


2009

## Perceptions of Doctoral Level Teaching Preparation in Counselor Education

Stephanie F. Hall

Diana Hulse

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.wcsu.edu/jcps>

 Part of the [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Hall, S. F., & Hulse, D. (2010). Perceptions of Doctoral Level Teaching Preparation in Counselor Education. *The Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, 1(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7729/12.0108>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by WestCollections: digitalcommons@wcsu. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision by an authorized editor of WestCollections: digitalcommons@wcsu. For more information, please contact [ir@wcsu.edu](mailto:ir@wcsu.edu).

---

# Perceptions of Doctoral Level Teaching Preparation in Counselor Education

## **Abstract**

This study explores counselor educators' perceptions of their doctoral level teaching preparation. Results indicate that observation and feedback from faculty, teaching under supervision, being mentored to teach, and attending seminars on college teaching are positively correlated with participants' perceptions of overall teaching preparedness. Implications for counselor education doctoral training and recommendations for further research are presented.

# Perceptions of Doctoral Level Teaching Preparation in Counselor Education

Stephanie F. Hall and Diana Hulse

---

This study explores counselor educators' perceptions of their doctoral level teaching preparation. Results indicate that observation and feedback from faculty, teaching under supervision, being mentored to teach, and attending seminars on college teaching are positively correlated with participants' perceptions of overall teaching preparedness. Implications for counselor education doctoral training and recommendations for further research are presented.

---

There has been extensive speculation in the higher education literature regarding the importance of teaching (Silverman, 2003) and reasons for the lack of emphasis on teaching preparation at the doctoral level (DeNeef, 1993); but there have been no known empirical studies that have examined the current state of doctoral teaching preparation in any discipline including counselor education. Discussions in higher education about teaching preparation have revolved around the topics of the importance of research versus teaching and how to best utilize resources. The debate about where to direct resources (teacher training versus researcher training) is not a new concept; for over one hundred years the academy has struggled with whether doctoral programs should impart research skills, teaching skills, or both (DeNeef, 1993). An intensified demand for competent teaching skills is evident in the fact that search committees are more frequently requesting statements of teaching interests, teaching philosophy, and teaching

demonstrations as part of the recruitment process (Warnke, Bethany, & Hedstrom, 1999).

The challenge of where to allocate resources is perhaps greater for counselor education than other disciplines in higher education, due to the fact that counselor education doctoral programs are expected to prepare graduates not only in the areas of teaching and research, but are also in clinical counseling and supervision. The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP, 2009) has suggested that doctoral programs in counselor education should "develop collaborative relationships with program faculty in teaching, supervision, research, professional writing, and service to the profession and the public" (Doctoral Standards Counselor Education and Supervision, Section II, A.2.).

Orr, Hall, and Hulse-Killacky (2008) discussed the importance of teaching preparation in counselor education, stating that teaching experience prepares doctoral students to participate more effectively in the counselor education profession, since

the professional standards specifically include teaching. If a doctoral program does not provide instruction in teaching, or provides less than adequate instruction in teaching, then the doctoral degree is not sufficiently preparing graduates to enter the position of faculty member, which assumes a teaching role (Meacham, 2002). Rogers, Gill-Wigal, Harrigan, and Abbey-Hines (1998) examined faculty criteria and found that for counselor education programs, teaching experience was ranked higher than publication activity, further supporting the need for teaching preparation at the doctoral level.

The purpose of this national study was to examine faculty member's perceptions of experiences during their doctoral training and the effectiveness of those experiences in preparing them for teaching. There were four research hypotheses. The first hypothesis stated that the number of courses taught from start to finish as a doctoral student is positively related to the level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. The second hypothesis stated that the number of courses taught under the supervision of a full time faculty member is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. Research hypothesis three stated that receiving feedback about teaching more frequently during doctoral training is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. Finally, research hypothesis four stated that the frequency of being given opportunities to reflect on feedback about teaching is positively related to the level of overall preparedness for teaching. Based on factors identified in this study as important in teaching preparation, suggestions are presented for improving the quality of doctoral level teacher training.

## **Doctoral Level Teaching Preparation in Counselor Education**

Graduates of counselor education doctoral programs are not only expected to be adequate researchers and teachers, but also competent counselors. To address this expectation, Hosie (1990) and Lanning (1990) proposed the educator-practitioner model for counselor education doctoral programs. Hosie and Lanning agreed that doctoral programs are preparing students who have earned master's degrees in counseling with additional counseling courses, making them more competent practitioners, but giving them little training in how to teach.

