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Domain A: Eligibility

The Counseling Psychology program at Boston College offers doctoral education and training to prepare students for the practice of professional psychology (see Domain B of this report for the specific goals and objectives of the program). The program has been continuously accredited by the American Psychological Association since 1984 and offers a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree in Counseling Psychology.

A1. Program Goal. Please see the transmittal page and Table 1. The goals and objectives are detailed in Domain B.

A2. Sponsoring Institution. Boston College sponsors the Counseling Psychology program, which is housed in the Carolyn A. and Peter S. Lynch School of Education (LSOE). The University is fully accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.

A3. Administrative Structure. The Counseling Psychology program reflects the mission of both the Lynch School and Boston College. Specifically, the Counseling Psychology program emphasizes excellence in the preparation of professional psychologists who promote the welfare of individuals with whom they work and the good of the community at large through both research and practice. The complete Boston College and LSOE mission statements can be found in the University Bulletin (Catalog) (see Appendix B, pages 5 and 278, respectively).

The Counseling Psychology program is located in the Department of Counseling, Developmental, and Educational Psychology (CDEP). The program is one of several graduate degree programs housed in CDEP, which includes another doctoral degree program (Ph.D.) in Applied Developmental and Educational Psychology along with master’s degree programs in Mental Health Counseling, School Counseling, and Developmental Psychology. The CDEP department also offers one undergraduate major, Human Development. The CDEP department is one of four departments housed in the LSOE at Boston College. The other three departments in the LSOE are as follows: Teacher Education/Special Education, and Curriculum and Instruction; Educational Administration and Higher Education; and Educational Research Measurement and Evaluation. The Counseling Psychology program is fully represented in the operating budget and planning processes of the Lynch School of Education and the University (see Domain C for details concerning resources available to the program).

The Counseling Psychology program is comprised of 9 core faculty members (Professors Blustein, Goodman, Helms, Kenny, Liang, Mahalik, Nicholas, Sparks, and Walsh). (Professor A.J. Franklin will join our faculty in January 2007 and will become a core member of our doctoral program as well.) Two additional non-core faculty members who are involved in various aspects of the doctoral program include Professor Robert Romano (a term appointment Visiting Assistant Professor) and Dr. Sandra Morse (a counseling psychologist who functions as our Master’s practicum coordinator and who
supervises the doctoral students in their training and supervisory roles with our Master’s students). The proximity of faculty offices and student offices ensures sustained interactions for the program community. (Further details on the faculty are provided in Domain C1.)

The Counseling Psychology program is housed in Campion Hall, a well-resourced building on the main campus of Boston College. Sufficient space exists for faculty offices and conference rooms. Students are housed in shared work spaces during their first two years and also use faculty office space. The faculty size is an excellent fit for the student body (currently including 43 students), which is sustained by accepting 6-8 new students each year.

A4. Length of Program and Residency. The doctoral program in Counseling Psychology is designed for full-time study and requires a minimum of four years to complete. Students who enter with a Master’s degree in Counseling or a related field (known as Master’s admits) are required to complete 66 credits, post-Masters. Students who enter the program without a Master’s degree in Counseling or a related degree (known as direct admit students) are required to complete 81 credits. (Most of the incoming students in recent years are Master’s admits.) Because the doctoral program is based on a full-time training model, students typically complete three years of full-time academic residency, followed by a year of dissertation research and further practicum training as needed; the program then culminates in a full-year pre-doctoral internship.

A5. Respect for Diversity. Consistent with the broader University mission (see Appendix B, page 5), the Counseling Psychology program is committed to respecting and understanding cultural and individual diversity. Consistent with the University’s mission and the broader goals of Jesuit education, the Counseling Psychology program affirms diversity through all of our interactions including the program’s recruitment, retention, and development of faculty and students, classroom experiences, programmatic diversity initiatives, and through research and clinical training experiences. In addition, we have documented our commitment to diversity in the program’s training goals (as reflected in Goal 3, detailed in Domain B), which underscores the program’s overarching intention to promote “social justice, manifested both by our focus on multicultural issues and training, as well as our commitment to training students to assume diverse practice, research, and program development roles addressing socio-political systems and underserved client populations” (Doctoral Program Handbook, see Appendix A, pages 5-6). Other programmatic initiatives, including a diversity climate study (currently underway), underscore our commitment to understanding cultural and individual diversity and infusing this critically important knowledge base and perspective into our training. (Further details on our diversity efforts are found throughout this report, particularly in Domain D.)

A6. Policies and Procedures. The program adheres to formal written policies and procedures that govern the work of faculty, staff, and students. These policies and
procedures are available to prospective and current students and their content and location are detailed below.

**Academic Admissions:** For the University, these policies and procedures are located in the Boston College Bulletin in Appendix B, (see page 282). For the LSOE, these policies are located in the LSOE Graduate Student Policies and Procedures document, which is located on the LSOE webpage (http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/policies/#admission; see Appendix C). For specific program admissions information, prospective students can explore the admissions requirements and process on the program website: (http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/graduate/phd/counsel/) see Appendix D, pages 5-7).

**Degree Requirements:** University policies and procedures are located in the Boston College Bulletin on pages 291-292 of Appendix B. Degree requirements are located in the LSOE Graduate Student Policies and Procedures document and the programs of study, which are located on the LSOE webpage (http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/pos/; see Appendix C). Policies specific to the Counseling Program are located in the Counseling Psychology Doctoral Student Handbook on page 6 of Appendix A, which is also found on the program’s webpage (http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/graduate/phd/counsel/).

**Administrative and Financial Assistance:** For the University, these policies and procedures are located in the Boston College Bulletin on pages 2-5 in Appendix B. For the LSOE, these policies are located in the LSOE Graduate Student Policies and Procedures document, which is located on the LSOE webpage (http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/policies/#financialaid; see Appendix C, see pages 4-6). For the Counseling Psychology program, these policies are located in the Counseling Psychology Doctoral Student Handbook on pages 12-13 in Appendix A, which is also found on the program webpage (http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/graduate/phd/counsel/).

**Student Performance Evaluation, Feedback, Advisement, Retention, and Termination Decisions:** For the University, these policies and procedures are located in the Boston College Bulletin on pages 41-45 in Appendix B. For the Counseling Psychology program, these policies are located in the Counseling Psychology Doctoral Student Handbook on pages 8-12 in Appendix A.

**Due Process and Grievance Procedures:** The program utilizes the grievance process of the LSOE, which has been constructed in accordance with the ethical standards of the American Psychological Association and the best practices in professional psychology and education. These policies are located in the LSOE webpage (http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/meta-elements/html/studentgrievances.htm) and are located in Appendix E.
### Domain B: Program Philosophy, Objectives, and Curriculum Plan

**B1. Program Philosophy.** The philosophy of the Ph.D. program in Counseling Psychology arises from three interrelated values. First, we believe that counseling psychologists should possess a comprehensive, rigorous, and contemporary knowledge base in psychology, generally, and counseling psychology, specifically. We embrace a developmental-contextual perspective throughout our training, which serves as an organizing framework for conceptualizing the interrelation of individual and contextual influences. We include attention to the wide scope of human development, including the cognitive, career, interpersonal, emotional, and intrapsychic domains of human experience. We regard human development as embedded in a context of social, economic, political, cultural, and historical influences that have an interactive and recursive relationship to the intrapersonal growth processes. More precisely, we view many of the decisional dilemmas and adjustment concerns of traditional counseling psychology practice as reflecting natural human strivings for growth and adaptation in a world that differentially offers access to interpersonal and economic resources. Within this theoretical infrastructure, we emphasize the core knowledge and skills that define contemporary counseling psychology.

Second, we believe the scientist-practitioner model best integrates the areas of theory, research, and practice such that it is the ideal training model for professional
psychology. We see the commitment to the scientist-practitioner role as providing the conceptual scaffolding for the curriculum. The scientist-practitioner model “recognizes the interdependence of theory, research and practice” and “emphasizes systematic and thoughtful analyses of human experiences and judicious application of the knowledge and attitudes gained from such analyses” (Meara, 1988). By emphasizing the scientist-practitioner model in our training, we seek to have our students function at the nexus of science and practice in a manner that transcends and informs the actual occupational role that they may occupy. Specifically, we emphasize that persons involved in practice be able to evaluate their treatments, learn from the body of scientific psychology in planning their work, be aware of the limitations to current knowledge, and employ a scientific attitude toward their work.

Third, we believe that counseling psychologists should espouse a commitment to social justice, which is a value that is shared by the larger institution of Boston College. That is, Jesuit education regards the purpose for education and professional training to be not simply the acquisition of knowledge, but the constructive and responsible use of that knowledge in service to others, specifically, in pursuit of social justice. This institutional mission is operationalized within the Lynch School of Education and other professional schools at Boston College through the preparation of professionals, including psychologists, teachers, nurses, social workers, lawyers, and managers, who will “serve others” and the public interest through socially responsible and ethically sensitive actions that improve the lives of children, families and communities, particularly in urban settings. The Counseling Psychology program shares those commitments and attempts to foster student interest and skills in working with diverse populations in under-served areas. Consistent with the traditions of counseling psychology, our model also promotes respect for the “socio-cultural context that is influenced by culture, ethnicity, gender, age and socio-historical perspective” (Kagan, 1988), as well as by ability and sexual orientation. We view the socio-cultural context as a crucial factor that shapes the development and well-being of individuals, groups, and systems. Our valuing of social justice is reflected most directly in our emphases on the analysis of the socio-cultural context, sensitivity to multicultural issues, as well as our commitment to training students to assume diverse practice roles in a varied set of systems and client populations.

