervised would’ve fallen in the “Higher” category.

Mental Health Internship Field Evaluations

Summer 2011-Spring 2014

1 - 5 Scale, 5 being the highest

<u>Semester</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Semester</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Rating</u>
<b>Summer 2011</b>	1	4.89	<b>Fall 2012</b>	1	3.80
	2	3.77		2	4.68
	3	3.37		3	5.00
	4	4.67		4	3.98
	5	4.8		5	4.26
	6	3.78		6	4.47
	7	4.27		7	3.72
	8	3.45		8	4.64
	9	4.50	Average		4.32
Average		4.17			
<b>Fall 2011</b>	1	4.32	<b>Spring 2013</b>	1	4.90
	2	4.32	2	4.53	
	3	4.50	Average		4.72
	4	5.00	<b>Summer 2013</b>	1	5.00
	5	4.17		2	4.42
	6	4.69		3	4.80
	7	4.49		4	4.50
Average		4.50	Average		4.68
<b>Spring 2012</b>	1	4.16	<b>Fall 2013</b>	1	4.80
	2	3.49		2	4.68
	3	3.70		3	4.11
	Average			3.78	4
<b>Summer 2012</b>	1	4.84		5	4.38
	2	4.41		6	3.55
	3	4.36		7	4.90
	4	5.00		8	4.53
	5	4.92	Average		4.49
	6	4.66	<b>Spring 2014</b>	1	3.52
	7	4.02		Average	
	8	3.07			
Average		4.41	Overall Average		4.36

Mental Health Counseling Practicum Competency Summaries  
Fall 2008-Spring 2011

1 - 5 Scale, 5 being the highest

<u>Semester</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Semester</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Rating</u>
<b><u>Fall 2011</u></b>	1	5.00	<b><u>Spring 2013</u></b>	1	4.26
	2	4.36		2	4.84
	3	4.82		3	4.97
	4	3.91		4	5.00
	5	5.00		5	4.83
	6	4.45		6	4.30
	7	3.77		7	4.28
	8	4.22		Average	4.64
	9	4.30			
	10	5.00			
	11	3.53	<b><u>Fall 2013</u></b>	1	3.28
Average		4.40		2	4.53
				3	4.40
				4	4.40
<b><u>Spring 2012</u></b>	1	4.53		5	4.76
	2	4.59		6	4.58
	3	4.66		7	3.23
	4	4.68		8	3.34
	5	4.84		9	3.60
	6	3.51		10	3.67
	7	4.30		11	4.92
Average		4.44		12	4.89
				13	4.96
				Average	4.20
<b><u>Fall 2012</u></b>	1	4.50			
	2	3.46	<b><u>Spring 2014</u></b>	1	4.75
	3	4.98		2	3.28
	4	4.63		3	4.52
	5	4.53		4	5.00
	6	4.50		5	4.68
	7	5.00		6	4.57
	8	4.58		7	3.57
Average		4.52		8	4.45
				Average	4.35
			Overall Average		4.40



## Summary of Comprehensive Examination Mean Scores

### Summary - Comprehensive Exam (CPCE) Mean Scores 2011-2014

Core Area	FA11N	FA11W	SP12N	SP12W	FA12N	FA12W	SP13N	SP13W	FA13N	FA13W	SP14N	SP14W
Human Development	12.33	12.33	12.33	14.4	12.34	14.3	12.34	12.86	9.93	10.67	9.85	11.5
Social/Cultural	11.1	11.17	11.1	13.2	8.56	10.6	8.56	9.43	10.98	10.56	10.58	12.71
Helping Relationships	12.14	14	12.14	14.6	10.27	11.3	10.27	10.79	11.69	10.89	10.04	12
Group	12.02	12.33	12.02	13.6	10.53	12.8	10.53	10.64	12.64	12.44	12.52	13.86
Career	11.6	11.67	11.6	13.3	10.49	12	10.49	11.43	10.25	11.11	10.54	11.43
Appraisal	10.48	11.17	10.48	10.9	10.06	11.7	10.06	10.93	9.81	10	10.62	11.79
Research	11.82	11.33	11.82	13.8	9.60	11.2	9.60	10.21	10.67	11.67	10.81	12.07
Professional Orientation	12.66	13.33	12.66	14.4	12.03	13.4	12.03	13.71	11.36	11.89	10.65	13.43
Range	40-124	90-113	40-124	84-120	42-125	72-112	42-125	71-102	42-121	63-104	44-118	90-108
<b>Total (Mean)</b>	94.14	97.33	94.14	108.20	83.87	97.3	83.87	90	87.32	89.22	85.61	98.79

