

Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling Program Comprehensive Assessment Plan Report Fall 2011- Spring 2012

The Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling (SACC) program uses several methods of program evaluation. Students, alumni, field-site supervisors, and other stakeholders are encouraged to participate in assisting the program to improve instruction and update the program. Various methods of evaluation, from surveys to face-to-face meetings, are employed.

Each method is described herein, results are discussed, and the actions taken are presented. Further, the Program's overall effectiveness and consistency with its mission and objectives, including student development in the areas of Professional Identity and Counseling Knowledge, Professional Practice and Counseling Skills, Self and Cultural Awareness, and Consumer Satisfaction, are evaluated.

1. Professional Identity and Counseling Knowledge:

Students must demonstrate an understanding of professional identity and counseling knowledge in the areas of addictions and clinical mental health counseling (history; philosophy; trends; ethical and legal considerations; roles and functions; professional organizations; models/theories of treatment, prevention, recovery relapse prevention, and consultation; etc.) as measured by:

(a) Student Portfolios Reviews: The SACC program began requiring portfolios in fall 2011. Students submit their portfolios for evaluation and feedback three times over the course of study. The first submission comes upon completion of 12 credit hours. The second submission is due during the semester students are enrolled in the Practicum course, and the final submission must occur during the semester students are enrolled in the Internship course.

Results: In fall 2011, 13 of 14 students (92.8%) submitted portfolios. Of the 13 students, 5 (38.4%) received a "satisfactory" score and eight (61.5%) were asked to revise and resubmit their portfolios. The reasons for resubmission included missing reflection forms, and reflection forms lacking detail and depth. All students who scored "satisfactory" presented artifacts for one or more "Areas of Competency/Proficiency." Four were related to Counseling Prevention and Intervention, D9; one was related to Foundations, B1; one was related to Diagnosis, K1 and K2; one was related to Assessment H5; and one was misrepresented as a practice/skill and was actually a knowledge competency. A total of seven Areas of Competency/Proficiency presented.

Action Taken: Since this was the first group to submit portfolios and the majority of students failed to score "satisfactory" or higher, portfolio submissions were suspended until a program template could be developed on ECU's system for online portfolios, called Iwebfolio. This template was developed during summer 2012 and implemented fall 2012. Additionally, the Program doubled the required group training from once (student orientation) to twice per semester (student orientation and a minimum of one month before the portfolio submission date). Individual assistance provided by the students' advisors will continue, and to ensure all students submit a portfolio, student schedules are placed on hold if they miss portfolio due date.

(b) Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE) Scores or Oral Case-Study Comprehensive Examination Pass rate (This is a “pass/fail” process): The purpose of the comprehensive examination process is to help students synthesize their learning in addictions and clinical mental health counseling and to ensure students have an understanding of the professional attitudes, skills, and knowledge related to the eight common-core areas as defined by CACREP’s Standards for Preparation (Addictions and Clinical Mental Health), and the 12 core functions of substance abuse counselors.

Evaluation of students’ examinations gives faculty the opportunity to evaluate students’ academic preparation. Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling students have two options for comprehensive examination: the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE) and the Oral Case Study Examination (OCSE).

The CPCE is a knowledge-based examination that reflects the eight core curriculum areas approved by CACREP. The examination is a summative evaluation that measures pertinent and professional knowledge acquired by students during their counselor preparation programs. Preparation for the CPCE helps prepare students for the National Counselor Examination (NCE). The CPCE is made up of 160 items, 20 items per CACREP area. The examination is administered as a whole (not by sections).

For the OCSE, students are given 60 to 90 minutes to review a case study and prepare an oral presentation comprising the following elements:

1. **Development of a Case Presentation:** Students begin the OCSE by providing a comprehensive description of the client as if they are in a team staffing, working on the assumption that the other “team members” (two faculty, who will evaluate the student’s performance) have little information about the client. Students must include information such as the client’s (a) age, gender, and social history, (b) reason for referral and the general medical and psychosocial issues which prompted the referral, (c) current level of functioning (strengths and limitations), and (d) major short-term and long-term issues which need to be addressed. Essentially, students are giving a brief assessment of the client and the impact their issues may have on the client clinically, medically, educationally, occupationally and socially. Students may use the *Assessment Summary* form from the Program’s Practicum and Internship courses to organize this information.

2. **Development of the Diagnosis and Treatment Plan:** Students begin this section of the OCSE by providing the current DSM’s five-axis diagnosis. Next, they develop a comprehensive treatment plan, including details on specific problem areas, goals, objectives, and counseling theories and the techniques to be applied in addressing the client’s counseling needs. Finally, they give a step-by-step description of the treatment/counseling process.

3. **Presentation of Counseling Strategies:** Students provide recommendations for the client in each of the life areas presented to the treatment team. Recommendations may include, but are not limited to: (a) counseling strategies used to treat the client’s specific issues, including substance and/or mental health issues, (b) strategies for seeking and maintaining employment, (c) a plan for maintaining or continuing the client’s education, and (d) any medical, physical, or health-related

conditions that would require follow-up. Students must state each of these issues in relationship to short-term and long-term treatment goals.

4. Presentation of Ethical or Legal Issues: Students present and discuss any legal or ethical issues that may be related to the client's case history. In order to develop comprehensive responses during the OCSE, students use the 60 to 90 minute preparation period to familiarize themselves with the case study provided. During the 60 to 90 minute preparation period, students may refer to resources and materials from their course work including textbooks, lecture notes and handouts in order to develop comprehensive responses to each of the above-listed areas components of a counseling intervention. Students may also take as many notes on the case as they like, prior to beginning the oral component of the exam.