Additionally, our program has been constructed in accordance with the principles of the Model Training Program in Counseling Psychology, which represents the collective input of the Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs and the Society of Counseling Psychology (Murdock, Alcorn, Heesacker, & Stoltenberg, 2005).

(Please note that the counseling psychology program at Boston College is the sole doctoral program in professional psychology in our institution.)

**B2. Educational Training Objectives and Competencies.** Derived from the aforementioned philosophy, our goals are to produce graduates who (1) demonstrate the foundational knowledge essential for the scientific and professional practice of Counseling Psychology, (2) demonstrate the ability to implement the scientist-practitioner model within the arenas of both research and clinical practice, (3) develop the awareness,
knowledge, and skills to effectively deal with self and client diversity as well as the intersection of these characteristics. Through careful deliberation in yearly faculty retreats and weekly faculty meetings, the program faculty have developed and refined a set of integrated goals, objectives, and competencies that, when considered collectively, define the training mission of the program. The following sections include a summary of the goals, objectives, and competencies that reflect the program’s training mission:

Goal 1: Students will demonstrate the foundational knowledge essential for the scientific and professional practice of Counseling Psychology. As such, we expect our graduates to be well-equipped with a knowledge base that will allow for the implementation of the scientist-practitioner model of counseling psychology. Three objectives along with corresponding competencies that flow from this general goal include:

Objective 1.1: Students will have knowledge of the theoretical and scientific foundations of Counseling Psychology.

Competency 1.1a: Students will demonstrate knowledge of theory and research pertaining to the professional core of counseling psychology, including multicultural issues, ethics, counseling theories, career development, social advocacy, and psychology of race, class, and gender.

Competency 1.1b: Students will demonstrate knowledge of theory and research of psychological foundations of counseling psychology with an emphasis on life-span development, including history and systems, developmental psychopathology, biological bases of behavior, cognitive and affective bases of behavior, and social bases of behavior.

Objective 1.2: Students will have foundational knowledge of the professional practice of Counseling Psychology (including ethical principles) in research and practice.

Competency 1.2a: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the implications of theory and research in the professional core for the practice of counseling psychology.

Competency 1.2b: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the implications of theory and research in the psychological foundations of counseling psychology.

Objective 1.3: Students will have attitudes essential for life long learning, scholarly inquiry, and professional problem solving as psychologists.
Competency 1.3a: Students will demonstrate professional development skills and behaviors that reflect a commitment to lifelong learning.

Goal 2: Students will demonstrate the ability to implement the scientist-practitioner model within the arenas of both research and clinical practice. As such, we expect our graduates to demonstrate a strong knowledge base of psychological theory, measurement, design, and statistics and to have the ability to apply this knowledge base to inform their clinical practice and research. Three objectives and corresponding competencies that flow from this general goal include:

Objective 2.1: Students will have knowledge of research methodology to examine clinical, theoretical, and societal questions.

Competency 2.1a: Students will demonstrate the ability to apply knowledge of research methodology to examine clinical, theoretical and societal questions.

Objective 2.2: Students will have knowledge to evaluate psychological research, learn to incorporate psychological research into practice, and know about relevant practice issues to inform programs of research.

Competency 2.2a: Students will demonstrate the ability to evaluate psychological research critically and incorporate psychological research into practice, as well as utilize relevant practice issues to inform programs of research.

Objective 2.3: Students will have developmentally appropriate skills in counseling psychology practice and advocacy, including the skills to design and implement psychological interventions at the individual, group, and systemic levels.

Competency 2.3a: Students will demonstrate developmentally appropriate skills in counseling psychology practice and advocacy, including the design and implementation of psychological interventions at the individual, group, and systemic levels.

Goal 3: Students will demonstrate the ability and knowledge to enable the growth of the individuals, families, and systems with whom they work and the good of the community at large in both their research and practice. Two objectives that emerge from this general goal include:
Objective 3.1: Students will obtain knowledge necessary to understand individual, family, and community strengths in the context of their socio-cultural milieu.

Competency 3.1a: Students will demonstrate the acquisition of knowledge about themselves as culturally embedded within a socio-historical perspective and will also demonstrate knowledge about how to infuse socio-cultural perspectives into their research and practice as counseling psychologists.

Objective 3.2: Students will develop competence in counseling practice and research to work with persons who are underserved by society and psychology, including persons of varying racial or ethnic backgrounds, disenfranchised classes, genders, sexual orientations, and those differently-abled.

Competency 3.2a: Students will demonstrate knowledge in the design and delivery of research studies, individual counseling practices, and systemic interventions that reflect a focus on underserved populations.

(Please see the summary document in Appendix F, which reviews the recent process of developing the competencies and proposed outcomes for each objective.)

B3. Curriculum Plan. Graduation from the Boston College doctoral program requires the completion of sequential, cumulative, and increasingly complex training experiences designed to prepare students for entry-level post-doctoral positions as counseling psychologists. These training experiences are derived from our program philosophy and are designed to meet the goals, objectives, and competencies specified above. The specific training requirements that our doctoral students complete entail formal course work, practicum training in counseling/psychotherapy and assessment, a doctoral dissertation, and other training experiences (e.g., research assistantships, teaching and supervision opportunities, counseling and assessment placements, First Year Experience) designed to meet the goals and objectives of our program. (Unless otherwise indicated, the sequence of courses described in this section is based on an MA admit, which has been the modal student in our program during the past 7 years.)

Our doctoral curriculum includes pre-requisite, required, and elective coursework spanning Areas A through F as represented in our Program of Studies (see Appendix G). (To maintain consistency within this report and other supporting documents, such as our doctoral handbook, please note we use the categorical system that is utilized in our program materials.) Specifically, these areas include the Professional Core (Area A), Statistical and Research Design (Area B), Psychological Measurement (Area C), Psychological Foundations (Area D), Advanced Practicum (Area E), and Internship in Counseling Psychology (Area F).

Area A: Professional Core. To develop students’ knowledge of the theoretical and scientific foundations of Counseling Psychology, students complete the curriculum
areas of the Professional Core, Psychological Foundations, and Advanced Practicum. Within the Professional Core (Area A in our Program of Studies), students participate in small seminars that seek to provide both content coverage and develop critical skills in inquiry and analysis with the intention of training students to be critical counseling psychologists. Early in their doctoral work, students enroll in the Seminar in Professional Issues in Counseling Psychology (PY 840). This course, which has been taught by Dr. Gerry Koocher (an adjunct faculty member in our program and a leading experts in ethics), provides students with foundational knowledge of professional psychology necessary to function as a scientist-practitioner with a particular focus on ethical and legal issues. The required Seminar in Career Development (PY 843) focuses on the role of working in human development, which is a key element within contemporary counseling psychology training. Counseling Psychology in Context (PY844), which is completed in conjunction with the First Year Experience, provides students with a knowledge base to examine their professional identities as counseling psychologists with a commitment to social justice. Students continue the acquisition of critical knowledge of theory and its scientific foundations through Critical Perspectives on the Psychology of Race, Class, and Gender (PY 915) and Seminar in Counseling Theory (PY 842). These courses provide students with foundational knowledge of psychological theory and help students to critique the ways in which existing theoretical assumptions may marginalize disenfranchised members of society. PY 528 (Multicultural Issues) and PY 915 (Critical Perspectives on the Psychology of Race, Class, and Gender), in conjunction with an infusion of multicultural content across the curriculum, provide students with a critical analysis of social and cultural influences on human development. Taken together, the requirements in the core foundation area furnish students with critical concepts and knowledge of psychological theory and its scientific foundations in a manner consistent with our commitment to social justice.

The academic coursework is directly intended to provide students with integrated and structured experiences in acquiring theory, research, and practice skills that will inform their counseling work, program development, and social advocacy. Master’s admits move directly into the doctoral seminar sequence outlined previously. Direct admit students, who do not have training in the foundational counseling skills (such as reflecting, listening, and developing empathic responses), complete a set of pre-requisite courses that provide skill building and basic coverage of counseling and personality theories. Once students develop these skills, they move into the aforementioned sequence of courses, which entail further exposure to counseling theories (with a particular focus on these theories in PY 842—Seminar in Counseling Theory) as well as the other courses in the professional core. Taken together, the professional core courses provide students with skills and knowledge in intervening in clients’ relational, social, vocational, interpersonal, cultural, socio-political, and health-related contexts. Students obtain competencies in tailoring effective interventions using the core of well-established psychological counseling theories (psychodynamic, cognitive-behavioral, family systems), which are informed by multicultural counseling competencies and other sources of diversity training. Moreover, the program training model emphasizes competency
development in the development and implementation of broad and systemic interventions that link students’ counseling work with their research, program development, and social advocacy efforts. Another feature of our training model is that we offer many of the seminars every other week across the full academic year (i.e., PY 841, PY 842, PY 844; PY 846.01, PY 846.02), which provides more sustained time for integration and reflection as students explore new bodies of literature.