Lanning (1990) extended the conversation by focusing on the need for reform in counselor education doctoral programs and the subsequent emphasis on teaching as a skill. He linked the creation of an educator-practitioner model to the continual search for a unique professional identity in the field of counseling, arguing that the counseling profession could make that contribution by producing doctoral graduates who know how to teach the skills and knowledge of counseling to those who wish to be effective practitioners, and also to those who aspire to be university professors.

Others in higher education have offered suggestions about activities that might prepare doctoral graduates to teach. Meacham (2002) identified several factors that he believed would prepare doctoral students to teach effectively. Those factors include being mentored by senior faculty, spending time following faculty through a typical day on campus, participating in high level graduate seminars on teaching and faculty life, preparing a course syllabus and having it critiqued, being supervised in teaching by excellent teachers, engaging in self-assessment related to teaching skills, and assembling a teaching portfolio that includes a statement of teaching philosophy.

In addition, Boyer's (1990) work identified the scholarship of teaching as the interaction of research with classroom instruction. Boyer's approach is slightly different than Meacham's (2002). Boyer

placed importance on teacher training by emphasizing the link between research productivity and performance in the classroom. Boyer's redefinition of scholarship to include teaching and service activities, which was seen as a turning point in higher education, was successful in drawing attention to the essential task of teaching.

This study drew on the works of Meacham (2002), Hosie (1990), Austin (2002a; 2002b) and Lanning (1990). Many of the items on the survey used in this research project, the Preparation for Teaching Survey (PFTS), were derived from the work of these authors. Items in the PFTS were developed to explore whether graduates of counselor education doctoral programs would report having had the experiences recommended by these authors.

## Method

### *Participants*

Participants in this study were counselor educators who were teaching in doctoral and master's level counselor preparation programs accredited by the Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Participants were identified by using a list of CACREP accredited counseling programs obtained from the CACREP website ([www.cacrep.org](http://www.cacrep.org)). Once the programs were identified as CACREP accredited, faculty members' e-mail addresses were gathered from the individual program websites and entered into an e-mail list. This list contained only the e-mail addresses of the faculty members, and no other identifying information. Participants for the study were then contacted by e-mail with a mass e-mail message. A total of 1,062 e-mail messages were sent, and 262 participants completed the survey (a response rate of 24.6%). A total of 60 responses were discarded because those participants reported having

a doctoral degree in psychology instead of counselor education.

Personal information (sex, ethnicity, tenure status, type of program, and type of institution in which participants were currently employed) was collected in order to provide descriptive information about the participants of this study. Of those participating, 74 were male (36.6%) and 128 were female (63.4%). Participants indicated that their ethnicities were as follows: 14 were African American (6.9%), 6 were Asian American (6%), 164 were Caucasian/European American (81.2%), 4 were Hispanic (2.0%), 3 were Native American (1.5%), and 10 indicated an ethnicity of other (5%). When answering the tenure status item, 101 participants indicated that they were tenured (50%), 88 participants were in tenure track positions (43.6%), and 12 participants were in non-tenure track positions (5.9%). Of those participating, 78 were employed in masters only programs (38.6%), and 121 were employed in combined master's and doctoral programs (59.9%). When surveyed about the type of institution in which they were employed, 14 responded that they were employed in private institutions (6.9%), while 188 responded that they were employed in public institutions (93.1%). In terms of academic rank, 49 participants held the rank of professor (24.3%), 61 held the rank of associate professor (30.2%), 90 held the rank of assistant professor (44.6%), and 2 held the rank of lecturer (1.0%).

### *Preparation for Teaching Survey*

The *Preparation for Teaching Survey* (PFTS) was developed specifically for use in this study. The instrument is a 58-item survey that employs a 7-point Likert scale with anchored responses on both ends of a continuum (see Appendix A). Participants were asked to respond to questions either on a scale of one to seven (one being never and seven being very frequently) or on a scale of one to seven (one being not at all effective and seven being very effective). The first nine items of the PFTS requested

personal information and asked participants to identify themselves by characteristics such as sex, ethnicity, tenure status, academic rank, and number of years as a faculty member.

