EDCO Continuous Systematic Program Evaluation

Doctoral Degree Alumni Survey Report

In the Spring of 2014, EDCO surveyed doctoral alumni from 2001 to 2013 to evaluate their perceptions of the program, employment status, licensure status, and involvement in professional organizations. Ten alumni (10) responded from the two campuses (i.e., Blacksburg \((n = 9)\), and Falls Church \((n = 1)\). One respondent graduated in each of the years 2002, 2007, 2008, and 2010. Two respondents graduated in 2011, 2012, and 2013.

The alumni were asked to describe their perceptions of the quality of the program in 32 core areas. The used the ratings Poor, Fair, Good, and Very Good to evaluate each area. Areas of the program were clustered into core curricular components: Counseling, Supervision, Teaching, Research, and Leadership. In addition, alumni rated the faculty and other aspects of the program such as practica, internships, and experiences with supervision. All results are displayed graphically below. The vast majority of the areas were rated Good or Very Good by respondents. Areas rated Fair provide opportunities for improvement on our ongoing program review (e.g., Counseling Assessment, Instructional Technology, Classroom Management, Academic Writing, and Research Experiences). The one area rated poor by three respondents was Grant Writing and Awards Experience.
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Additional Components
Respondents were also asked to list strengths and weaknesses of the program, which highlighted strengths in several areas. All of the respondents listed the faculty as a strength of the program ($n = 10$). They described the faculty leadership, compassion, expertise, support, and advising as essential to their positive experiences. Four respondents listed the supervision received by faculty as a strength of the program. Other strengths included, the internship, cognate options, professional development, and work with master’s students. In contrast, participant responses for areas of improvement addressed different aspects of the program, with no two respondents listing the same area for improvement. Most suggested additional emphasis on an existing part of the program: more advanced clinical preparation, more research preparation, more opportunities to publish, more grant writing, more mentorship, etc.

In addition to sharing their perceptions of the program, respondents were asked to describe their current professional work, credentials, and involvement. One respondent was employed as a counselor, seven as counselor educators, one as a higher education administrator, and one in a different type of position. All were satisfied or completely satisfied with their jobs. Among the respondents, all were licensed or seeking licensure: 30% were Licensed School Counselors, 70% were Licensed Professional Counselors, and 20% were Nationally Certified Counselors, and 20% were Approved Clinical Supervisors (percentages to not sum to 100% because of overlap). All but one of the respondents were involved in professional organizations listed on the survey, including the American Counseling Association ($n = 8$), the American School Counselor Association ($n = 1$), and The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision ($n = 6$).