The acquisition of knowledge and skills in consultation and supervision are reflected in the Professional Core, as well as in a variety of graduated experiences throughout the program. For example, students are first exposed to the consultation literature in PY 844 (Counseling Psychology in Context: Social Action, Consultation, and Collaboration), and many students simultaneously gain consultation experience in the First Year Field Experience. The PY 846.02 seminar (Advanced Pre-Internship Counseling Practicum; Seminar in Practice, Supervision, and Consultation), which takes place in the third year, further explores the consultation literature during the spring semester. Increasingly more challenging experiences in supervision are also integrated in the program. Students learn how to do training of basic counseling skills in leading the Master’s labs in their second or third year; in addition, they study the theory and research on supervision in the third year advanced practicum seminar (PY 846.02--during the fall semester). In the third or fourth years of the doctoral program, students then supervise MA students as part of their role as facilitators of the MA internship. The supervision that doctoral students receive throughout these experiences contributes further to their knowledge and skill development in supervision.

**Area B: Statistics and Research Design.** Students complete a series of courses that equip them with research skills to be competent consumers of psychological research and independent contributors to the knowledge base of our profession. At the beginning of their doctoral studies, students are introduced to the scientist-practitioner model through enrollment in PY841 (Quantitative Research Design in Counseling and Development Psychology). In this course, the students learn about research design and critique examples of research in counseling and developmental psychology, gaining an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of different quantitatively oriented designs. Students gain direct experience by designing and carrying out a small, independent research study which they present at the end of the course. This course is complemented by classes in intermediate statistics and general linear models (PY 469 and PY 667, respectively). Furthermore, students are required to take a course in qualitative research methods (typically PY 851). Students also elect an advanced research course, generally selected to provide skills that will enhance their dissertation research and future scholarly agenda. In addition, students’ development as scientist-practitioners is enhanced by their work with faculty as graduate assistants, through which they gain a variety of research experiences and skills.

**Area C: Psychological Measurement.** Students are required to complete a foundational course in Psychological Testing (PY 465) or the equivalent through which
they gain basic knowledge of psychometric and measurement issues in testing. In addition, this foundational course includes coverage of ethical, professional and social issues in testing. Coursework in Intellectual Assessment (PY464) and Projective Assessment (PY662) provides students with specific assessment skills in cognitive and projective personality assessment, while also immersing them in a critical consideration of test standards, ethical and social issues in assessment, psychometric foundations, and additional research literature related to culture, race and assessment.

**Area D: Psychological Foundations.** Our doctoral students complete comprehensive courses that are common across doctoral training in the applied domains of psychology in North America. Each of these requirements is fulfilled in accordance with the Committee on Accreditation’s Implementing Regulation C-16, which emphasizes the need for “broad and general” knowledge in psychological foundations. Doctoral students complete Biological Bases of Behavior (PY 745), which ensures that students have fundamental knowledge in the biological aspects of human behavior. Students take Cognitive-Affective Bases of Behavior (PY 917) early in their program, which provides a theoretical and empirical foundation for understanding the cognitive and affective processes and their manifestation in human development. In fulfillment of the requirement for the course on individual differences, students complete the Advanced Seminar in Psychopathology (PY 741), which provides students with the requisite knowledge in psychopathology from the developmental-contextual perspective. The fourth core area, the Social Bases of Behavior, is currently fulfilled by Advanced Topics in Social Psychology (PS 540). This course explores classic and contemporary social influences on the human experience, including attitudes, stereotyping and prejudice, verbal and nonverbal communication, social relations, the self, and culture. The fifth core area, history and systems, is fulfilled by History and Theories of Psychology (PS 590). This course reviews the intellectual and social history of psychology. In this historical analysis, students are exposed to many of the strands of knowledge that form the core of the scientist-practitioner identity. (The later two courses are offered by the Psychology Department in the College of Arts and Sciences.)

**Area E: Advanced Practicum.** In Area E of the curriculum plan, students complete the Advanced Pre-Internship Counseling Practicum courses (PY846.01 and .02) that provide conceptual and supervisory support for students with placements in the field. The culmination of training in this domain is the Predoctoral Internship in Counseling Psychology (PY 849).

For students entering the doctoral program with a Master’s degree (which is the norm in recent years, accounting for 86% of the incoming classes in the past three years), the primary traditional practicum experience during doctoral training begins in the Advanced Practicum, typically during students’ second year in the program. The practicum seminars (PY846.01 and PY846.02), which meet on alternate weeks across the full semester, serve as the focal point for the off-campus practicum experiences. The PY 846.01 course utilizes case material from students’ clinical practicum placements so that
they practice skills in conceptualizing cases from multiple theoretical perspectives. Additionally, the course helps students to incorporate relevant empirical literature in the development of effective treatment plans. Students make one case presentation (oral and written) each semester that provides a supervised experience in integrating theory, research, and practice. As part of this case presentation, students also provide an audio-tape and written transcription of their interaction with the client whose case they are presenting. In addition to the advanced practicum seminar, all doctoral students enrolled in PY 846.01 are assigned to a faculty member for supplementary supervision. (Further details on the role of the faculty supervisor are discussed later in section B4.) Third-year students enroll simultaneously in PY 846.02 (Advanced Pre-Internship Counseling Practicum: Seminar in Practice, Supervision, and Consultation). This seminar provides increasingly more sophisticated resources to support the students’ more responsible positions in the field. This seminar integrates material on supervision and consultation in conjunction with research and theory on students’ case presentations. This course is required for all students, whether or not they elect to complete a third- year practicum, because it includes academic training in supervision and consultation.

Direct admit students typically follow the first two years of our Master’s practicum training sequence, which begins with a course in counseling techniques and a concurrent lab to develop counseling skills. Once these prerequisite requirements are completed, direct admit students follow the same practicum sequence as MA admits. In addition to the traditional practicum experience, all doctoral students gain professional skills through completion of the First-Year Experience (FYE), which is completed concurrent with enrollment in PY 844 (Counseling Psychology in Context: Social Action, Consultation, and Collaboration). Students are engaged in a field experience for 4 to 6 hours per week in their first doctoral year that focus on non-traditional roles for counseling psychologists, such as designing and delivering psychoeducational programs, interprofessional collaboration, consultation, and action research.

**Cultural and Individual Diversity:** As reflected in our goals and objectives, cultural and individual diversity forms one of the cornerstones of our program. As such, we emphasize student learning in this area and employ multiple methods to achieve the desired level of competency in multicultural counseling and in affirmation of all forms of cultural and individual diversity. Consistent with best practices in this area, we have infused an explicit emphasis on cultural and individual diversity into most of our courses, practicum experiences, and research efforts. Moreover, students are required to complete two courses in this area (PY 528: Multicultural Issues and PY 915: Critical Perspectives on the Psychology of Race, Class, and Gender) as part of their core requirements. Further details on the program’s mission in this area and the ways in which competencies are assessed in this area are provided in Domain D and throughout this report.

**Developing Attitudes for Lifelong Learning:** The development of attitudes for lifelong learning is a complex enterprise entailing direct instruction via courses as well as apprenticeship experiences in which students work closely with faculty mentors and
clinical supervisors throughout their doctoral studies to learn about how psychologists continually enhance their skills and knowledge. In the realm of coursework, students are encouraged to pursue areas of interest in selecting topics for papers and research studies, which will provide motivating experiences for students that are likely to continue during the post-doctoral years. Furthermore, we seek to help students understand how their ideas and projects are linked to the broader theoretical and empirical world of counseling psychology, thereby providing a means for students to connect their interests to other issues and concerns that will promote critical thinking and a commitment to lifelong learning. Students’ research and dissertation work also promote attitudes essential for lifelong learning. By developing student competence and ensuring successful experiences in research, we are helping to enhance students’ self-efficacy as critical consumers of research results and as producers of new knowledge.

In addition, the faculty provide extensive modeling about lifelong learning via their own research, learning, and openness to new experiences. Much of this learning is conveyed *in vivo* as faculty discuss their own reading, workshop attendance, and new ideas with students. Furthermore, students are encouraged to join professional associations at the local, state, and national levels, which provide focal points for lifelong learning. The focus on lifelong learning continues for students in their practicum sites, most of which have formal training programs and/or grand rounds. These seminars and training sessions furnish students with important vehicles for learning about how critical new knowledge is for practitioners and how critical new scholarship is in informing contemporary clinical work.

**B4: Practicum Experiences**

A. *Student Placements.* Students engage in community-based practicum experiences in conjunction with on-campus seminars. By virtue of our location in the Boston area, our students have access to a wide variety of high quality clinical training sites in universities, hospitals, and community mental health settings. We have been fortunate to develop excellent relationships with a number of these sites that typically select our students for advanced training in their settings.

The process of selecting an advanced practicum site begins when the practicum guidelines are distributed to students at a meeting with the Advanced Practicum Coordinator during the first semester of their first year. These guidelines ensure that students select sites that are committed to training, provide appropriate supervision, and a wide range of training and educational experiences (see Table 2 for a listing of existing practicum sites and Appendix H for additional practicum materials, including the list of approved sites). Additionally, students are given a list of “pre-approved” sites (i.e., sites that the Practicum coordinator knows fulfill both the training and supervision guidelines of our program, see Appendix H). Although students are free to explore other sites, they cannot accept a site that has not been approved by the Advanced Practicum Coordinator (see Pre-Approval Site Form and additional practicum forms in Appendix H2). During this meeting with the Advanced Practicum Coordinator, students are informed about how
to apply for practicum sites and work with the Advanced Practicum Coordinator until they have accepted an offer from an approved site.