## Results

Ratings of the effectiveness of preparation experiences counselor educators had ranged from 1.34 (effectiveness of taking courses in college teaching) to 6.02 (effectiveness of teaching an entire course from start to finish). (See Appendix B for results from all computed correlations). Counselor educators did not find their courses on college teaching to be effective in preparing them to teach, however, they found that teaching an entire course (different from delivering lectures as a teaching assistant) was very effective in preparing them to teach. Silverman (2003) discussed that taking courses in teaching might prepare doctoral students to teach, but responses to this survey did not support that sort of activity as effective in teaching preparation. A total of 68 (36.4%) participants who reported taking one course in college teaching, and 100 (53.5%) participants reported not having any college teaching courses. According to the participants in this study who did complete courses in college teaching, the courses that were taken during their doctoral training were not effective in preparing them to teach.

Mean effectiveness ratings for some of Silverman's (2003) other suggested activities did indicate that they were effective in teaching preparation. For example, being a participant in a teaching practicum was given a mean rating of 5.56, which indicates that this was rated as highly effective. That rating also provides support for more experiential training of teachers, and is consistent with Orr et al. (2008) who observed that after participating in a supervised teaching practicum, students reported having greater depth of knowledge about the counseling curriculum,

understanding how to develop a course and implement it from start to finish, and developing a greater awareness of the role of a teacher in the counseling classroom. Sharing of resources with faculty had a mean effectiveness rating of 4.06, teaching under supervision had a mean rating of 5.60 (also suggested by Austin, 2002a; 2002b and Orr et al.), having discussions with faculty about teaching philosophy had a mean rating of 4.76, and having discussions with faculty about why instructional decisions are made in courses had a mean rating of 4.81. Participants in this study endorsed training activities that provided room for observation of skills, feedback, and reflection, along with open discussion of the process.

Activities suggested by Austin (2002a; 2002b) were also supported, with receiving feedback about teaching being assigned a mean effectiveness rating of 5.00; reflecting on feedback about teaching receiving a mean effectiveness rating of 5.00; observing others teaching receiving a mean effectiveness rating of 4.91; participating in designing a course receiving a mean effectiveness rating of 5.40; and gaining knowledge about individual learning differences receiving a mean effectiveness rating of 4.59. There seems to be a definite parallel between counselor preparation and Austin's suggestions about the training of doctoral students to teach. She emphasized training under supervision, receiving feedback, reflecting on the feedback, and sharing of resources with the supervisor. It follows that a more collaborative model of teacher training, closely resembling the training of counselors might be quite effective in training counselor education doctoral students to teach.

Meacham (2002) suggested preparing a course syllabus, engaging in self assessment, and completing a teaching portfolio as ideas for better teacher training, and those activities received mean effectiveness ratings of 5.89, 5.41, and 4.96 respectively. Of particular emphasis is the rating of 5.41 with regard to self assessment of teaching. Being asked to assess one's



own performance as a teacher is a different activity than simply receiving a performance rating given by an observer or supervisor, and may be instrumental in the development of one's own teaching philosophy. Engaging in self assessment requires students to critique their own performance, ultimately forcing them to ponder their own beliefs and ideas about teaching and learning. Self assessment also fits closely with the way in which counselors are trained. In counselor training programs, students are often encouraged to look inward and examine personal thoughts, beliefs, and biases, in addition to assessing their own growth throughout the learning process. Young (2001) discussed the interaction between self-assessment and other essential factors in the preparation of counselors, stating that supervision and mentoring are essential for self-assessment and reflection. Based on responses to items on the PFTS, doctoral students learning to teach counseling could benefit from supervision and mentoring (as suggested by Young, 2001) to engage in self-assessment of teaching and reflection on their classroom performance.

Participants also gave participation in a teaching practicum a high mean rating of effectiveness (5.56), providing further support for more experiential teacher training. Of the 202 respondents to this survey, a large number, 91 (46.7%), indicated that they did participate in some sort of teaching practicum. It is important to note that the nature of these teaching practica may vary, given that the term teaching practicum may have been defined differently by participants. All of the activities mentioned above that were given high effectiveness ratings are activities that could be included as part of a teaching practicum and could be tied into a more collaborative learning experience for doctoral students (Orr et al., 2008).

In summary, it was evident from the quantitative data that participants would like more experiential training to teach, which would include mentoring, supervision, a structured way of teaching, being given

feedback about that teaching and having a way to reflect on their teaching.