After the student has prepared and presented an oral presentation covering the required areas listed above, faculty will ask relevant questions in order to gauge the depth of the student's understanding of the counseling interventions proposed. Student responses must be related to the specific case study; generalized responses may indicate that a student would have difficulty applying a particular counseling intervention, strategy, treatment, or goal to a "real world" situation.

CPCE Results: The first administration of the CPCE occurred October 28, 2011, with nine students taking the examination. All students (100%) passed and all scored above the national mean of 94.18 (SD = 14.49), with a mean of 102 (SD = 4.88). The national and ECU student scores on all eight subcategories are provided below.

Fall 2011 National Mean and SD (n = 1053)
ECU Student Mean and SD (n = 9)

C1: Human Growth and Development 12.75 (SD = 2.49) 12.78 (SD = 1.47)

C2: Social and Cultural Foundations 10.88 (SD = 2.63) 12.00 (SD = 1.25)

C3: Helping Relationships 11.82 (SD = 2.22) 12.56 (SD = 1.26)

C4: Group Work 12.87 (SD = 2.43) 14.67 (SD= 1.63)

C5: Career & Life Style Development 11.35 (SD = 2.23) *11.00 (SD = 1.49)

C6: Appraisal 11.48 (SD = 2.46) *11.11 (SD = 1.59)

C7: Research and Program Eval. 11.48 (SD= 2.77) 13.11 (SD= 1.66)

C8: Professional Orientation & Ethics 13 (SD = 2.34) 14.78 (Sd = 1.31)

Note: All ECU students who took the CPCE were in the Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling Program.

When comparing ECU student subcategory score averages with the national averages, six of the ECU student subcategory scores are above the national average. Two ECU student subcategory scores (marked with an asterisk in the above listing) are slightly below the national average. All ECU student subcategory scores are within one standard deviation + or – the national average.

The second administration of the CPCE February 17, 2012. Fourteen Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling students took the examination; 13 passed (93%). The national average score was 94.14 (SD = 13.34) and the East Carolina student average score was 98.4 (SD = 11.59). The national and ECU student scores on the eight subcategories are provided below.

Spring 2012 National Mean and SD (n = 1224)

ECU Student Mean and SD (n = 15)

C1: Human Growth and Development 12.33 (SD = 2.44) *12.13 (SD = 2.16)

C2: Social and Cultural Foundations 11.1 (SD = 2.26) 11.8 (SD = 1.76)

C3: Helping Relationships 12.14 (SD = 2.39) 12.8 (SD = 1.97)

C4: Group Work 12.02 (SD = 2.49) 12.33 (SD = 2.39)

C5: Career & Life Style Development 11.60 (SD = 2.34) 11.8 (SD = 2.32)

C6: Appraisal 10.48 (SD = 2.23) 11.4 (SD = 1.70)

C7: Research and Program Eval. 11.82 (SD = 2.61) 13.07 (SD = 2.49)

C8: Professional Orientation & Ethics 12.66 (SD = 2.24) 13.07 (SD = 2.35)

Note: Of 15 ECU students taking the CPCE, one student was in the Rehabilitation Counseling Program and the remaining 14 were from the Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling Program.

When comparing ECU student subcategory score averages with the national average, seven of the ECU student subcategory scores are above the national average, and one (marked with an asterisk, above) was slightly below. All ECU student subcategory scores are within one standard deviation plus or minus the national average.

Action Taken: Due to students' scores being slightly below the national average in Career and Life Style Development, Appraisal, and Human Growth and Development, three changes to the curriculum were made: (a) a new course focused on career counseling and development was added starting fall 2012: *REHB 6380 Career Counseling in Addictions and Rehabilitation (3), Consent of instructor. Concepts of social, psychological, theoretical, and learning needs;* (b) a new text chosen for *REHB 6401 Rehabilitation Evaluation*. The new text is *Assessment in Counseling: A Guide to the Use of Psychological Assessment Procedures*, 4th edition, by A. B. Hood and R. W. Johnson; and (c) a new course, *REHB 6340 Human Growth and Development in Addictions and Rehabilitation* was added.

Prior to the above course changes, students were taking *REHB 6100 Occupational Analysis & Career Counseling* which was a combination of occupational analysis (e.g., function analysis, functional capacity, job placement) and career development (career theory and decision making, testing/assessment across the life span) and *REHB 6300 Counseling and Human Development Theories* which was a combination of counseling theories and human growth and development theories. With the approval of the new *Career Counseling in Addictions and Rehabilitation* course and the separation of the *Counseling Theories* and *Human Growth and Development* courses, class work now addresses the needed areas.

Oral Case Study Examination Results: Two students took the Oral Comprehensives and both passed.

Action Taken: Since the CPCE prepares students for the NCE, advisors have been asked by the Department Chair to encourage students to take the CPCE examination.

(C) Number of students involved in professional organizations: The *SACC Student Survey* is administered yearly during the fall semester. One question is, “Are you currently a member of any counseling related Professional Organizations (ACA and its divisions, LPCANC, PARC)? Yes ____ No _____. If yes, please list your memberships below.”

Results: The *SACC Student Survey* was first administered by email on September 20, 2011 and a second request for completion was sent November 8, 2011. Twenty-seven out of 45 students responded, a response rate of 60%. Of these, five reported involvement in professional organizations. Four reported membership in PARC, a professional association developed specifically for Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling students, alumni, and counselors practicing in the fields of addictions and clinical counseling. PARC was founded 1994 by Dr. Lloyd Goodwin at East Carolina University. One student reported membership in the American Counseling Association (ACA). During the spring 2012 semester, 35 students joined PARC.