During the advanced practicum, students are at their sites between 20-24 hours a week. Simultaneously, the students meet on campus for the advanced practicum seminar. The Advanced Practicum Coordinator, who serves as the major liaison between the site and the training program, visits the site in both fall and spring, meeting with supervisors and students to evaluate student progress in the development of clinical skills. As indicated earlier, program faculty provide supplemental supervision to Advanced Practicum students individually throughout the academic year on a bi-weekly basis. This provides students with opportunities to observe and interact with faculty concerning treatment issues and provides faculty with increased awareness of the clinical issues and settings encountered by students. The supervising faculty member also attends their students’ case presentations in the advanced practicum seminar as a way of facilitating communication between the seminar sessions and the faculty supervision process. (Please see Appendix I for copies of practicum evaluation forms, including a new form to be used during the 2006-07 academic year.) The relevant syllabi for the practicum seminars—PY 846.01/.02 are located in the Course Syllabi section. (Please note that all course syllabi are in numerical order by course number.)

Although the primary practicum experience occurs during the second year for MA admits (third year for direct admit students), students have a range of clinically related experiences across their training. This begins in their first year, when all of our first-year doctoral students become involved in the aforementioned First Year Experience (FYE) placement. As a means of structuring the FYE, faculty develop a list of approved first-year experience placements at the beginning of the academic year (see Appendix H3 for a list of the FYE sites). Students may make suggestions for other experiences that will be considered for their ability to meet criteria for the FYE. These include at least 3 of the following opportunities for the student: (1) exposure to the analysis of systemic factors impacting mental health, (2) experience in collaboration across professions, (3) collaboration, advocacy or indirect service with under-served populations, (4) the design, delivery and/or evaluation of a preventive intervention, and (5) exposure to expanded professional roles for counseling psychologists. All placements must be distinguishable from the typical practicum placement or research experience. A faculty member, or other designated supervisor who has appropriate training and experience relevant to the setting, supervises the FYE. The FYE, which exemplifies our program’s leadership with respect to the growing social justice agenda in counseling psychology, has been described in a well-cited article by Dr. Goodman and other program faculty in a 2004 issue of The Counseling Psychologist (see Appendix J for a copy of this article).

In addition to the First Year Experience and Advanced Pre-Internship Counseling Practicum, we encourage students to obtain additional clinical and assessment training during the third doctoral year as needed to meet their professional goals. Program supervision of training in the third year takes place in Advanced Counseling Practicum: Seminar in Practice, Supervision, and Consultation Seminar (PY 846.02). The instructor for this course (who is currently the Director of Training) contacts each site once per
semester via phone consultations; in person site visits are used on an as needed basis for students who are encountering some difficulties in their site. In all of the above experiences, the off-campus supervisors complete evaluations of the students, which are reviewed by the practicum seminar supervisors and then reviewed by the faculty in the annual student evaluation process. (See Appendix K for a copy of the evaluation form.)

If students are involved in clinical placements during their fourth year in the program or thereafter, students apply for approval of the site from the Director of Training. The Director of Training contacts the students’ supervisor once each semester by phone and obtains written evaluations of students from the sites.

B. Integration of Practicum Experiences with Didactic and Research Training.
The scientist-practitioner training model provides a clear framework for the integration of practicum experiences with the research and theoretical components of our program. We have designed each practicum experience on campus to provide the explicit means of integration and synthesis. As indicated earlier, students in the second year Advanced Practicum (third year for direct admit students) receive supplemental supervision from a faculty member in our program who typically focuses on a few specific cases in order to help students integrate theory and research into their case conceptualization and treatment implementation skills. In addition, the case reports that students present in their advanced practicum seminars require explicit theory and evidence-based treatment strategies.

Other exemplars of our commitment to integration take place in the comprehensive exams, which entail consistent interplay between practice and research. One of the three days of the exam is structured around a detailed case, which frames questions on ethics, counseling theory, and career development/psychology of working. In addition, students present a case in the oral portion of the comprehensive exam, which forms the basis for an evaluation of students’ conceptualization skills and also provides a means for the faculty to follow up on issues that may be unclear from the written portion of the exam.

C. Consistency of Practicum Experiences with Program Training Goals.
The practicum component of the doctoral program has been established in accordance with the training goals, objectives, and competencies that have been detailed previously in this section. The vast majority of the sites that we use for practicum serve clients who have been historically under-represented in mental health practice. In addition, the sequence of training experiences, which begins with the non-traditional field placement of the First-Year Experience, underscores our commitment to training counseling psychologists who will be committed to diverse practice and consultation roles, including, of course, psychotherapy and assessment. Furthermore, students are encouraged to have their practice inform their research, which is a key component of the scientist-practitioner training model. In this context, many of the sites that we use have active research and evaluation components, thereby reinforcing our commitment to the scientist-practitioner role. Students’ acquisition of assessment skills is also rooted in the program’s training
goals, which emphasize the integrative nature of assessment and treatment and which also highlight the cultural aspects of all assessment activities. Students generally integrate assessment into their case conceptualization, using formal diagnostic criteria and/or assessment tools. Students are also encouraged to consider the cultural framework of each client who is treated and assessed. Thus, the program’s goals and objectives are well-represented and carefully integrated into the sequence of practicum experiences in the program.

D. Sufficiency of Practicum Experiences for Pre-Doctoral Internships. At minimum, the doctoral program requires that students complete the second-year practicum (PY 846.01--Advanced Practicum), which requires a minimum of 400 hours in placement of which 150 hours are in direct service experience and at least 75 hours are in formally scheduled supervision. Students taking this Advanced Practicum must have completed the equivalent of an initial practicum, typically completed at the Master’s level, which also includes 400 hours of placement. The reality is that our students generally obtain more than 800 hours of practicum. Our success in having 93% of our students obtain APA-accredited internships on their first attempt (which is the case for all of our doctoral students during the 2000-2006 time frame) affirms the fact that our students are receiving sufficient practicum experiences in terms of quality, diversity, and quantity.

Ensuring Satisfactory Competence

Our program devotes considerable effort to ensuring that students attain satisfactory competence in their learning and training. The primary integrative mechanism for ensuring satisfactory competence is the annual student evaluation process. This process, which begins around April of each academic year, entails students completing a self-evaluation (see Appendix K for a copy of this form) that is then reviewed with the student’s advisor. A series of faculty meetings is then devoted to the annual student evaluations in May and early June, which involve discussions by the entire faculty about each student’s progress in a given year. Student grades, practicum evaluations, evaluations from assistantship assignments, and other pertinent observations are included in this process. The input is then recorded by the student’s advisor who meets with the student to review the impressions and observations of the faculty. The evaluation form is once again completed, this time by the faculty advisor, reflecting the collective input from the array of supervisors, instructors, and mentors who have worked with a given student that year. The student is then asked to sign this form as well as the advisor and the Director of Training. If students are not attaining competence in a given domain, the advisor and Director of Training develop a remedial plan designed to help the student attain the requisite competency level. The remedial plan is then monitored by the student’s advisor and Director of Training. The clear levels of competence that are necessary to move forward are detailed in writing to the student (summarized in the annual evaluation form) and in a conference including the advisor and Director of Training. Once competence has been obtained, the student is then notified in writing that the
remediation plan has been fulfilled. In effect, the annual student evaluation process is structured to infuse an intentional feedback loop into our training model that is consensual, empirically-based, and carefully rooted in the training goals of our program. The student evaluation process also informs the program’s training model in that patterns of student issues may reflect growth edges for our own evolution as a program.

One of the core elements that is reviewed in this process are student grades and practicum evaluations. In order for a student to move forward in the program, s/he needs to attain no grade lower than a B. The LSOE policies (see Appendix C) indicate that a student who receives a grade of "C" or "I" in two courses (six semester hours) or a grade of "F" in an elective course (three semester hours) may be reviewed by the Academic Standards Committee and put on academic probation. A subsequent grade of "C" or "F" in an elective course may be grounds for dismissal from the Lynch School. A grade of "F" in a required course is grounds for review by the Academic Standards Committee and possible dismissal from the Lynch School. In the practicum realm, students must receive satisfactory evaluations by their on-site supervisor and a passing grade in the practicum seminar.

In addition to grades and practicum evaluations, the comprehensive exams provide another mechanism to ensure student competence. This process, which is detailed in the doctoral handbook (see Appendix A, pages 15-20), entails an integrative assessment of student competency in the full array of skills and knowledge that are integral to our program’s training mission.

Students are also evaluated in their assistantship duties, which we view as integral to the training process. Because many of the assistantships involve research, teaching, and supervision, the roles and responsibilities parallel many of the skills that we seek to nurture in our training program. With the annual student evaluation process as the core mechanism, the program has numerous procedures in place that ensure consistent, timely, and feedback-rich processes that evaluate student competency and inform program assessment.