### *Responses to Open Ended Survey Item about Teaching Preparation*

This portion of the study asked participants to respond to the following: "please provide any additional information about activities or experiences during your doctoral training that would have better prepared you for teaching as a faculty member". Upon analysis of responses, four themes emerged: mentoring, a teaching practicum, more courses on teaching, and observation/feedback from faculty. Although these are four distinct themes that emerged from the data, there is substantial overlap between the applications of these concepts, and they are presented as such below.

*Mentoring.* The identified theme of mentoring provides support for Silverman (2003) and others (Cesa & Fraser, 1989; Wilde & Schau, 1991) who have cited mentoring as an essential factor in teacher training. Many responses indicated the desire to be mentored into the role of teacher by experienced faculty. This information supports the ideas of Anderson and Shannon (1988) who wrote that the purpose of a mentor is to integrate a new person into a professional role that is already held by the mentor and Orr et al. (2008) who suggest that faculty supervisors of students in teaching take a mentoring role in helping doctoral students transition from learner to leader in the classroom. Examples of responses were "more mentoring into the role of faculty member", "better mentoring" and "Mentorship by faculty in the areas of teaching, research and service...to learn about the different types involved and the expectations for tenure".

*Participation in a Teaching Practicum.* The second theme, participation in a teaching practicum, arising from responses to the open ended question, was a call for a

teaching practicum/internship and supervision of teaching. Comments supporting a desire for more structured teaching preparation abound; providing evidence that not only is there a need for more attention to teaching preparation, but also a desire for further instruction by the doctoral students enrolled in counselor education programs. For example, one participant stated that "A required teaching practicum under supervision that dealt with all of the elements of teaching from course design through assessment" would be useful. These comments provide support for Lanning's (1990) endorsement of an educator practitioner model in counselor education doctoral programs, as he pointed out that doctoral programs in counselor education should be concerned with preparing graduates who were not only skilled counselors, but also skilled teachers. In addition, these results support the work of Orr et al. (2008), whose participants suggested that a collaborative, supervised model for teacher training was beneficial in increasing their learning.

*More Courses on College Teaching.* Along with the desire for a teaching practicum, participants identified a need for more comprehensive courses on teaching. For example, one participant remarked "teaching courses could have been more practical...more in-depth and concentrated, and more time could have been spent talking about the role of instructor, grading, assessing goals and objectives, creating assignments, and engaging adult learners". Another participant stated that "a class or several seminars on teaching including teaching methods, syllabus development, grading, classroom/student management" was needed.

*Observation and Feedback from Faculty.* The fourth identified theme from responses to the open ended question was a need for observation and feedback from faculty. One example can be seen in this quote "I would have liked to have more observation and feedback from my faculty members. They seemed to be overly confident in my

abilities, sight unseen". Support for the importance of observation and feedback can also be found in the response of one participant who reported having an exceptional teaching experience. "Their [faculty members'] commitment to providing me with opportunities, feedback, and role modeling were the key elements to my success as a "teacher" of counselor education."

In summary, qualitative responses showed that participants wanted more mentoring, participation in a structured teaching practicum (that could include observation and feedback from faculty) and more comprehensive courses on college teaching.

## Discussion of Hypotheses

All hypotheses in the study were tested through the use of Pearson product moment correlations between items. The correlations yielded positive results, and those hypotheses are presented and discussed below.

The first hypothesis stated that the number of courses taught from start to finish as a doctoral student is positively related to the level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. The positive correlation found ( $r(114) = .300, p < .001$ ) indicated that as the frequency of courses that participants taught as doctoral students increased, their ratings of overall preparedness for teaching increased. Often, when doctoral students are given the opportunity to teach, they serve as teaching assistants, delivering the occasional lecture. It is clear that more teaching experience allowed participants to feel more prepared overall for teaching, but it seems that the experience of teaching an entire course, rather than single presentations, is key. Here, the importance of continuity is evident. In the field of counselor education, counseling students are expected to have some degree of continuity in counseling relationships, as opposed to having single sessions with multiple clients. The rationale here is that



the students will build confidence and competence while moving through the developmental process of becoming a counselor.