Action Taken: To increase student involvement in professional organizations, students will continue to be given ACA applications at New Student Orientation, and effective fall 2012, joining ACA will be a course requirement for *Introduction to Substance Abuse* (first-year course) and for *Practicum in Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling* (second- year course). Faculty continue to announce upcoming conferences in the Department News Letter, in class, and through email announcements, and encourage student involvement in faculty presentations at conferences of professional organizations.

2. Professional Practice and Counseling Skills:

Students demonstrate an understanding of, and the ability to apply professional practice and counseling skills in, areas of addictions and clinical mental health counseling (legal and ethical principles and financing and regulatory processes; diagnosis, treatment, and referral; cooccurring disorders, suicide and homicide risk, crisis, disaster and other trauma causing events; etc.) as measured by:

(a) Student Portfolios Reviews: The SACC program began requiring portfolios in fall 2011.

Students submit portfolios for evaluation and feedback three times over the course of their program. The first submission is upon completion of 12 credit hours. The second submission is during the Practicum course, and the final submission is during the Internship course.

Results: As discussed above (p. 1, paragraph 5), 13 of 14 students (92.8%) submitted portfolios for review. Of these, five (38.4%) received a “satisfactory” score. All five presented artifacts for one or more “Areas of Competency/Proficiency.” Four were related to Counseling Prevention and Intervention, D9; one to Foundations, B1; one to Diagnosis, K1 and K2; one to Assessment H5; and one was misrepresented as a practice/skill but was actually a knowledge competency. A total of seven Areas of Competency/Proficiency were presented.

Action Taken: Since this was the first group to submit portfolios and the majority of students failed to score “satisfactory” or higher, portfolio submissions were suspended until a Program template could be developed on ECU’s system for online portfolios, Iwebfolio. This template was developed during summer 2012 and implemented fall 2012. Additionally, the Program has increased the required group training for portfolio preparation from once a semester (student orientation) to twice a semester (at student orientation and again at least one month before the submission date). Individual assistance provided by the student’s advisor also will continue. Lastly, in order to ensure all students submit a portfolio, students’ schedules are placed on hold if they fail to do so.

(b) Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale Scores: The *Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (CSES)* assesses self-efficacy for performing counseling skills, carrying out the counseling process, and handling difficult counseling situations. Students are asked to rate their ability to do counseling skills on a five-point scale Likert Scale (5 = agree strongly; 4 = agree moderately; 3 = neutral/uncertain; 2 = disagree moderately; and 1 = disagree strongly). Scores can range from 20 to 100. The higher the score, the more confident the person is in their performance. Students take the CSES four times over the course of the program (Orientation, beginning of Practicum course, end of Practicum course and end of Internship course) and group mean scores are compared to gauge changes in self-efficacy.

Results: (Data collection is in process.) The first administration of the CSES occurred on 8-26-11, with 17 students participating. The group mean was 65.5; the median 69; there were repeating scores at 37 (two students), 68 (two), 69 (two), and 78 (two); and the scores ranged from 37 to 83. Comparative scores will be available fall 2012 and spring 2013 when this cohort begins the Practicum course and completes the Internship course.

In January of 2012, a second cohort consisting of twelve (N = 12) students completed the CSES, with a group mean of 65.9; a median of 68.5; no mode as there were no repeating scores; and scores ranged from 37 to 85. Comparative scores will be available spring and fall 2013 when this cohort begins the practicum course and completes the internship course.

Action Taken: None. Data collection is in process.

(c) Supervisor Evaluation of Supervisee Form (SESF): The SESF assesses and evaluates students’ performance during field placements (Practicum and Internship). The SESF is

completed at the mid-point and end of the field-site placement. The field-site supervisor, the faculty supervisor, and/or the doctoral supervisor complete a SESF and review it with students.

The evaluated performance categories include: Counseling/Clinical Activities; Ethical Knowledge, Skills, and Application of Ethical Guidelines; Multicultural Competence; Record Keeping; Responsiveness to Supervision; Working Relationship with Organizational Staff; Attendance/Punctuality; Professionalism; and Enthusiasm/Creativity. Each category is rated on a three-point scale (poor, satisfactory, excellent). Supervisors also complete a narrative section which identifies students' notable strengths, areas for improvement, and whether the students have satisfactorily fulfilled their assigned role at the field placement (Yes/No/Explain). Students are expected to score "satisfactory" or above by the completion of their field placement. For the area of Professional Identity and Counseling Knowledge the "Overall Score: Did this student satisfactorily fulfill their assigned role at the field placement – Yes/No/Explain" was evaluated.

Results: Of the twelve (12) students who completed Practicum during fall 2011, eleven (11) (91.7) were rated as "satisfactory fulfilling their assigned roles" by field-site and faculty/doctoral supervisors. One student (8.3%) failed to successfully complete Practicum. This student subsequently withdrew from the program due to "personal issues." Eleven (11) students completed Practicum during spring 2012. All students were rated as "satisfactory fulfilling their assigned roles" by field-site and faculty/doctoral supervisors.

Five (5) students completed Internship during fall 2011, 12 completed during spring 2012 and 5 during summer 2012. All were rated as "satisfactory fulfilling their assigned roles" by field-site and faculty/doctoral supervisors.

Action Taken: The Practicum Instructor and the Advisor met with the student who failed to complete Practicum. This was the student's second attempt at Practicum. (During his first attempt, he withdrew from the course and sought personal counseling.) Other career options were discussed, and the student voluntarily withdrew from the program.