**Domain C: Program Resources**

Our Ph.D. program has extensive resources to achieve the goals and objectives specified in Domain B. Specifically, the program has a strong core faculty who are aided in meeting training goals by high-quality affiliate and adjunct faculty. The program recruits quality doctoral students who succeed in meeting the goals of the training program. Additionally, the program receives strong financial support from the University and Lynch School of Education in terms of clerical and technical support, funding for doctoral students, replacement of faculty lines upon retirements and transitions of faculty, and modern physical facilities. Finally, the practicum sites at which students train help meet the goals and objectives of our training program.
C1. Core Faculty

C1a. Function as a Unit. The core faculty in the Counseling Psychology Program currently consists of nine full-time, tenured or tenure-track faculty members (including three endowed chairs, effective January 2007 when Dr. Franklin arrives) who hold academic rank in the University and whose primary responsibilities are to the program. Of our current faculty, Drs. Blustein, Helms, Kenny, Mahalik, and Walsh are tenured as Full Professors; Drs. Goodman, Liang, and Sparks are tenured as Associate Professors; Dr. Nicolas is an Assistant Professor in the tenure track. We define the notion of “core faculty” in a manner that is consistent with the Committee on Accreditation Implementing Regulation C-18. Specifically, these faculty members devote at least 50% of their time over the course of each academic year in activities related to the doctoral program. (As indicated earlier, Dr. Franklin will join our core faculty in January 2007.) All of the aforementioned faculty supervise doctoral students as research assistants, supervise their clinical work in the second year advanced practicum, serve as dissertation chairs and readers on student committees, grade the comprehensive exams, and attend weekly program meetings and retreats related to doctoral program procedures and policies. These faculty are responsible as well for teaching the doctoral seminars and courses as well as in functioning as part of the program’s admissions processes. In addition, the core faculty are active researchers who work closely with doctoral students on scholarly investigations, publications and conference presentations. Decisions about which faculty function as core faculty are made by the Director of Training in consultation with the Chair of the Department.

Program responsibilities are shared by all faculty members, who meet weekly during the academic year to discuss administrative, curricular, professional, and student advisement and evaluation issues. In addition, the faculty meet at least once a year for a doctoral program retreat where broader issues are discussed related to the program’s goals, objectives, and competencies. The faculty retreat functions, to a great extent, as a feedback session wherein the Director of Training shares data and feedback collected over the year to the faculty, who then use this information to inform program changes. Decisions regarding curriculum development, course assignments, selection of doctoral applicants, program problems and changes are made by consensus of the faculty with the advice of the students when appropriate (see Domain E for details on student representation).

An important feature of the Boston College Counseling Psychology program is the commitment to function as a coherent unit. The faculty values consensual decision making about all aspects of program life, including admissions, assistantship and advising assignments, student evaluations, and curricular policies. As such, the weekly program meetings generally entail extensive discussion on relevant issues, with efforts made to include diverse perspectives in our collective decision making.

Individual faculty members also perform specific program tasks. The position of Department Chair, appointed by the Dean with consultation from the Department faculty, is currently held by Dr. Elizabeth Sparks. The Department Chair provides leadership and administrative support for the programs in the Counseling,
Developmental, and Educational Psychology department. She is also responsible for communication among the University Administration, the Lynch School of Education Administration, and the Department faculty.

The Director of Training is Dr. David Blustein who coordinates and supervises the doctoral program. The Director of Training provides leadership within the program, serves as a liaison with outside agencies (i.e., state licensing boards, Council of Counseling Psychology Training Program, the Committee on Accreditation, the American Psychological Association, and internship sites) and fulfills a liaison/consultative role in advocating for program needs. Within the program, the Director of Training works with the faculty to develop and implement a curriculum that fosters the training model and enhances the learning experiences of the students. The Director of Training is responsible for communicating the training model and curriculum/program needs to the Department Chair, informing the Chair of courses needed to fulfill program licensing and accreditation requirements and ensuring that those courses are offered and scheduled appropriately. The Director of Training fulfills a consultative/advocacy role in requests and decisions such as faculty course assignments and the awarding of student financial support. The Director of Training also assigns faculty advisors, organizes the admission of Ph.D. students, chairs the Counseling Psychology faculty weekly meetings and annual retreat sessions, approves doctoral programs of studies, organizes and reviews annual student evaluations, coordinates the development and administration of the Doctoral Comprehensive exams, reviews and revises descriptive printed material on the Counseling Psychology program, certifies student readiness for internship, is the principal representative of the views of the Counseling Psychology faculty to the rest of the Department, the Lynch School of Education and the University, and has administrative responsibility for the integrity of the Counseling Doctoral Program.

The Director of Training also coordinates pre-doctoral internships, which entails advising doctoral students throughout the internship application process, serving as a program liaison with internship sites, and is responsible for coordinating the evaluation of pre-doctoral interns. A non-curricular seminar is offered to students to assist with the application process during the year prior to placement.

The Field Coordinators of Advanced Practicum I and II are Drs. Mary Walsh and David Blustein, respectively. In these roles Drs. Walsh and Blustein advise students on the process of applying for and securing advanced practicum placements, evaluate and approve placement sites, serve as the program liaisons and complete site visits with advanced practicum sites, develop relationships with new sites that match the goals and objectives of the program, lead the Advanced Practicum Seminars in which students present cases and integrate theory, research and practice, and coordinate the evaluation of advanced practicum students.

C1b. Sufficient in Number. With 43 active students in our program as of August 28, 2006, we currently have a student-to-core faculty ratio of 4.8 to 1. Given that we average seven students in each new doctoral cohort, the program faculty size is sufficient to teach program courses, advise students, supervise dissertations, and meet the
administrative roles necessary for the successful implementation of program goals and objectives. The ways in which we assess whether we have sufficient numbers of faculty to support our students are as follows:

a. Our students are increasingly finishing their dissertations prior to their pre-doctoral internship.

b. Students and alumni report that they have sufficient access to faculty (as evidenced by our survey data; see Domain F and the data provided in Appendices L & M).

c. In addition, we generally maintain a policy in which a faculty member will take on no more than one new student each year.

In sum, given the aforementioned criteria, we believe that the current size and configuration of the faculty is consistent with our training model and with the doctoral education philosophy of Boston College (which emphasizes a similar focus on small incoming classes in conjunction with systematic and effective mentoring of students).

C1c. Perspectives and Experience. In many ways, the roles and responsibilities of the faculty of a doctoral program represent the prototypical exemplars of a training model. Our program emphasizes training psychologists in the scientist-practitioner model with a commitment to social justice, multiculturalism, and enhancing the lives of underserved populations. As such, we have given careful thought to how we manifest our professional identities in our work lives. One of the primary goals of our program is training psychologists who will be license-eligible; the current core faculty includes 7 individuals who are licensed in Massachusetts or in other states as health service provider psychologists. The faculty members represent a wide range of theoretical orientations including psychodynamic, cognitive-behavioral, interpersonal, feminist, and systems-based perspectives. These theoretical perspectives are consistent with our training model and are also congruent with prevailing paradigms in the local Boston community and in the national psychological community. In addition, the faculty have a strong commitment to social justice, multicultural work, and community-based interventions, which is evident in a variety of aspects of our collective and individual efforts. (Please see faculty vitae for evidence of congruence of faculty research interests and program goals and objectives.)

As reflected in their vitae, our core faculty has significant applied experiences. Specifically, the faculty have worked in community mental health centers, children’s psychological services, schools, family centers, independent practice, college counseling centers, day treatment centers, general hospitals, and psychiatric hospitals. Within these settings, faculty members have worked clinically with persons across the life-span and with persons of varying racial and ethnic backgrounds, disenfranchised social classes, genders, sexual orientations, and those differently-abled.

Currently, a number of faculty members are involved in direct service roles. For example, Dr. Sparks sees a variety of clients on a pro bono or sliding scale basis in her part-time independent practice. In addition she conducts psycho-educational process groups with incarcerated delinquent girls to enhance their relational connections and social skills. Dr. Walsh sits on student support teams who assess and plan interventions in
local schools; she also sees a number of clients in a small private practice. In addition, Dr. Liang has worked extensively in direct service roles, including psychotherapy, consultation, and testing for adolescents, adults, and couples in her part-time private practice. The rest of the core faculty have extensive and diverse clinical experiences and all work as supervisors of doctoral students in their advanced practicum. In addition, several faculty currently consult with agencies and institutions on issues pertaining to counseling and direct service delivery. In addition, the two non-core faculty members, Drs. Morse and Romano, have extensive experience in delivering psychological services in the Boston area. Furthermore, Drs. Koocher and Kulish (who teach our professional issues and biological bases courses, respectively), have considerable experience in their areas of expertise, which complement the skills of the core faculty. Dr. Koocher is a leading expert in forensic evaluations and ethical applications to practice. Dr. Kulish is a highly regarded neuropsychologist in the Boston area.

C1d. Competence. The faculty have demonstrated considerable competence related to the goals and objectives of our training model. Because our program has a strong community and social justice perspective, we have constructed a faculty composition that blends very well with our training mission. Five of the core faculty are trained in counseling psychology and four are trained in clinical psychology. Of the four faculty trained in clinical psychology, three were trained in programs that have strong community frameworks and one was trained in a program with a developmental-contextual orientation, thereby bringing important resources to the program’s capacity to meet its goals and objectives.