### Summary - Comprehensive Exam (CPCE) Mean Scores 2008 - 2011

Core Area	FA08N*	FA08W	SP09N	SP09W	FA09N	FA09W	SP10N	SP10W	FA10N	FA10W	SP11N	SP11W
n=	*non-exit	(6)		(15)		(11)		(15)		(13)		(13)
Human Development	11.42	13.30	12.14	13.93	11.45	14.36	12.75	14.20	10.00	11.54	12.75	14.15
Social/Cultural	10.17	11.33	10.24	11.93	10.72	11.55	10.88	11.33	8.10	8.85	10.88	12.23
Helping Relationships	12.10	13.00	12.87	14.40	11.00	14.18	11.82	12.33	9.39	9.77	11.82	13.00
Group	11.53	13.33	11.47	13.13	11.24	12.55	12.87	13.27	11.04	11.46	12.87	14.23
Career	8.96	10.33	8.56	9.93	10.99	13.82	11.35	12.00	10.25	11.00	11.35	12.46
Appraisal	10.38	10.83(-)	11.89	12.73	9.89	12.00	10.05	11.27	10.58	11.69	10.05	10.69
Research	10.84	12.17	9.89	10.93	10.46	13.64	11.48	11.67	9.05	9.23	11.48	12.77
Professional Orientation	12.21	14.00	11.41	13.47	11.55	13.73	13.00	14.07	9.93	11.69	13.00	14.38
Range	30-119	84-108	23-123	81-113	43-118	93-122	40-124	69-120	40-114	74-99	40-124	83-116
<b>Total</b>	87.61	98.33	88.89	100.47	87.30	105.82	94.18	100.13	78.35	85.23	94.18	103.92

N=National norms

W=Walsh norms

## Summary of Comprehensive Examination Mean Scores

### Summary - Comprehensive Exam (CPCE) Mean Scores      2005 - 2008

Core Area	FA05/		FA06 N	FA06 W	SP07N	SP07 W	FA07 N	FA07 W	SP08 N	SP08 W
	FA05 N	SP06 W								
Human Development	11.50	12.05	11.44	12.57	11.42	12.81	8.28	13.27	11.42	12.82
Social/Cultural	11.30	11.90	10.03	11.28	10.17	11.37	8.49	11.93	10.17	11.65
Helping Relationships	11.40	12.20	12.00	12.85	12.10	13.50	8.77	13.47	12.10	13.12
Group	11.60	12.30	11.55	13.14	11.53	13.12	10.93	13.47	11.53	12.65
Career	9.60	9.80	8.77	10.71	8.96	9.68	9.76	10.07	8.96	9.47
Appraisal	9.80	9.80	10.34	9.85	10.38	10.93	8.00	11.47	10.38	11.00
Research	10.80	11.40	10.80	11.57	10.84	11.68	10.10	11.73	10.84	11.06
Professional Orientation	12.50	13.30	12.18	13.42	12.21	13.62	10.93	13.73	12.21	12.88
<b>Total</b>	<b>88.50</b>	<b>93.20</b>	<b>87.12</b>	<b>95.42</b>	<b>87.61</b>	<b>96.75</b>	<b>75.26</b>	<b>99.13</b>	<b>87.61</b>	<b>94.65</b>

### Summary - Comprehensive Exam (CPCE) Mean Scores      2002 - 2005

Core Area	FA02N	FA02W	SP03N	SP03W	FA03N	FA03W	SP04N	SP04W	FA04N	FA04W	SP05N	SP05W
Human Development	11.24	15.00	12.45	14.25	11.29	13.50	11.24	12.00	12.29	12.80	11.45	13.70
Social/Cultural	10.28	12.67	12.24	11.63	10.37	11.50	10.10	12.27	11.90	11.60	10.33	13.20
Helping Relationships	11.32	13.00	12.46	13.63	10.99	14.50	11.80	11.33	12.47	12.80	12.01	14.60
Group	12.70	14.33	13.23	13.63	11.18	14.75	11.61	12.33	12.79	12.20	11.62	14.30
Career	10.95	11.33	9.46	11.13	9.30	9.50	9.57	10.20	9.31	9.20	9.45	10.10
Appraisal	10.80	10.33	10.18	11.50	9.30	9.75	10.12	9.73	10.03	10.00	10.43	11.00
Research	9.80	11.67	10.23	12.75	10.59	9.75	9.90	10.47	9.81	11.60	10.61	12.90
Professional Orientation	11.58	14.67	13.01	13.25	11.85	14.00	11.96	12.73	12.74	13.60	12.09	14.30
<b>Total</b>	<b>88.71</b>	<b>103.00</b>	<b>93.26</b>	<b>102.00</b>	<b>84.90</b>	<b>97.25</b>	<b>86.30</b>	<b>92.70</b>	<b>91.32</b>	<b>93.80</b>	<b>87.99</b>	<b>104.10</b>

### Admissions Data Summary 2011-2014

Admissions Year	Admits	Enrolled	GRE Range	GRE Mean	GRE Median	MAT Range	MAT Mean	MAT Median	GPA Range	GPA Mean	GPA Median
2011-2012	41	30	730-1250	951	890	14-88	44	41	2.01-3.97	3.25	3.17
2012-2013	32	23	199-1050	N/A	N/A	393-434	414	414	2.88-3.88	3.43	3.55
2013-2014	56	34	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.55-3.97	3.35	3.39
2008-2009	34	32	770-1310	987	1040	24-74	42	49	2.9-3.9	3.40	3.40
2009-2010	41	29	630-1170	983	900	18-82	40	50	2.11-4.0	3.36	3.05
2010-2011	37	29	640-1150	895	895	22-69	50	46	2.85-3.89	3.00	3.37
2005-2006	31	23		999			55.5			3.4	
2006-2007	36	32		983			41.0			3.5	
2007-2008	29	23		927			40.0			3.4	
2002-2003	32			870			37.0			3.3	
2003-2004	37			933			49.0			3.3	
2004-2005	44			1023			44.0			3.4	