3. Self and Cultural Awareness:

Students must demonstrate an understanding of and the ability to apply self and cultural awareness in the areas of addictions and clinical mental health counseling (understand how living in a multicultural society affects clients; provide culturally relevant education; make appropriate referrals; modify counseling theories, techniques, and interventions to be culturally appropriate; recognize own limitations and seek supervision; etc.) as measured by:

(a) *Student Portfolios Reviews:* As discussed above (p. 1, paragraph 5), 13 out of 14 students (92.8%) submitted portfolios for review. Five (38.4%) of the 13 students' portfolios received a "satisfactory" score.

Results: None of the areas students addressed were related to self or cultural Awareness. This area will be addressed in future submissions.

Action Taken: None. Data collection is in process.

(b) *Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge and Skills Survey(MAKSS)*: According to D' Andrea, Daniels and Heck (http://cart.rmcdenver.com/instruments/multicultural_awareness.pdf) the MAKSS is “designed to measure an individual's multicultural counseling awareness, knowledge, and skills. This 60-item survey is divided into three sub-scales. Items 1-20 measure multicultural counseling awareness; items 21-40 measure multicultural counseling knowledge; and items 41-60 measure multicultural counseling skills.” Each item is ranked on a four-point Likert scale (1 = “very limited” or “strongly disagree”; 2 = “Limited” or “Disagree”; 3 = “Good” or “Agree,” and 4 = “Very Good” or “Strongly Agree. A mean score is calculated for each of the sub-scales. The higher the score, the greater the student’s multicultural awareness, knowledge and skills.

Students take the MAKSS four times over the course of their program (Orientation, beginning of Practicum course, end of Practicum course and end of Internship course) and group mean scores are compared for changes.

Results: (Data collection is in process.) The first programmatic administration of the MAKSS occurred on 8-26-2011. Fifteen (N = 15) students completed the MAKSS. Two students failed to produce usable results (leaving items blank).

The group mean for *Multicultural Awareness* was 2.54; the median was 2.5; there were repeating scores at 2.4 (two students), 2.45 (two), 2.7 (two), and 2.85 (two); and the scores ranged from 2.5 to 2.85. Comparative scores will be available fall 2012 and spring 2013 when this cohort enrolls in Practicum and then Internship.

The group mean for *Multicultural Counseling Knowledge* was 2.57, the median was 2.5, the mode was 2.45 (two students) and the scores ranged from 2.55 to 3.0. Comparative scores will be available fall 2012 and spring 2013 when this cohort enrolls in Practicum and then Internship.

The group mean for *Multicultural Counseling Skills* was 2.56; the median was 2.65; there were repeating scores at 1.7 (two students), 2.5 (two), 2.6 (two), 2.75 (two) and 3.0 (two); and the scores ranged from 1.7 to 3.1. Comparative scores will be available fall 2012 and spring 2013 when this cohort enrolls in Practicum and then Internship.

The second programmatic administration of the MAKSS occurred on January 13, 2012. Twelve (N =12) students completed the MAKSS. The group mean for *Multicultural Awareness* was 2.67; the median was 2.6 and the mode was 2.7 (three students); and the scores ranged from 2.4 to 2.9. Comparative scores will be available spring and fall 2013 when this cohort enrolls in Practicum and then Internship.

The group mean for *Multicultural Counseling Knowledge* 2.57; the median was 2.5; the mode was 2.5 (four students) and the scores ranged from 2.15 to 3.1. Comparative scores will be available spring and fall 2013 when this cohort enrolls in Practicum and then Internship. The group mean for *Multicultural Counseling Skills* was 2.47; the median was 2.55; the mode was 2.6 (four students) and the scores ranged from 1.9 to 2.8. Comparative scores will be available spring and fall 2013 when this cohort enrolls in Practicum and then Internship.

Action Taken: None. Data collection is in process.

4. Consumer Satisfaction:

Satisfaction level of students, field-site supervisors, alumni, and employers of graduates as measured by:

(a) Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling (SACC) Student Survey: The SACC Student Survey is administered yearly. It was first administered via email on 09-11-2011 and a second request was sent on 11-8-2011. Twenty-seven (N = 27) out of 45 students responded, a rate of 60%. Students evaluated the program, advisor, courses, overall professional preparation, and the use of technology on a four-point scale (Extremely Helpful = 4, Very Helpful = 3; Helpful = 2, Not Helpful = 1, Not Applicable = 0).

Results: Of the 27 respondents, 22 (81%) were full-time students and five (19%) were part-time students.

Results of Each Question:

1. How helpful did you find the Department's New Student Orientation?

Break down of responses: "Extremely Helpful" = three students; "Very Helpful" = 10 students; "Helpful" = seven students; "Not Helpful" = three students; and "Did not attend" = four students; for a mean score/category of 3.0, "Very Helpful."

Action Taken: Faculty reviewed the new student orientation process and discussed ways to increasing student to student communication and to convey program specific information. Effective fall 2011, the new student orientation was increased from a half day to a full day orientation to include program specific breakout sessions. Effective spring 2012, an ice breaker was used to begin the orientation which included student to student discussion and effective fall 2012, the Student Addictions and Rehabilitation Association sponsored a "potluck" luncheon during orientation.

2. How helpful do you find the Departmental Staff (i.e., front office staff)?

Breakdown of responses: "Extremely Helpful" = 12 students; "Very Helpful" = nine students; "Helpful" = two students; "Not Helpful" = no students; and "Not Applicable/Did not attend" = four students; for a mean score/category of 3.43, "Very Helpful."

Action Taken: Findings were shared with Departmental Staff.

3. How helpful do you find your academic advisor?

Breakdown of responses: "Extremely Helpful" = nine students; "Very Helpful" = seven students; "Helpful" = seven students; "Not Helpful" = three students; and "Not Applicable/Did not attend" = one students; for a mean score/category of 2.73, "Helpful."