The research programs of the faculty also meld well with our training program’s mission. The faculty focus on issues pertaining to underserved populations and/or on issues that inform public policy with respect to pressing social issues in our society. As reflected in their vitae (see faculty CV for selected publications and professional presentations during the last seven years), faculty have published articles in the leading journals in counseling psychology (i.e., *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *The Counseling Psychologist*, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *Journal of Counseling and Development*) and other well-known scholarly journals (i.e., *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *American Psychologist*, *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *Journal of Black Psychology*, *Journal of Community Psychology*, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *Journal of Men’s Studies*, *Journal of Primary Prevention*, *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, *Sex Roles*, and *Professional School Counseling*), as well as authored numerous chapters related to their areas of expertise. In addition, several faculty have published books in recent years, including Dr. Kenny (*Learning to Serve: Promoting Civil Society through Service Learning*, published by Kluwer), Dr. Walsh (*Children, Health, and Learning*, published by Jossey-Bass), and Dr. Blustein (*The Psychology of*

An additional indicator of the quality of faculty research is their grant productivity. A number of faculty (Walsh, Goodman, Kenny, Liang, Nicolas, Blustein) have received external funding since the last site visit from both government (National Institute of Mental Health, U.S. Department of Education, National Science Foundation, National Institute of Justice, Boston Public Schools) and foundations (William T. Grant, New Balance Foundation, Barr Foundation, American Honda Foundation, Massachusetts Department of Education, DeWitt Wallace Readers’ Digest Foundation, Herman and Frieda L. Miller Foundation, Charles Hayden Foundation, Wellesley College Stone Center Empowering Children for Life Grant). These grants total over five million dollars since 2000 (i.e., our last site visit).

Other indicators of the quality of faculty scholarship and service to the profession include fellow status in APA and professional awards. A number of the faculty have been recognized as fellows in Division 17 (Blustein, Helms, Mahalik, and Kenny), Division 35 (Goodman), Division 45 (Helms), and Division 51 (Mahalik). Since the last site visit, several faculty members also have been recognized with individual awards. For example, Dr. Helms received the Distinguished Contributions to Education and Training Award by the American Psychological Association; Dr. Mahalik received the Researcher of the Year Award from the Society for the Psychological Study of Men and Masculinity of the American Psychological Association; Dr. Walsh received the Doctor of Science Honorary Degree from Clark University; and Dr. Blustein received the Outstanding Contribution Award from the Society of Counseling Psychology for an article that appeared in The Counseling Psychologist.

The faculty also has been professionally active providing service to the field. Specifically, Dr. Blustein has served as Associate Editor of The Counseling Psychologist. Dr. Helms currently serves as the Associate Editor for Journal of Counseling Psychology and Psychological Assessment. In addition, several faculty serve on the editorial boards on Journal of Counseling Psychology (Kenny, Mahalik), Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development (Helms), Journal of Vocational Behavior (Blustein), Journal of Career Assessment (Blustein), Journal of Psychological Assessment (Helms), Violence Against Women (Goodman), Psychology of Men and Masculinity (Mahalik), and the Journal of HIV/AIDS Prevention and Education for Children and Adolescents (Walsh).

C1e. Available as Role Models. The faculty seek to socialize students into the profession as scientist-practitioners through interactions as advisors, instructors, supervisors, dissertation mentors, and as collaborators on research (See Domains B and E). The faculty maintain extensive office hours, as required by the LSOE (usually well-beyond the 2 hours per three credit course requirement in the LSOE) and as reflected by their commitment to excellence in their work. Other means by which the faculty convey their availability as role models are via the use of regularly scheduled research team meetings, which include discussions of research, theory, practice, and public policy issues related to the scholarly agenda of the given team. Another means of manifesting faculty
availability as role models is in co-authored publications and presentations with students. Since the last site visit, 62% of our doctoral students co-authored publications with faculty, and 62% have co-presented with faculty at national conferences. Faculty also serve as role models through such training activities as the First Year Experience and secondary supervision during advanced practicum placements. Furthermore, all of our doctoral students serve as research assistants for at least two years with the core faculty, which provides a discernible means for student-faculty contact with clear opportunities for role modeling and mentoring.

Non-core Faculty. Our program also benefits from our adjunct and affiliate faculty members (see Table 3). Our adjunct and affiliate faculty members primarily contribute to the program through serving as course instructors and dissertation committee members. Our program colleagues includes faculty from CDEP (i.e., Drs. Hauser-Cram, Lerner, Lucariello, Levine-Coley, Lykes, Morse, Romano, and Vasilyeva), Educational Research and Measurement Evaluation (i.e., Drs. Ludlow, Pedulla, and Russell), Teacher Education (Dr. McQuillan), Psychology (i.e., Drs. Banuaizi), or psychologists from the greater Boston area (i.e., Drs. Kulish, Koocher). Criteria for membership in the affiliate and adjunct faculty are determined by the Chair and the Director of Doctoral Training. The affiliate and adjunct faculty need to be experts in their field, experienced instructors, and need to understand the Boston College Counseling Psychology training model. The Chair of the Department and/or Director of Training generally meet with affiliate and adjunct faculty periodically to review program issues and to discuss the relationship between the adjunct/affiliate course responsibilities and the training mission of the program. Vitae for affiliate and adjunct faculty are also found in the Faculty Vita section.

C2. Students

C2a. Number and Interactions. Every year the program admits between 6-8 doctoral students. We have found this number of students to be optimal in terms of providing close faculty contact and advising, and still of sufficient size to provide meaningful peer interaction, support within and across cohorts, and opportunities for socialization into the profession through experiences with faculty and other students (see Table 4 for description of student statistics, demographics and professional activities).

C2b. Student Interests, Aptitudes, and Prior Achievements. We strive to select a cohort of students each year who have interests that match the goals and mission of our program and possess a record of prior achievement and ability indicative of the potential to achieve our program objectives. Towards this end, multiple criteria are used in the selection process. We evaluate applicants’ record of achievement at the master’s and undergraduate level as predictors of academic achievement, creativity, and scholarly competence at the doctoral level. For MA admit students, applicants usually have experience working in the counselor role in at least a 400-hour counseling practicum. Success in that experience, including recommendations from prior faculty and site supervisors, is evaluated to assess the practitioner potential of our applicants. We evaluate successful performance in relevant courses along with previous research
experience, publications, presentations, and performance on the GRE exam to assess the research potential of applicants.

C2c. Development and Intended Career Paths. We assess applicants’ match with the program goals and mission through careful evaluation of their “Statement of Purpose” in their doctoral application. In addition, we also evaluate this match through letters of recommendation, and, finally for students who are finalists in the selection process, through on-campus interviews. Typically, the interviews focus on applicants’ previous experiences, current training, and future professional goals to assess match with the program goals at Boston College.

The objective of these selection efforts is to produce in each doctoral class a group of individuals with a range of diversity in terms of interests, cultural backgrounds characteristics, sexual orientation, and previous educational affiliations. Our success in selecting quality applicants who are a good match to the program’s goals is evident by the accomplishments of our students and graduates, which is discussed in Domain F.

In closing, the program faculty devote considerable time to ensuring that our selection and training of students meets our criteria, as detailed in Domain B. We have an elaborate and well-established admissions process that generally entails explicit attention to the student’s fit with the program mission. (Please see the text from the program’s webpage on admissions in Appendix D, for further details on how we present ourselves to the community.)

C3. Additional Resources

C3a. Financial Support for Training:

Student support. The program enjoys substantial financial support from the University. Each year, the Lynch School of Education makes available graduate assistantships and teaching fellowships. The program has a commitment to funding students throughout their first three years of training. After that period of time, students may be eligible for additional assistantships if positions exist in our program or within the broader Boston College community. Typically, most fourth year students have obtained funding in our program via external grants that the faculty have obtained, undergraduate teaching, or supervising Master’s seminars. All of these mechanisms of financial support typically carry full tuition remission with stipends that range from $14,000 to $16,000 per year. Awards are given for one year and students must reapply on an annual basis. The Director of Training organizes student applications for financial support; decisions about support are then made by the entire faculty who receive recommendations from the Director of Training and the Chair of the Department.

Students who are awarded a graduate assistantship or a teaching fellowship must be enrolled as full-time doctoral students and may not carry any incomplete coursework. Students accepting fellowships or assistantships may not accept any additional employment without prior consultation with and permission of the Director of Training, the Department Chairperson and the Associate Dean of Graduate Student Services of the Lynch School.
First-year and second-year doctoral students are generally awarded research assistantships. Second and third year students may apply for teaching fellowships and/or research assistantships. Graduate assistants usually work with a faculty member in the Counseling Psychology program. An award of a graduate assistantship carries the expectation that the student will be available for 10 or 20 hours a week of work (depending on the nature of the assistantship) from September 1 to May 31. Some additional assistantship funds are available for doctoral students to work during the summer months. The specific times students work are negotiated with the supervising faculty member so as not to conflict with any courses students may be taking. Typically, graduate assistants are involved in research activities such as library searches, literature reviews, data collection, data entry and analysis, manuscript preparation, report writing, often resulting in opportunities to collaborate on presentations and publications. In addition, assistants may be asked to help with classes faculty are teaching by grading exams, keeping records, photocopying, helping with library research for classes, and other tasks.

Graduate students may apply to teach Master’s level counseling practicum and internship seminars, and undergraduate human development courses. Teaching fellowship awards carry the expectation that fellows will plan class meetings, conduct classes, meet with site supervisors and evaluate students, keep regular office hours, and participate in the University evaluation process.

The University also has 6 Diversity Fellowships available each year for incoming doctoral students from across the campus. These Fellowships provide 5 years of support with a stipend of $18,500 (for the 2006-07 year) and tuition reimbursement of up to 24 credits per year. Students who receive this award are not specifically required to work as a graduate assistant within our program, although most diversity fellows do contribute about 10 hours per week to a faculty member’s research team. Our program has been highly competitive in obtaining these awards as reflected by the fact that we have been able to fund 6 students of color with this prestigious award since 2000.