The second hypothesis stated that the number of courses taught under the supervision of a full time faculty member is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. The positive correlation found here ( $r(140) = .297, p < .001$ ) indicated that there is a significant relationship; as frequency of teaching under supervision increased, so did participants' ratings of their overall preparedness. In a parallel way, supervision is provided to counseling students during practicum and internship not only to ensure client safety, but also to support new practitioners (Ladany et al., 1999).

Research hypothesis three stated that receiving feedback about teaching more frequently during doctoral training is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. This hypothesis was supported through findings which indicated a highly significant correlation ( $r(182) = .547, p < .001$ ). As frequency of receiving feedback increased, participants rated themselves as more prepared to teach. Again, there is a parallel here to the training of counselors. An integral part of the supervision process is the observation of students (through use of audio or video tapes) and the provision of feedback about their performance. Feedback has been given great attention in the counselor education literature (Young, 2001), particularly attention to the use of corrective feedback and its utility in counselor training (Hulse-Killacky, 1996). A similar process for the training of teachers would be useful, and fairly easy to employ. Doctoral students could tape the classes being taught and then turn the tapes in to faculty supervisors, later receiving feedback about the teaching skills employed in classrooms. Alternatively, doctoral students could serve as lead instructors of courses under the supervision of faculty supervisors, who would be responsible for attending

classes taught by the doctoral student lead instructor and providing feedback about the student's teaching (see Orr et al., 2008).

Research hypothesis four stated that the frequency of being given opportunities to reflect on feedback about teaching is positively related to the level of overall preparedness for teaching. When this hypothesis was tested through the use of a Pearson product moment correlation, a highly significant result was found ( $r(180) = .550, p < .001$ ). Those participants reporting more opportunities to reflect on feedback about teaching rated themselves as more overall prepared for the task of teaching. Again, in the training of counselors, there is often a focus on being aware of what is happening in the counseling session and reflecting on the experience of counseling after the session's conclusion. There are ways in which counselor educators can provide more structured opportunities for doctoral students to reflect on feedback about their teaching. For example, there could be a requirement for students to answer questions about teaching experiences based on feedback received, in the form of a short reflection paper.

## Limitations of the Study

The participant sample represents the first potential limitation of this study. Because participants are not required to complete the survey, those that chose to complete it may not be representative of the entire population of counselor education faculty. Another limitation of the study lies in the percentage of completed surveys; 1,062 e-mail messages were sent, and 262 participants completed the survey (a response rate of 24.6%).

## Implications for Counselor Education Doctoral Programs

Overall, the importance of activities such as teaching entire courses, receiving supervision while teaching, receiving

feedback about teaching, reflecting on that feedback, and having discussions with faculty and other students about teaching issues were highlighted in the responses to this survey. Findings suggested a need to create structured approaches for teacher training, and are consistent with the description of a teaching collaborative model presented by Orr et al. (2008). Orr et al.'s model of a teaching collaborative, which involves the concepts mentioned above could be beneficial in training doctoral students to teach; and this teaching collaborative is very similar to the regimented way in which counselor education programs train students to be counselors. Components such as supervision, observation of teaching, feedback from faculty about teaching and opportunities for students to reflect on that feedback and engage in self assessment with regard to development of teaching skills are included. The supervision of doctoral students is of particular importance during teacher training, and this need could be addressed in a variety of ways. Orr et al. (2008) suggested that a faculty supervisor observe the class on a regular basis. Another method might be to conduct doctoral seminars on supervision and expand them to include a component of teacher training, based on Bernard and Goodyear's (1998) notions about the teaching component of supervision. In either case, doctoral students could then be provided with feedback from faculty supervisors, based on observations of teaching (through live supervision, viewing of audio or video tapes for example). A next step would be to have structured approaches to reflection on this feedback, and having doctoral students engage in self assessment of progress by way of reflection papers, for example. As stated previously in this manuscript, a model for teacher training with these components would closely follow the way that counselors are being trained. For this reason, counselor education is in a prime position to be responsive to the needs of doctoral students highlighted in the responses to the PFTS.

## Implications for Further Research

The results of this study are intended to extend counselor educators' understanding of the state of teaching preparation in doctoral programs. Based on the preliminary findings of this study, future research can focus on several areas.

Two themes emerged from responses to the open-ended question that warranted further clarity: mentoring and teaching practica. A qualitative study could be helpful to explore what a mentoring relationship for teaching in counselor education would look like.