Action Taken: Due to three students not reporting their academic advisor as "not helpful" and one not seeking advisement, the faculty established program-specific advisement. At the time of this survey, some students were being advised by faculty in the Department, but outside of their program, in the hope scores will improve with program-specific advisors.

4. *How helpful do you find the SACC faculty (Drs. Crozier, Goodwin, Sias and Toriello)?*

Break down of responses: “Extremely Helpful”= 19 students; “Very Helpful” = three students; “Helpful = five students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Did not attend” = no students; for a mean score/category of 3.50, “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.50, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

5. *How helpful have the following courses been in your professional preparation?*

(a) *Occupational Analysis and Career Counseling*

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful”= one student; “Very Helpful” = three students; “Helpful = nine students; “Not Helpful” = seven students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = seven students; for a mean score/category of 1.9, “Not Helpful.”

Action Taken: Due to the average score being “Not Helpful,” a new course focuses on career counseling and development was added starting fall 2012, *REHB 6380 Career Counseling in Addictions and Rehabilitation (3), Consent of instructor. Concepts of social, psychological, theoretical, and learning needs Career counseling and development.*

(b) *Introduction to Counseling and Rehabilitation (formerly Introduction to Rehabilitation)*

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = nine students; “Very Helpful” = seven students; “Helpful = nine students; “Not Helpful” = one student; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = one student; for a mean score/category of 2.90, “Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 2.90, “Helpful,” no action taken.

(c) *Psychiatric Rehabilitation (DSM)*

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful”= seven students; “Very Helpful” = four students; “Helpful = two students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 14 students; for a mean score/category of 3.38, “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.38, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(d) *Counseling Theories in Addiction and Rehabilitation*

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful”= 12 students; “Very Helpful” = 10 students; “Helpful = three students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = two students; for a mean score/category of 3.36, “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.36, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(e) *Prepracticum in Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling*

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful”= 12 students; “Very Helpful” = three students; “Helpful = one student; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 11 students; for a mean score/category of 3.68, “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.68, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(e) Group Counseling for Addictive Behaviors

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = 10 students; “Very Helpful” = four students; “Helpful = no students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 13 students; for a mean score/category of 3.71, “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.71, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(f) Small Group

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = 12 students; “Very Helpful” = no students; “Helpful = three students; “Not Helpful” = two students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 10 students; for a mean score/category of 3.29, “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.29, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(g) Ethical and Legal Aspects of Substance Abuse and Rehabilitation Counseling

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = six students; “Very Helpful” = two students; “Helpful = one students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 18 students; for a mean score/category of 3.55, “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.55, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(h) Multicultural Counseling in Rehabilitation

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = three students; “Very Helpful” = two students; “Helpful = nine students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 13 students; for a mean score/category of 2.76, “Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 2.76, “Helpful,” no action taken.

(i) Rehabilitation Evaluation (Assessment)

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = three students; “Very Helpful” = three students; “Helpful = seven students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 12 students; for a mean score/category of 2.60, “Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 2.60, “Helpful,” no action taken.

(j) Rehabilitation Research

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = three students; “Very Helpful” = three students; “Helpful = seven students; “Not Helpful” = one student; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 13 students; for a mean score/category of 2.57, “Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 2.57, “Helpful,” no action taken.

(k) Treatment of Drug and Behavioral Addictions (formerly Treatment of Alcohol and Drug Addiction)

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = seven students; “Very Helpful” = seven students; “Helpful = two students; “Not Helpful” = one student; and “Not Applicable/Have not

taken the course” = 10 students; for a mean score/category of 3.10, “Very Helpful”.

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.20, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(l) Family Treatment in Substance Abuse Rehabilitation

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = 11 students; “Very Helpful” = four students; “Helpful = no students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 12 students; for a mean score/category of 3.73, “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.73, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(m) Substance Abuse Counseling

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = 10 students; “Very Helpful” = four students; “Helpful = four students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = nine students; for a mean score/category of 3.33, “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.33, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(n) Introduction to Substance Abuse

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = eight students; “Very Helpful” = eight students; “Helpful = seven students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = three students; for a mean score/category of 3.04, “Very Helpful.”

Actions Taken: The mean score/category was 3.04, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(o) Practicum

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = seven students; “Very Helpful” = no students; “Helpful = one students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 19 students; for a mean score/category of 3.75, “Extremely Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.75, “Extremely Helpful,” no action taken.

(p) Internship

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = two students; “Very Helpful” = no students; “Helpful = no students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 25 students; for a mean score/category of 4.00, “Extremely Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 4.00, “Extremely Helpful,” no action taken.

(q) Supervision for Practicum (Faculty Member)

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = four students; “Very Helpful” = three students; “Helpful = one students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 19 students; for a mean score/category of 3.37, “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.37, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(r) Supervision for Practicum (Doctoral Student)

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = four students; “Very Helpful” = one student; “Helpful = three students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 19 students; for a mean score/category of 2.62 “Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 2.62, “Helpful,” no action taken.

(s) Supervision for Practicum (Field-site Supervisor)

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = three students; “Very Helpful” = one student; “Helpful = three students; “Not Helpful” = one student; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 19 students; for a mean score/category of 2.75 “Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 2.75, “Helpful,” no action taken.

(t) Supervision for Internship (Faculty Member)

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = two students; “Very Helpful” = no students; “Helpful = no students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 25 students; for a mean score/category of 3.37 “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.37, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(u) Supervision for Internship (Site-supervisor)

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = no students; “Very Helpful” = 2 students; “Helpful = no students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = 25 students; for a mean score/category of 3.0 “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.0, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(v) Evaluation of Professional Preparation

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = eight students; “Very Helpful” = eight students; “Helpful = four students; “Not Helpful” = no students; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = seven students; for a mean score/category of 3.20, “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.20, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(w) Use of Technology

Breakdown of responses: “Extremely Helpful” = seven students; “Very Helpful” = seven students; “Helpful = three students; “Not Helpful” = no student; and “Not Applicable/Have not taken the course” = no students; for a mean score/category of 3.11, “Very Helpful.”

