

APPENDIX D

Grouped Responses of Programs Interviewed

1. What is your title(s)?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	Number
CACREP Liaison	3
Department Chair	2
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1
NR	NR
Program Coordinator	1
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1
Total (n=10)	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	Number
Department Chair	4
CACREP Liaison	1
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1
Community Counseling Coordinator	1
NR	NR
Professor	1
Total (n=10)	9

2. How long as department chair or CACREP liaison?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	Length in Years
CACREP Liaison	3	3, 15, 10
Department Chair	2	4, 15
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	2
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	5
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	10
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	4
Total Responses (n = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	Length in Years
Department Chair	4	12, 1, 9, 7
CACREP Liaison	1	3
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	10
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	Liaison 8 & Director 2
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	3
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	12
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

3. How long with program?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	Length in Years
CACREP Liaison	3	29, 15, 22
Department Chair	2	4, 32
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	8
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	5
NR	1	1
Program Coordinator	1	28
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	16
Total Responses (n = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	Length in Years
Department Chair	4	6, 8,12, 27
CACREP Liaison	1	30
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	18
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	9
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	3
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	25
Total (n=10)	10	9

4. How long have you been a counselor educator?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	Length in Years
CACREP Liaison	3	24, 30, 35
Department Chair	2	22, 32
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	8
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	11
NR	1	1
Program Coordinator	1	28
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	16
Total Responses (n = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n=10)

Title	(n)	Length in Years
Department Chair	4	6, 8 as FT, 25, 27
CACREP Liaison	1	30
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	26
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	13
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	5
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	28
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

5. Are you involved with admissions of prospective master's students?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	Response
CACREP Liaison	3	Yes
Department Chair	2	Yes
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	Yes
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	Yes
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	Yes
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	Yes
Total Responses (n = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	Response
Department Chair	4	Yes
CACREP Liaison	1	Yes
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	Yes
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	Yes
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	Yes
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	Yes
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

6. How many faculty in your department?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	# of Full-Time Faculty
CACREP Liaison	3	7, 17, 6
Department Chair	2	11, 23
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	5
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	5
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	5
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	10
Total Responses (n = 10)	9	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	# of Full-Time Faculty
Department Chair	4	5, 6, 8, 8 teaching & 4 non-teaching
CACREP Liaison	1	6 ¼
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	11
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	13
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	5
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	10
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

7. How many masters' students are in the counseling program?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	# of Master's Students
CACREP Liaison	3	80 FT, 250 FT, 130 FT & PT
Department Chair	2	175 FT & PT, 130 FT
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	60 FT
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	45 FT
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	30-35 per year (SC only)
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	60 FT
Total Responses (n = 10)	9	9

PFAR Group (n=10)

Title	(n)	# of Master's Students
Department Chair	4	115 FT & 70 PT, 120 FT, 240 FT, 300+ FT
CACREP Liaison	1	200
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	Approx. 60 total
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	120
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	120
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	Approx. 260 total
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

8. What do you believe are the characteristics of effective counselors?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

See Appendix E (p. 149)

PFAR Group (n =10)

See Appendix F (p. 157)

9. Do you think your admission requirements and procedures result in adequate screening of prospective students for your counseling program, such as assessing characteristics of effective counselors (i.e., cognitive-behavioral/academic & personal-emotional), particularly personal characteristics? How? Why?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	Adequate Screening?
CACREP Liaison	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonably Satisfied • Could be better • Yes, but imperfect process
Department Chair	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For most part... • Yes, although don't screen for PC prior to admission to program. Do in first semester.
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	Yes
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	Don't know. Just started new procedures. Previous screening not good.
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	No. Don't assess until in program.
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	Yes
Total Responses (N = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n=10)

Title	(n)	Adequate Screening?
Department Chair	4	2-Yes; 1-Yes, in general; 1-Yes, b/c we require a portfolio before candidacy; 1-Marginally, would be better if we were more intense & specific. We have to watch maintenance of enrollment.
CACREP Liaison	1	Yes. We b/c of the group interview where we rate on criteria, flexibility, personal, etc. We use a subjective scale.
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	Yes, we do a good job, but aren't perfect. Don't like our recommendation forms-isn't personal. To improve would like to see a 2-3 day retreat to function as a team & groups (i.e., ropes courses, group initiatives, etc.)
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	Yes
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	No, we miss some – our incremental validity isn't good.
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	Yes
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

10. How long has your program been using these requirements and procedures?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	Length of Time in Years
CACREP Liaison	3	10, 10, 23
Department Chair	2	10+, 25
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	2, but still fine-tuning
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	Just began Aug. '99
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	28+
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	4, but really only 1
Total Responses (n = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n=10)

Title	(n)	Length of Time in Years
Department Chair	4	8, 10, 10 w/last 5 more structured, 20+
CACREP Liaison	1	20 – originally used 16PF, but test missed some. Have used the MMPI-II for the past 10yrs.
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	10
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	7
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	15
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	5
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