Many participants in this study cited a mentoring relationship as crucial for development of teaching skills, and others who had not experienced a mentoring relationship stated that it would have been helpful. However, mentoring may be defined in a variety of ways, so further investigation into the meaning of mentoring and its relationship to teaching preparation is warranted. Further exploration of the need for a teaching practicum would also provide insight into better training of doctoral students.

Examination of teaching preparation at the doctoral level could also be useful across disciplines. Research could be conducted to compare several disciplines that have a masters' degree as the terminal degree for practice (i.e. social work, counselor education, business administration, public administration) evaluating their respective approaches to teacher training at the doctoral level. The assumption here is that many people obtaining a doctorate in disciplines that only require a master's degree for practice are doing so to prepare themselves to take faculty positions, which will require a significant amount of teaching.

Finally, further investigation into whether having teaching experience in secondary education prior to pursuing a doctoral degree has an effect on doctoral teacher training could be useful; thus

probing the issue of whether learning to teach adults is somehow different than learning to teach children and adolescents.

## Conclusion

There is increasing attention to teaching in higher education, with additional demands being placed on faculty to prove competency in the area of teaching (Austin, 2002b). In addition, it is apparent that teaching as a skill is valued by the field of counselor education. At this point, the issue for counselor educators is to be clear about where teaching preparation will fall in counselor education programs and to make decisions about where to place program resources. These data provide initial ideas about how to train doctoral students to teach which are in line with Hosie's (1990) and Lanning's (1990) arguments for an educator practitioner model of doctoral training. In fact, the discussion of results not only provides support for Lanning's idea of an educator practitioner model, but begins to suggest ways in which it could be implemented. An educator practitioner

model that prepares doctoral students to be competent practitioners as well as competent educators could be achieved through the use of structured approaches to teaching preparation. These structured approaches could include implementation of the teaching collaborative model suggested by Orr et al. (2008) and attention to other topics of importance, including the ethics of teaching (emphasized by the American Counseling Association in section F.6.d. of the code of ethics, CACREP in section IV.C.3. and the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Ethical Guidelines in section three).

The results of this study and respective discussion of findings provide a starting point for addressing an area in counselor education that is in great need of attention. It is obvious that teaching is still in competition with research; this is true across disciplines in higher education. One question remains: does teaching have to be in competition with research, or can counselor education doctoral training programs address both?

Stephanie F. Hall, Ph.D.; Assistant Professor of Psychological Counseling; Monmouth University; 400 Cedar Ave, West Long Branch, NJ 07764; w (732) 263-5731 h (859) 200-7206; e-mail [shall@monmouth.edu](mailto:shall@monmouth.edu).

Diana Hulse, Ed.D.; Professor and Chair of Counselor Education; Fairfield University; 1073 North Benson Road; Fairfield, CT 06824; w (203) 254-4000 ext 2245; h (203) 345-1242; e-mail [dhulse@mail.fairfield.edu](mailto:dhulse@mail.fairfield.edu).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.7729/12.0108>

# Appendix A

## PREPARATION FOR TEACHING SCALE

### PERSONAL INFORMATION

Please provide the following personal information:

1. Sex:

- Male  
 Female

2. Ethnicity:

- African American  
 Asian American  
 Caucasian/European American  
 Hispanic  
 Native American  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_

3. Tenure Status:

Please check all that apply

- Tenured  
 Tenure Track  
 Non-Tenure Track

4. Type of Program in Which You are Currently Employed:

- Master's Only  
 Master's and Doctoral

5. Type of Institution in Which You are Currently Employed:

- Private  
 Public

6. Academic Rank:

- Professor  
 Associate Professor  
 Assistant Professor  
 Instructor  
 Lecturer

7. Number of Years as a Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Was Your Doctoral Training Program CACREP accredited?

- Yes  
 No

9. Please List All Degrees That You Currently Hold:

\_\_\_\_\_

Please read the items below and respond based on the training that you received as a doctoral student:

#### FREQUENCY

Never

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Very Frequently

#### EFFECTIVENESS

Not at All Effective

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Very Effective

10. How many times did you participate in designing a course? \_\_\_\_\_

11. If you participated in designing a course, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

12. How many times did you teach an entire course from beginning to end? \_\_\_\_\_

13. If you taught a course from beginning to end, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

14. How many times did you design a course syllabus? \_\_\_\_\_

15. If you designed a course syllabus, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

16. How many times did you teach a course under the supervision of a full time faculty member? \_\_\_\_\_

17. If you taught a course under the supervision of a full time faculty member, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