Action Taken: The mean score/category was 3.11, “Very Helpful,” no action taken.

(x) Are you a member of a Professional Counseling Organization?

Yes: five (one ACA, four PARC).

No: 22.

Action Taken: To increase student involvement in professional organizations, students will continue to be given ACA applications at new student orientation and, effective fall 2012, joining ACA was made a course requirement in *Introduction to Substance Abuse* (first-year course) and the *Practicum in Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling* (second-year course).

Faculty will continue to announce upcoming conferences in the department newsletter, in class, and through email announcements, and to encourage student involvement in faculty presentations at the conferences of professional organizations.

(b) Field-Site Supervisory Survey:

Results: The SACC Field-Site Supervisor Survey is administered yearly. It was first administered via email on October 30, 2011 and a second request was sent on 11-16-2011. Nine (N = 9) out of 24 supervisors responded, a rate of 38%. Supervisors evaluated students in the areas of content knowledge, organizational skills, interpersonal skills, communication skills, clinical judgment, leadership skills, preparation to work in their particular job setting, and comparing ECU graduates to other students they've supervised on a four-point scale (Very Good = 4, Good = 3; Fair = 2, Poor = 1, Not Applicable = 0).

Content Knowledge: Breakdown of scores: "Very Good" = five supervisors; "Good" = four, for a mean score of 3.6.

Counseling Skill: Break-down of scores: "Very Good" = three supervisors; "Good" = six, for a mean score of 3.3.

Organizational Knowledge: Breakdown of scores: "Very Good" = four supervisors; "Good" = five, for a mean score of 3.4.

Interpersonal Skills: Breakdown of scores: "Very Good" = eight students; "Good" = one, for a mean score of 3.9.

Communication Skill: Breakdown of scores: "Very Good" = six supervisors; "Good" = three, for a mean score of 3.7.

Clinical Judgment: Breakdown of scores: "Very Good" = two supervisors; "Good" = seven, for a mean score of 3.2.

Leadership Skills: Breakdown of scores: (N = 8) "Very Good" = four supervisors; "Good" = three; "Fair" = one; NA = one, for a mean score of 3.4.

Job Setting: Breakdown of scores: "Very Good" = six supervisors; "Good" = two; "Fair" = one, for a mean score of 3.6.

Comparison to Other Programs: (N = 6) "Better Prepared" = four supervisors; "About the Same" = three; NA = three, for a mean score of 3.7.

Action Taken: Faculty reviewed results during the department retreat on 5-9-2012. In all areas, the scores were "well," "helpful," "good" or above. However, the respond rate was only 38%. This is the first time the SACC Field-Site Supervisor Survey was administered, so faculty agreed to continue monitoring results to evaluate possible trends.

(c) Graduate Student Exit Survey (GSES): The GSES is administered through the University's Instructional Planning, Assessment, and Research Division to students at the time of graduation. Areas of evaluation include: Faculty Contributions; Help Outside of the Classroom; Knowledge, Skills, and Personal Growth; Other Offices that Serve You; Your Conclusions; and Plans for Next Year.

Results: When asked, "To what extent do you think your graduate education contributed to your knowledge in your program" 10 of 10 (100%) graduates rated the Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling Program "Very Much."

Action Taken: Ratings exceeded the standard of "Average" or above. However, the ratings were based on 10 students. Faculty will continue to review GSES and evaluate for trends in responses.

(d) Alumni Survey:

Results: The Alumni Survey occurs every two years. The first survey was completed in 2009-2010. Sixty-two (62) responses were received. A majority of the response (48 or 77.4%) were from SACC graduates. The years of graduation ranged from 1991 to 2009 with the majority identifying their year of graduation as 1996. Alumni evaluated the program, the courses, and overall professional preparation on a four-point scale (Extremely Well/Extremely Helpful = 4, Very Well/Very Helpful = 3; Well/Helpful = 2, Not Well/Not Helpful = 1, Not Applicable = 0).

When asked: "Overall, as a graduate of the M.S. degree program in Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling how well do you think you were prepared as a substance abuse and clinical counselor?" 24 (39.3%) responded "Extremely Well"; 21 (34.4%) responded "Very Well"; five (8.2%) responded "Well" (Note: Two alumni answered questions who did not identify as SACC graduates at the beginning of the survey). A repeat survey was sent June 1, 2012.

Action Taken: Results were reviewed at the 2009-2010 Department Retreat and again at 2011-2012 Department Retreat (prior to the re-administration), with the recommendation to evaluate programs separately in order to reduce the confusion of what questions alumni are to answer, and to add a question concerning the use of technology.

Results of June 1, 2012 survey: Twenty-eight (28) responses were received. The years of graduation ranged from 1992 to 2012 with the majority identifying their year of graduation as 2009. Alumni evaluated the program, the courses, and overall professional preparation on a 4-point scale (Extremely Well/Extremely Helpful = 4, Very Well/Very Helpful = 3; Well/Helpful = 2, Not Well/Not Helpful = 1, Not Applicable = 0).

When asked: "Overall, as a graduate of the M.S. degree program in Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling how well do you think you were prepared as a substance abuse and clinical counselor?" Thirteen (13) of respondents' reported "Extremely Well"; 11 reported "Very Well"; and three reported "Well" for a mean score of 3.37 "Very Well".

Action Taken: Average score was “Very Well,” no action taken.