11. If your current admission requirements and procedures are currently more focussed on characteristics of effective counselors, do you believe your students to be better and more prepared personally and professionally/cognitively/academically?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	Have better students?
CACREP Liaison	3	No, N/A, N/A
Department Chair	2	N/A
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	Yes
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	N/A
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	N/A
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	Yes, much better.
Total Responses (n = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	Have better students?
Department Chair	4	4-Yes; Comment: Yes, much better standards and they increase as we go.
CACREP Liaison	1	Yes, group interviews and MMPI-II very useful
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	No major improvements. Is less work on faculty to develop students since we screen better.
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	Yes
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	Yes
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	Yes
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

12. Have you had less or more problems (i.e., student interventions/remediation/ dismissals) with your counseling graduate students since adopting admission requirements and procedures that include more of a personal focus?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	More or less problems?
CACREP Liaison	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No variation • N/A • N/A
Department Chair	2	N/A
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	Less problems, although have confounding variables: turn over in faculty (now is a better group) and added a new course line/track.
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	N/A
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	N/A
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	N/A
Total Responses (n = 10)	9	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	More or less problems?
Department Chair	4	3-Yes, 1- Can't say
CACREP Liaison	1	Less
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	Probably less - didn't have many remediations before anyway.
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	Less
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	Neither more or less
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	Less, reduced problem level from 6% to 2%.
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

13. I noticed you do an extensive personal/group interview, ask very detailed and specific questions concerning life experiences, personal characteristics, etc. of the student, use the MMPI, use the CPI, require a portfolio, require 1-3 courses in your program be completed as a prerequisite, etc? How has this worked for your program? Do you believe these to be good indicators of effective counselor qualities of the prospective student particularly the personal qualities?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	Specific measures? Good?
CACREP Liaison	3	N/A
Department Chair	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A • Weighted formula converted to weight on a 10 pt scale. Three characteristics/criteria: undergraduate GPA = 9 pts, Work Experience = 6 pts, & GRE (800+) = 6 pts. Arrange scores in each category into 5 pt scale. For example, the bottom is 1 equivalent to 2.5 undergraduate GPA.
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	N/A
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	N/A
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	N/A
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	N/A
Total Responses (n = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	Specific measures? Good?
Department Chair	4	1-Interviews used heavily & work well. Optimism scale –good but not a discriminator. Use own weighted scale (Truax-Carkuff Measure – core measures) is 30% effective; 1-Group interview & responses to audiotapes (Carkhuff’s work -6 vignettes) works well in identifying skills, self-awareness, presentation, sense of maturity & why they want to be a counselor. Dyads used b/c can present personal material, give feedback w/o bias, and show how they manage anxiety; 1-Personal Statements and Interviews. Both work well; 1-CPI in last 5yrs. Gives hints & red flags. Rate it as fair & better than the MMPI-II. Interviews & personal statements. Yes, believe these two work well.
CACREP Liaison	1	MMPI-II - Yes, works well at getting personal qualities.
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	Personal statement/in depth personal responses to 5 ?s & a 3-5 typed pages of a short autobiography including family history. Yes, very worthwhile b/c gets into family of origin stuff (interpersonal). Recommendations letters, but don’t really say much, just who their friends are.
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	MMPI-II used to verify letters of recommendation and workshop. Is so-so effective, although don’t use as only/final determinant. Pre-admission workshop very effective in identifying communication skills, biases, openness, how students relate and to get & receive feedback.
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	GC-640 Dogmatism Scale and whether student agrees with experts on counseling vignettes.

		Good as indicators, but that's all.
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	Use a 24 point matrix: Undergrad GPA = 3pts max. (0pts for 2.74 & lower); GRE of 675+ = 3pts; 5yrs professional experience = 3pts (3yrs = 2pts); letters of recommendation = 3pts; writing sample = 3pts; Self recommendation letter = 3pts; and pre-admit workshop = 6 max (based on day). Yes, feel works well, given the time available.
Total Responses (n=10)		9

14. What other instruments or requirements have you used? How did they work?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	What else used? How worked?
CACREP Liaison	3	None
Department Chair	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None • Once used undergraduate major, but didn't work well.
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	A weighted formula 4-5 yrs ago
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	Application, short autobiography, 3 letters of recommendation, & periodic interviews. These weren't working as we wanted-had to do many remediations. Also used the MMPI-II -was too risky.
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	Personality test -a long time ago
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	None
Total Responses (n = 10)		9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	What else used? How worked?
Department Chair	4	2-None; 1-Group Problem-solving, but didn't work well, and Myers Briggs which was no good; 1-MMPI-II & Myers Briggs, but neither worked very well.
CACREP Liaison	1	Used 16PF 10yrs ago wasn't good. Wasn't giving us what we wanted.
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	None
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	GRE scores if GPA below 3.0; Ok
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	Counselor Characteristics Inventory. Works Ok.
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	MAT; Ok
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