18. How often did you have discussions with faculty about your teaching philosophy?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. If you discussed your teaching philosophy with faculty, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

20. How often did faculty share teaching resources (e.g. lecture materials) with you?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. If faculty shared teaching resources with you, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

22. How often did you have discussions with faculty about why instructional classroom decisions are made?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. If you had discussions with faculty about why instructional classroom decisions are made, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

24. Did you participate in a teaching practicum? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

25. If you participated in a teaching practicum, please rate it's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

26. How many courses in college teaching did you take? \_\_\_\_\_

27. If you took courses in college teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

28. How often did you receive feedback from a faculty member about your teaching skills?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. If you received feedback from a faculty member about your teaching skills, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

30. How often were you provided with opportunities to reflect on feedback about your teaching?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31. If you were given the opportunity to reflect on feedback about your teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

32. How often did you observe someone teaching (not including classes that you were enrolled in?)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33. If you observed someone teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

34. How often did you have discussions with faculty about individual learning differences?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35. If you had discussions with faculty about individual learning differences, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

36. How often did you have conversations with faculty about their approaches to grading?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37. If you had conversations with faculty about their approaches to grading; please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

38. How often did you engage in self assessment with regard to your teaching?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

39. If you engaged in self assessment with regard to your teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

40. Were you encouraged to develop a teaching portfolio? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

41. Were you provided assistance in developing the portfolio by a faculty member? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

N/A \_\_\_\_\_

42. If you were given the opportunity to develop a teaching portfolio, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

43. How often did you deliver a lecture in the classroom?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

44. If you delivered a lecture in the classroom, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

45. How often did you grade exams?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

46. If you graded exams, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

47. How often did you grade or provide feedback on written assignments?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

48. If you graded or provided feedback on written assignments, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

49. How often did you prepare course assignments?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

50. If you prepared course assignments, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

51. How often did you attend seminars on college teaching?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

52. If you attended seminars on college teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

53. How often did you engage in conversations with other students about teaching?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

54. If you engaged in conversations with other students about teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

55. How often were you able to ask faculty members questions about teaching?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

56. If you asked faculty members questions about teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

57. Upon completion of your doctoral degree, please rate your overall preparedness for the task of teaching:

Not at All Prepared

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Very Prepared

58. Please provide any additional information about activities or experiences during your doctoral training that would have better prepared you for teaching as a faculty member.