(d) Employer Survey:

Results: The 2010-2011 SACC graduates were contacted by Sharon Shallow, Field-Site Coordinator, asked if they were currently employed and if so, whether an employer survey could be sent. The SACC Employer Survey was administered by email on 2-22-2012, with a second request was sent on 4-5-2012. Of the 26, only three employers responded to the survey for a 12% return rate. Employers evaluated employees in the areas of content knowledge, organizational skills, interpersonal skills, communication skills, clinical judgment, leadership skills, preparation to work in their particular job setting, and comparing ECU graduates to other students they've supervised on a 4-point scale (Very Good = 4, Good = 3; Fair = 2, Poor = 1, Not Applicable = 0).

Content Knowledge: Breakdown of scores: "Very Good" = one employer; "Good" = two, for a mean score of 3.3.

Counseling Skill: Breakdown of scores: "Very Good" = two employers; "Good" = one, for a mean score of 3.6.

Organizational Knowledge: Breakdown of scores: "Very Good" = one employer; "Good" = two, for a mean score of 3.3.

Interpersonal Skills: Break-down of scores: "Very Good" = one employer; "Good" = two, for a mean score of 3.3.

Communication Skill: Breakdown of scores: "Very Good" = one employer; "Good" = two, for a mean score of 3.3.

Clinical Judgment: Break-down of scores: "Very Good" = one employer; "Good" = two, for a mean score of 3.3.

Leadership Skills: Break-down of scores: one employer each for "Very Good," "Good," and "Fair" and NA one, for a mean score of 2.7.

Job Setting: Break-down of scores: "Very Good" = two employers; "Good" = one, for a mean score of 3.6.

Comparison to Other Programs: (N = 2) "Better Prepared" = one employer; "About the Same" = one; NA = one, for a mean score of 3.5.

(e) External Advisory Board Feedback:

The External Advisory Board is made up of field-site supervisors in the community, some of which are past graduates of the program. It meets once a year to provide feedback and directions to the Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling Program.

Results:

The External Advisory Board met on 7-27-2012 and the agenda included:

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Program Status Report
 - Overview
 - Department and RCC program name changes
 - Enrollment information
 - CPCE results
 - New courses
 - Pending changes
3. CACREP Accreditation Update
 - Self-Study
4. Supervisor Training
 - Topics
 - Dates and times
5. Feedback/Suggestions from the Advisory Board
 - Improve documentation skills of students - - Mental Status Exams, Assessments/Intakes, and Progress Notes
 - Conduct site visits with all sites not just new ones.
6. Other

Action Taken:

- The Practicum and Internship instructors discussed ways to increase documentation instruction. Group instruction will continue in Practicum and Internship. Practicum doctoral student supervisors will be asked to review documentation as part of individual/triadic supervision as well.
- Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling faculty members were asked to make site visits to all sites, not just new ones.

5. Effectiveness of Curricular Content and Design, as measured by:

(a) SACC Student Survey:

The SACC Student Survey is administered yearly. It was first administered via email on 9-11-2011, with a second request sent on 11-8-2011. Twenty-seven (N = 27) of 45 students responded, a rate of 60%. Students evaluated the program courses on a four-point scale (Extremely Helpful = 4, Very Helpful = 3; Helpful = 2, Not Helpful = 1, Not Applicable = 0).

Results:

Student ratings are based on total mean scores. Two courses (Practicum and Internship) were rated "Extremely Helpful." Twelve courses were rated "Very Helpful," four courses (Introduction to Counseling and Rehabilitation, Rehabilitation Research, Multicultural

Counseling in Rehabilitation, and Rehabilitation Evaluation) were “Helpful” and one course (Occupational Analysis) was rated “Not Helpful.”

Action Taken:

Occupational Analysis: Due to the average score being “Not Helpful,” a new course which focuses on career counseling and development was added starting fall, 2012 - *REHB 6380 Career Counseling in Addictions and Rehabilitation. (3), Consent of instructor. Concepts of social, psychological, theoretical, and learning needs Career counseling and development.* No other changes were needed due to ratings being “Helpful” or higher.

(b) Alumni Survey:

The Alumni Survey occurs every two years. The first survey was completed in 2009-2010. Sixty-two (62) responses were received. Of these, 48 (77.4%) were SACC graduates. The years of graduation ranged from 1991 to 2009 with the majority identifying their year of graduation as 1996. Alumni evaluated the courses, and overall professional preparation, on a four-point scale (Extremely Well/Extremely Helpful = 4, Very Well/Very Helpful = 3; Well/Helpful = 2, Not Well/Not Helpful = 1, Not Applicable = 0).

When asked: "Overall, as a graduate of the M.S. degree program in Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling how well do you think you were prepared as a substance abuse and clinical counselor?" Twenty-four (24) (39.3%) reported "Extremely Well"; 21 (34.4%) reported "Very Well"; five or (8.2%) reported "Well" (Note: Two alumni answered this questions that did not identify as SACC graduates at the beginning of the survey). A repeat survey was sent 6-1-2012.

Action Taken: Results were reviewed at the 2009-2010 Department Retreat and again at 2011-2012 Department Retreat (in preparation for the re-administration of the survey). Recommendations were made to evaluate programs separately to reduce the confusion of what questions alumni are to answer, and to add a question concerning the use of technology.

(c) Field-Site Supervisory Survey:

The SACC Field-Site Supervisor Survey is administered yearly. It was first administered via email on 10-30-2011 and a second request was sent on 11-16-2011. Nine (N = 9) out of 24 supervisors responded, a rate of 38%. Supervisors evaluated students content knowledge on a four-point scale (Very Good = 4, Good = 3; Fair = 2, Poor = 1, Not Applicable = 0).