15. What other instruments or requirements are you considering using or would like to use?
Why?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	What else considering or would like to use?
CACREP Liaison	3	None, None, None
Department Chair	2	1-None; 1-Nothing, whatever we use has to relate to performance of program (Griggs vs. Power Co.- needs statistical relationship to performance in job). Can't defend personal measures legally.
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	Group Interview, although doesn't work as well alone.
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	a) Interview w/3+ faculty panel, b) have a structured interview form including personal-emotional issues, c) Use Informed Consents- student realizes professional & emotional elements are as important as GPA.
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	None
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	None
Total Responses (n = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	What else considering or would like to use?
Department Chair	4	1-Internal locus of control measure; 1-Considering GRE writing test, but none for personal characteristics; 1-Nothing, are satisfied with current; 1-Can't recall at present, but are considering some changes.
CACREP Liaison	1	Nothing, satisfied w/current procedures
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	2-3 day retreat which includes groups and a ropes courses.
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	Happy with current req./measures
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	Nothing
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	Nothing
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

16. At the time of admissions, do you believe most counseling programs adequately screen and assess the characteristics deemed necessary to be an effective counselor, particularly the personal characteristics? If so why? If not, why and what would you add/suggest?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	Do most programs adequately assess ECC, specifically PC?
CACREP Liaison	3	1-Generally, No. We aren't adequate either-don't have time; 1-No; 1-No
Department Chair	2	1-No idea. Suggest a) instruction should modify the behavior of student, b) have a periodic review of students; 1-I believe best screening is within the program. Build into program remediation.
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	Yes
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	Definitely not for fear of litigation, liability issues, ambiguity of personal elements, unable to quantify/justify.
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	No
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	Probably, if CACREP approved
Total Responses (n = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	Do most programs adequately assess ECC, specifically PC?
Department Chair	4	2-No; 1- No, since 50% hold no interviews; 1-No, b/c they don't take the time, aren't as committed to professionalism & don't have administrative support.
CACREP Liaison	1	Believe most try to adequately asses.
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	Yes, the few I know.
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	No, lots of our graduated doc students are calling back & saying they need our admission procedures b/c the program they're now teaching in doesn't have any.
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	No
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	Don't know, maybe 70%.
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

17. Do you believe it's possible to have one measure/instrument to assess characteristics of effective counselors?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	One measure possible to assess ECC, specifically PC?
CACREP Liaison	3	No, No, No
Department Chair	2	No, No
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	No
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	No, need multiple measures
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	No
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	No
Total Responses (n = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	One measure possible to assess ECC, specifically PC?
Department Chair	4	1-No; 1- No, need multiple measures; 1-Absolutely not; 1-I suppose in a perfect world.
CACREP Liaison	1	No
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	No. Best instruments are “effectively living people” (Robert Carkhuff’s concepts), such as role models.
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	No, at least not in a written form.
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	No, takes a battery of tests. Those with 4.0 don’t do as well -lack flexibility side
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	No
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

18. Would you like to see such a measure developed? Why?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	Want such a measure developed? Why?
CACREP Liaison	3	1-Sure, interested; 1-No, don’t believe in it; 1-Don’t think it’s possible-need multiple measures.
Department Chair	2	1-No, believe in multiple criteria; 1-No
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	No
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	Yes, I would.
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	Not really. Personal issues must be tied to coursework or else get into legal problems. Once in program, screening is done in the classes
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	Yes
Total Responses (n = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	Want such a measure developed? Why?
Department Chair	4	2-Sure; 1-Not really-believe in multiple methods; 1-Impossible. Believe in multiple personality measures. Need to do a multimodal assessment.
CACREP Liaison	1	Yes
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	No
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	Sure, to compliment other criteria, but not as only measure.
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	Yes
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	No
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9

19. If there were such a measure/instrument, would you use it?

AFAR Group (n = 10)

Title	(n)	If were such a measure, would you use it?
CACREP Liaison	3	1-Interested; 2-Probably not;
Department Chair	2	1-No, not really; 1-No
Department Chair & School Counseling Coordinator	1	No
Director of Program & CACREP Liaison	1	Yes
NR	1	NR
Program Coordinator	1	Probably
School Program Coordinator & CACREP Liaison	1	Yes
Total Responses (n = 10)	10	9

PFAR Group (n =10)

Title	(n)	If were such a measure, would you use it?
Department Chair	4	2-Yes; 1-Might consider & try, but would bring everyone in for an initial face-to-face screening; 1-No;
CACREP Liaison	1	Yes
CACREP Liaison & Director of Admissions	1	Would try, but not by itself.
CACREP Liaison & Director of Division	1	Yes
Community Counseling Coordinator	1	Yes
NR	1	NR
Professor	1	No
Total Responses (n=10)	10	9