Faculty support. Boston College has a number of internal programs that are designed to provide financial support for faculty. The faculty research grants program provides internal grants for research, including one semester research fellowships, research incentive grants and research expense grants for research and teaching projects. These grant monies are competitive; however, the strength of our faculty has resulted in successful applications for a number of our faculty. Additionally, the Office of Sponsored Programs and/or the Development Office have been instrumental in helping to locate funding sources and prepare grant proposals for federal, state, and foundation grants.

In addition, a number of program faculty are involved in the Center for Study of Testing Evaluation and Educational Policy (CSTEEP) and the Center for Child, Family, and Community Partnerships (CCFCP); both of these Centers provide infrastructure support on grants and provide a forum for some faculty to discuss research ideas, methodology, and grant-seeking strategies.
The University also provides travel money for faculty to attend conferences. Priority is given to faculty who present at national conferences or who are officers of national organizations. Students typically receive funding for travel to conferences and for travel related to their assistantships from the Graduate Education Association. Finally, our University offers a generous faculty sabbatical policy. Faculty are eligible for sabbaticals every seven years, which entails one semester off with full pay and two semesters off with 50% of one’s salary. (Two sabbaticals providing 80% of one’s salary are available every three years to LSOE faculty. The decision about the recipients of these sabbaticals is made by a faculty-elected awards committee.)

C3b. Clerical and Technical Support. The Department in which the program is housed has two full-time clerical staff members. The staff provides a variety of support services including data base management, copying, word processing, and note taking for meetings. In addition, Dr. Helms has full-time support to staff the Institute for the Study and Promotion of Race and Culture (ISPRC). We also receive considerable technical support from two technology consultants who serve the faculty, staff, and students of the Lynch School.

The faculty offices are also well supported with updated computers and access to printers and scanners. The computers are generally replaced every three years. In addition, we have been able to obtain computers for the graduate student offices, which have enabled students to link to the internet and to maximize their productivity on campus.

C3c. Training Materials and Equipment. The Department and the University provide extensive materials and resources that serve to facilitate student learning in research and practice as well as faculty research. Within the Department administrative office (Campion 309), a number of updated reference books are available for students to explore internship sites (APPIC publications), examine Massachusetts mental health law, as well as other resources that enhance student and faculty communication (e.g., APA Directories). In addition to a small video collection maintained by the Department, films/videos/DVDs are available through the University library system. In conjunction with the 1991 renovation of Campion Hall, a new and expanded Educational Resource Center (ERC) was built. The ERC is a unit of the Boston College library system and employs two full-time professional librarians and several staff. The ERC houses many of the program’s educational and psychological tests and related publications. Test materials for courses are provided either in our main administrative office or in the ERC. Tape recorders, digital recorders, and video monitors are maintained by the University’s Audio-Visual office, which are used in clinical supervision sessions and practicum seminars. Finally, Campion Hall has three “smart” classrooms, which contain state-of-the-art technical support for web-based and computer-rich instruction and training.

C3d. Physical Facilities. The Boston College library system is a multi-facility complex with a collection of 2,124,242 printed books and 52,338 electronic and print
serials, including outstanding collections in psychology, counseling, and related fields. In addition, the library offers extensive databases that facilitate faculty and student research. Cooperative agreements with other academic and research libraries in the Boston area effectively expand the Libraries’ resources by over 20 million volumes.

The Thomas P. O’Neill Library, the main Boston College library, offers a wealth of resources and services that support teaching and research activities, including a computer center and media center. One may search the Boston College Libraries’ online catalog, Quest, and other library information sources, which include extensive on-line and print resources. Furthermore, the University has a considerable number of journals available on line, which has had a positive impact on research and teaching in our program. In addition to the normal reference and instructional services provided at the University, a departmental account is available to support faculty photocopying. There is a full time reference librarian/bibliographer at O’Neill Library who serves the LSOE. The Boston College faculty and graduate students, through the Boston Library Consortium, have access and borrowing privileges at 15 other area university libraries.

Regarding computer hardware, Boston College faculty members are provided their choice of either a Macintosh or Dell personal computer. The secretarial stations are also equipped with Dell personal computers. Microcomputers (in computer stations in O’Neill Library, the ERC and Fulton Hall) are available to students and faculty without charge. The faculty receives upgrades on computer hardware and recent versions of software on a regular basis.

The University also participates in a consortium arrangement that enables graduate students to cross-register for graduate courses at Boston University, Brandeis University, or Tufts University. This arrangement enables students to enroll in courses not available in our curriculum that will enhance their knowledge in specialty areas. In addition, the University participates in the Boston Graduate Women’s Studies Consortium.

C3e. Student support services. The doctoral handbook and the Boston College course catalog highlight a number of resources for doctoral students (see Appendices A and B). These resources include Audio Visual Services; the Career Center; Computing and Communications Resources who provide computing resources for doctoral students whether they are on campus or are networked from home; Counseling Services; Financial Aid; Graduate AHANA who develop, implement and coordinate a variety of programs that support and enhance the academic performance of graduate African-American, Hispanic, Asian and Native American students; the Graduate Education Association who plan educational and social events in addition to supporting student travel; the Graduate International Student Association who provide a forum for students to share different aspects of their cultures with fellow students and create greater multicultural awareness within the BC community; the Graduate Student Association who provide many services, activities, and events that meet the academic, social, and personal needs of graduate students at Boston College; Health Services; the Housing Office; the Connors Family Learning Center, the John Courtney Murray, S.J., Graduate Center at Murray House that
serves as the center of the graduate student activity and community at Boston College; the Office of Research Administration; University Chaplaincy; and University Libraries. (Please see Appendix N for the listing of services available via the University’s webpage.)

C3f. Training Sites and Facilities

Practicum Sites. The Greater Boston area has many well-known and diverse mental health and educational agencies that provide Advanced Practicum sites for our students. Dr. Walsh has been the liaison person with the practicum placements and has effectively developed new sites while continually evaluating the quality of existing sites. Although many cooperating sites have provided placements for our students over a number of years, the sites accept practicum applications from students enrolled in a variety of psychology graduate training programs in the Boston area and are unwilling to commit their openings to any single training program. Thus, although our students benefit from the variety of possible placement sites in the Boston area, they also have to compete with many students for available practicum slots. This competition notwithstanding, our students obtain placements that are consistent with their training needs and career goals at some of the most competitive sites in the city (see Table 2 for listing of placements since our last site visit).

To ensure that the program maintains quality control over the practicum experiences of our doctoral students, we have formulated an approved listing of possible placements that is updated each year and meets the APA criteria for appropriate placements (see Appendix H for those criteria).

Additionally, the program institutes a training contract with practicum sites that specifies students’ duties, dates of service, hours, frequency of supervision, credentials of supervisors, and compensation when appropriate. Students’ professional liability coverage is through the University Liability Policy.

Internship Sites. After satisfactory completion of the Doctoral Comprehensive Examination, the program requires that students complete a pre-doctoral internship prior to graduation. The internship must be APA/CoA-accredited or its equivalent, total 2000 hours in the course of a full or academic-year full-time experience as specific to the site (or a two-year half-time experience), and provide applied experiences, appropriate supervision, regularly scheduled professional education, and an adequate number of professional and training personnel.

Although each student chooses sites to apply to and rank orders them for the matching process based on a personal assessment of training needs and goals, students have a number of resources available to help in the selection and ranking of sites. As discussed earlier, the Director of Training advises doctoral students throughout the internship application process, serves as a program liaison with internship sites, and is responsible for coordinating the evaluation of pre-doctoral interns. Also, each student makes his or her decision in consultation with the advisor, the Director of Training, other faculty, and supervisors.
C4. This item is not applicable to our program as our program is a single administrative entity in the Lynch School of Education.

**Domain D: Cultural and Individual Differences and Diversity**

**D1. Attracting and Retaining Students and Faculty.** Our efforts to attract and retain a diverse faculty and student body emerge from our program’s mission to train counseling psychologists who work with under-served persons of varying racial or ethnic backgrounds, disenfranchised populations, genders, and sexual orientations. With regards to faculty, this commitment has been demonstrated through our recruiting leading ethnic-minority psychologists to apply for tenure-track or tenured positions in the department. We have used personal contacts with colleagues from other academic institutions as well as mainstream media such as the APA Monitor to place advertisements for faculty positions, emphasizing that we encourage applications from minority candidates, and advertised in publications that are frequently accessed by psychologists of color (e.g., *Black Issues in Higher Education*).

The program has been successful over the last 15 years in hiring and retaining five ethnic-minority psychologists in tenured or tenure-track faculty positions. Dr. Elizabeth Sparks was hired in 1992 as an Assistant Professor level, was promoted to Associate Professor with tenure in 1997, and now serves as our Department Chair. Dr. Janet Helms was hired as a Full Professor with tenure and directs the Institute for the Study and Promotion of Race and Culture housed in the Lynch School. Dr. Belle Liang was hired in 2001 at the Assistant Professor level and was promoted to Associate Professor with tenure in 2006. Dr. Guerda Nicolas was hired at the Assistant Professor level in 2003 and was awarded the Lynch School Faculty Fellowship for Fall 2006. In addition, Dr. A.J. Franklin will join our faculty in the Spring 2007 as the Honorable David S. Nelson Professional Chair in Education. We should note that Dr. Etiony Aldarondo left the Lynch School in June of 2003 to follow his wife to the University of Miami, where both secured tenure-track positions; he maintains close connections with our program faculty and has taught on occasion during the summers when visiting Boston.