Results: Content Knowledge: Breakdown of scores: "Very Good" = five field-site supervisors; "Good" = four, for a mean score of 3.6, “Very Good.”

Action Taken: Field-site supervisors overall rating of students’ content knowledge was “Very Good.” No action taken.

(d) Graduate Student Exit Survey:

The GSES is administered through the University’s Instructional Planning, Assessment, and Research Division. It is administered to students at the time of graduation. Areas of evaluation include: Faculty Contributions; Help Outside of the Classroom; Knowledge, Skills, and Personal Growth; Other Offices that Serve You; Your Conclusions; and Plans for Next Year.

Results: When asked, "To what extent do you think your graduate education contribute to your knowledge in your program," 10 out of 10 (100%) graduates rated the Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling Program as "Very Much" which is the highest category.

Action Taken: Rating were "Average" or above. However, the response rate was based on 10 students. Faculty will continue to review GSES and evaluate for trends in responses.

(e) Employer Survey:

The 2010-2011 SACC graduates were contacted by Sharon Shallow, Field-Site Coordinator, asked if they were currently employed and, if so, whether an employer survey could be sent. The SACC Employer Survey was administered by email on 2-22-2012, with a second request sent 4-5-2012. Of the 26 sent, only 3 employers responded, a 12% return rate. Employers evaluated employees in the areas of content knowledge on a four-point scale (Very Good = 4, Good = 3; Fair = 2, Poor = 1, Not Applicable = 0).

Results: Content Knowledge: Break-down of scores: "Very Good" = one employer; "Good" = two, for a mean score of 3.30, "Good."

Action Taken: Due to the low response rate, no evaluation was made. Faculty discussed ways to increase the response rate such as asking field-site supervisors who have recently hired graduates to complete a survey when they attend the department's field-site supervisor training, and to send the evaluation to the newly hired graduate for them to give to their employer for completion.

(f) External Advisory Board Feedback (EAB):

The External Advisory Board is made up of field-site supervisors in the community, some of which are past graduates of the program. It meets once a year to provide feedback and direction to the Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling Program.

Results: The External Advisory Board reported overall the students were well prepared and suggestions were given for course content changes.

Action Taken: Faculty will continue to meet yearly with the EAB to evaluate course content and student preparation.

6. The effective use of technology to deliver the curriculum and enhance experiences to meet program and student needs as measured by:

(a) SACC Student Survey:

Break-down of responses: "Extremely Helpful" = seven students; "Very Helpful" = seven; "Helpful" = three; "Not Helpful" = one; and "Not Applicable/Have not taken the course" = two, for a mean score of 3.11, "Very Helpful."

Action Taken: Average score was "Very Helpful," no action taken.

(b) Alumni Survey:

Twenty-eight (28) responses were received. The years of graduation ranged from 1992 to 2012, with the majority identifying their year of graduation as 2009. Alumni evaluated the program, the courses, and overall professional preparation on a four-point scale (Extremely Well/Extremely Helpful = 4, Very Well/Very Helpful = 3; Well/Helpful = 2, Not Well/Not Helpful = 1, Not Applicable = 0).

When asked: "Overall, as a graduate of the M.S. degree program in Substance Abuse and Clinical Counseling how well do you think you were prepared as a substance abuse and clinical counselor?" Thirteen (13) of respondents' reported "Extremely Well"; 11 reported "Very Well"; and three reported "Well," for a mean score of 3.37, "Very Well."

Action Taken:

Average score was "Very Well," no action taken.

7. Recruitment and retention of students as measured by:

(a) Number of Applicants:

Fall 2011: 36 applicants (for spring 2012 admission)

Spring 2012: 50 applicants (for fall 2012 admission)

(b) Number of Admits:

Fall 2011: 19 admits and one re-admit (two males and 18 females)

Spring 2012: 22 Admits (one male and 21 females)

(c) Number Enrolled:

Fall 2011: 19 were enrolled (none withdrew)

Spring 2012: 19 were enrolled (three withdrew their application. One went to NC State, one ECU's Social Work Program and one withdrew due to "family issues")

(d) Number of Rejected Applicants:

Fall 2011: 14 Rejected Applicants

- 12 failed to meet ECU's Graduate School admission requirements

- Two met Graduate School admission requirements but scored below department standards (one scored 12 and one scored 14).

Spring 2012: 28 Rejected Applicants

- 22 failed to meet ECU's Graduate School admission requirements

- Six met Graduate School admission requirements but scored below department standards (two scored 12, one scored 13, and three scored 15). The admission ratings are: Mean = 18, Median = 18, Mode = 18, and scores ranged from 21 to 17.

(e) Number of Non-Completers (voluntarily or involuntarily):

One student failed to successfully complete Practicum. This student withdrew from program due to "personal issues."

(e) Number of Graduates:

Five fall graduates and 12 spring graduates

5. Program recognition as measured by:

(a) *Successful Completion of CACREP Accreditation:* In process. CACREP Self Study will be submitted fall 2013.

Action Taken

CACREP Self Study is in process. No action taken.

(b) *Faculty Achievements*

During the 2011-2012 school year there were nine full-time faculty members in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies and 15 publications, which is an average of 1.6 publications per full-time faculty member.

Action Taken

The faculty met the goal of an average of one publication per full-time faculty member. No action taken.

(c) *Student Achievements* as measured by:

1. *Number of Awards:* None

2. *Number of Scholarships:* One student received the Lambeth Scholarship

3. *Number of Presentation:* Three students presented poster sessions at the North Carolina Rehabilitation Counselors Association conference, and one presented a poster session at the Professional Association of Rehabilitation Counselors conference.