## Appendix B

### Results of Pearson Product Moment Correlations for Selected Items Correlated to Perceived Overall Preparation

Variables	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
10. Times You Participated in Designing a Course	.264	.003
11. Rating of Effectiveness for Course Design	.473	<.001
12. Times You Taught an Entire Course	.300	.001
13. Ratings of Effectiveness For Teaching an Entire Course	.487	<.001
14. Times You Designed a Course Syllabus	.188	.042
15. Ratings of Effectiveness for Syllabus Design	.405	<.001
16. Times You Taught a Course Under the Supervision of a Full Time Faculty Member	.297	<.001
17. Ratings of Effectiveness for Teaching Under Supervision	.470	<.001
18. How Often Did You Have Discussions with Faculty About Your Teaching Philosophy	.478	<.001
19. Ratings of Effectiveness for Discussions About Teaching Philosophy	.462	<.001
20. How Often Faculty Shared Teaching Resources with You	.492	<.001
21. Ratings of Effectiveness for Sharing of Resources	.457	<.001
22. How Often You Discussed With Faculty Why Instructional Decisions Are Made	.512	<.001
23. Ratings of Effectiveness for Discussion of Why Instructional Decisions are Made	.504	<.001
25. Ratings of Effectiveness for Participating in a Teaching Practicum	.572	<.001
27. Ratings of Effectiveness for Taking Courses in College Teaching	.478	<.001
28. How Often Did You Receive Feedback from Faculty About Your Teaching Skills?	.547	<.001
29. Ratings of Effectiveness for Receiving Feedback from Faculty About Your Teaching	.410	<.001
30. How Often Were You Provided With Opportunities to Reflect On Feedback?	.550	<.001
31. Ratings of Effectiveness for Reflecting on Feedback About Your Teaching	.520	<.001
32. How Often Did You Observe Teaching?	.401	<.001
33. Ratings of Effectiveness for Observing Teaching	.381	<.001
34. How Often Did You Have Discussions with Faculty About Learning Differences?	.418	<.001
35. Ratings of Effectiveness for Discussions with Faculty About Learning Differences	.384	<.001
36. How Often Did You Have Conversations with Faculty About Grading?	.464	<.001
37. Ratings of Effectiveness for Conversations with Faculty About Grading	.486	<.001
38. How Often Did You Engage In Self Assessment with Regard to Teaching?	.569	<.001
39. Ratings of Effectiveness for Engaging in Self Assessment With Regard to Teaching?	.494	<.001
42. Ratings of Effectiveness for Developing a Teaching Portfolio	.293	.116
43. How Often Did You Deliver a Lecture in the Classroom?	.486	<.001
44. Ratings of Effectiveness for Delivering a Lecture	.560	<.001
45. How Often Did You Grade Exams?	.409	<.001
46. Ratings of Effectiveness for Grading Exams	.337	<.001
47. How Often Did You Grade or Provide Feedback on Written Assignments?	.481	<.001
48. Ratings of Effectiveness for Grading or Providing Feedback On Written Assignments	.470	<.001
49. How Often Did You Prepare Course Assignments?	.520	<.001
50. Ratings of Effectiveness for Preparing Course Assignments	.436	<.001
51. How Often Did You Attend Seminars on College Teaching?	.259	<.001
52. Ratings of Effectiveness for Attending Seminars on College Teaching	.311	.008
53. How Often Did You Engage in Conversations with Other Students About Teaching?	.561	<.001
54. Ratings of Effectiveness for Conversations with Other Students About Teaching	.461	<.001
55. How Often Were You Able To Ask Faculty Members Questions About Teaching?	.622	<.001
56. Ratings of Effectiveness for Asking Faculty Members About Teaching	.504	<.001

## References

- American Counseling Association (2005). ACA code of ethics. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Anderson, E. M., & Shannon, A. L. (1988). Toward a conceptualization of mentoring. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39, 38-42.
- Association of Counselor Education and Supervision (1993). Ethical guidelines for counseling supervisors. Retrieved December 2, 2009 from [http://www.acesonline.net/ethical\\_guidelines.asp](http://www.acesonline.net/ethical_guidelines.asp).
- Austin, A. E. (2002a). Creating a bridge to the future: Preparing new faculty to face changing expectations in a shifting context. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26, 119-144.
- Austin, A. E. (2002b). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94-122.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. G. (1998). *Fundamentals of Clinical Supervision* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Nedham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Cesa, I. L., & Fraser, S. C. (1989). A method for encouraging the development of good mentor-protégé relationships. *Teaching of Psychology*, 16, 125-128.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2009). *The 2009 standards*. Retrieved December 2, 2009 from <http://www.cacrep.org/2001standards.html>.
- DeNeef, A. L. (1993). Right here right now. *Liberal Education*, 79(2), 20-26.
- Golde, C. M. (2004). The responsibility of doctoral programs for the career preparation of future faculty. *Peer Review*, 6 (3), 26 -29.
- Hosie, T. W. (1990). Recommendations for improvement in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 130-133.
- Hulse-Killacky, D. (1996). Using the classroom as a group to integrate knowledge, skills, and supervised practice. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 21, 163-168.
- Ladany, N., Ellis, M. V., & Friedlander, M. L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 77, 447-455.
- Lanning, W. (1990). An educator/practitioner model for counselor education doctoral programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 163-170.
- Magnuson, S. (2002). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their 1<sup>st</sup> year. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 306-320.
- Meacham, J. (2002). Our doctoral programs are failing our undergraduate students. *Liberal Education*, 88(3), 22-28.
- Orr, J. J., Hall, S. F., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2008). A model for collaborative teaching teams in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 146-163.
- Rogers, J. R., Gill-Wigal, J. A., Harrigan, M., & Abbey-Hines, J. (1998). Academic hiring policies and projections: A survey of CACREP and APA-accredited counseling programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 166-177.
- Silverman, S. (2003). The role of teaching in the preparation of future faculty. *Quest*, 55, 72-81.
- Wilde, J. B., & Schau, C. G. (1991). Mentoring in graduate schools of education: Mentees' perceptions. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 59, 165-179.
- Young, M. E. (2001). *Learning the art of helping: Building blocks and techniques*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.