We believe that several factors account for our success in recruitment and retention of faculty of color. First, our program publicly values research and training related to minority and marginalized populations typically underserved by society and psychology. Second, the University supports this type of applied research in the provision of resources, such as through the Research Incentive Grant program and the Collaborative Fellows program. We believe another reason for our success in retaining junior faculty of color is that senior faculty mentors guide them within the University system and support their scholarly development.

We also have succeeded in recruiting a considerable number of students of color into our doctoral program. We select students who share our concerns about marginalized individuals in society, and have demonstrated this concern in their previous research and clinical activities. Among the 49 students who have matriculated to the program during
the last seven-year period, 28 (i.e., 43%) are students of color. In addition to efforts by the Admissions Office to increase applications from students of color, we attribute our success in recruiting and retaining students of color to: (1) the ethnic diversity of the faculty; (2) the training opportunities that result from the research interests of faculty and their commitment to working with marginalized urban populations; (3) the training opportunities that exist in the city of Boston to work with persons of color in urban settings, and (4) the availability of funds to support the training of doctoral students of color at Boston College.

To ensure that the program is able to recruit and retain a diverse student body, we have been careful to avoid any actions that would restrict program access on the basis of financial resources. During the past seven-year period, we have secured funding for every student seeking financial assistance through the third year of training. Specific to the recruitment and retention of minority students, we have also been awarded six University Diversity Fellowships since 2000. (Details on this award have been provided in Domain C3.) Thus, with the support of the University, our program has been successful in providing a solid level of financial assistance for all students, and have been successful in obtaining a large number of Diversity Fellowships for students of color.

**D2. Education on Diversity Issues.** Our efforts to educate students about diversity issues and their relationship to the practice of professional psychology are integrated throughout students’ doctoral training. In addition to taking a course devoted to multicultural issues (PY 548) as a broad based exposure to multiculturalism, all students take an intensive doctoral course PY 915 (Critical Perspectives on the Psychology of Race, Class, and Gender), typically taught by Dr. Janet Helms. In the course, students are introduced to multiple strategies for thinking culturally about select psychological constructs and processes (for example, the self, family and community relations, and socio-political oppression).

Diversity material is also infused into much of our coursework and practicum training. During their first year in our program, students are engaged in the FYE, which is designed to expose them to professional practice in non-traditional settings. The goal of this activity is to place students in sites where they are involved in expanded roles for psychologists (e.g., advocacy, program implementation). For the most part, these sites provide intervention or prevention services to individuals living in low-income situations and/or individuals of color.

This FYE is followed by other practicum-level clinical experiences, which are described in further detail in Domain B. In terms of their relevance for educating students about diversity issues, we encourage students to have at least one clinical experience prior to the pre-doctoral internship in which they work with low-income clients in a community context (see Domain F for evidence of students’ work with under-served populations).

The program evaluates students’ competency to practice with individuals from diverse cultures through their performance in practicum placements. We rely on the supervisors’ evaluations of the students’ clinical work and on their presentations of this
work in the practicum seminars to determine the students’ level of competence to practice with diverse individuals.

In terms of the curriculum, most courses taught in our program addresses culture and race as key contextual elements of the human experience (see course syllabi, particularly including PY 528, PY 843, PY 844, PY 915). By using specific courses on diversity coupled with the infusion model, we believe our curriculum presents optimal exposure to the central role of diversity in counseling psychology.

The commitment to diversity is clearly demonstrated in faculty and students’ research. Addressing critical social issues such as race, culture, poverty, gender, and sexual orientation in our programmatic research, faculty provide national and international leadership in the academic community contributing to new knowledge and public policy. Many of our program faculty are recognized as pioneers in the diversity community and nationally recognized scholars in addressing socio-contextual issues related to race, culture, poverty, gender, and sexual orientation.

A notable exemplar of national success in diversity research and training is the work of the Institute for the Study and Promotion of Race and Culture (ISPRC), which is housed in the LSOE and is directed by two program faculty (Drs. Janet Helms and Guerda Nicolas). ISPRC has been very active in providing leadership to the psychological and educational communities on a host of issues related to diversity. An annual conference, entitled the Diversity Challenge, characterizes the broad outreach efforts of ISPRC. Further initiatives include an annual summer training program on race and culture as well as research efforts both in the US and abroad. In addition, ISPRC supports a staff of 18, including students, faculty, and administrators, and functions as the focal point for diversity research and advocacy at Boston College and in the broader national psychological community. Illustrative materials developed by ISPRC, including a program from a Diversity Challenge conference, call for papers, and information on this past summer’s training session can be found in Appendix O.

Students also are active in the program’s research efforts addressing diversity. As an example, 67% of our students’ dissertation projects during the past 7 years focused on diversity issues (primarily pertaining to racial/ethnic minority issues and gender issues).

The program’s commitment to diversity is also demonstrated by faculty and students’ engagement in openly exploring program diversity issues in several contexts. For example, in recent years, the program has engaged in a systematic effort to study its own diversity climate and to create processes for continued dialogue. During the 2004-05 academic year, the program held town hall meetings several times a semester to discuss the diversity climate. One of the outcomes of these meetings culminated in a conjoint letter written to the University President advocating for a more affirming climate on campus with respect to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered (LGBT) issues. The town hall meetings also focused extensively on the power dynamics in the program related to race and culture. The meetings have recently led to a full-scale diversity climate study, which is currently underway. The diversity climate study has been facilitated by a steering committee including doctoral student representatives, selected faculty, the Director of Training, a member of the University’s Office of Institutional Diversity, and a
member of the University’s Office of Institutional Research. The findings from this study, which used focus groups with faculty and students during the spring 2006 semester, will be made available to our program community early in the fall 2006 semester. (Please see Appendix P for the questions used in these focus groups.) These findings will then inform the next level of diversity training for our program. In short, our faculty and students all share in the assumption that one’s growth with respect to diversity is a lifelong process; hence, both faculty and students are actively engaged in these processes as fully involved participants.

**Assessing Competence in Diversity Education.** Students are evaluated with respect to their development of an internalized level of self-awareness and knowledge about race and culture via multiple means. In each course that reviews diversity issues, students are provided with feedback about their ability to explore themselves, their socio-cultural context, their emerging knowledge, and their professional and personal relationships. Student competence in the knowledge of the role of race and culture are therefore assessed via courses, practicum experiences, and in the comprehensive exam. Assessing self-awareness, while more challenging, is discerned in the specific diversity courses in our curriculum (PY 548 and PY 915) as well as in practicum seminars and other supervisory relationships that provide a climate for the exploration of one’s racial identity. Furthermore, students are assessed in relation to diversity during the annual evaluation process.

**Domain E: Student-Faculty Relations**

**E1. Student Rights and Collegiality.** The program’s education, training, and socialization experiences are characterized by mutual respect and courtesy between students and faculty. To make students aware of their rights to be treated with mutual respect and collegiality, students are provided with copies of the APA “Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct” (2002) and the Doctoral Handbook in the summer prior to their first year in the program. Student rights and privileges are detailed in the doctoral handbook (see pages 10-13 of Appendix A) and are discussed in the initial set of cohort meetings.

The University Bulletin documents contain information on discrimination (see page 16 of Appendix B). Additionally, the Doctoral Handbook for the Lynch School of Education (LSOE) (http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/policies/) contains a web-link to the Lynch School of Education Grievance Procedure (http://www.bc.edu/schools/lsoe/academics/policies/#grievance). (The current grievance policy is found in Appendix E.)

To provide students with resources for help regarding experiences of harassment, the University provides a harassment counselor (i.e., Mary Ellen Fulton, Associate Dean for Finance, Research, and Administration of the Lynch School of Education), who is easily accessible and is housed in Campion Hall (the home of the counseling psychology program).
For matters that stand outside of the current grievance or harassment procedures, a variety of informal mechanisms are available, including meeting with the faculty advisor, the Director of Training, the Department Chair, student representatives to faculty meetings, or the Associate Dean or Dean for the LSOE. Also, students are able to discuss issues of concern to them at counseling psychology Town Hall meetings. As indicated in Domain D, the Town Hall meeting format has been used in recent years as a means of exploring the diversity climate in the program. In addition, the doctoral students in the Counseling Psychology program have developed a student organization to provide a forum for discussion of individual and group issues with the intent of providing information, support, and initiating change. The organization provides a mechanism through which students can discuss their concerns and communicate these to the faculty, through student representatives, on a regular basis.

A student representative from each cohort is invited to program meetings, faculty retreats, and to other policy-based functions (such as our recent competencies retreat). The faculty strongly espouse a model of doctoral education that ensures that students are treated with respect, courtesy, and dignity throughout all of their interactions in our program.

In sum, students are made aware of their rights, privileges, and related policies (such as the grievance policy) in the doctoral student orientation and in their initial cohort meetings with the Director of Training. In addition, students continue to learn about their rights and responsibilities in the PY840 course (Professional Issues in Counseling Psychology) as well as in other courses throughout their doctoral training. Furthermore, the Director of Training holds meetings with each cohort at least once a semester, which often focus on student policies and rights. As such, the program uses multiple methods to disseminate information about student rights, encompassing written modalities, web-based information, informal meetings, and formal class contacts.

E2. Advisement and Mentoring. The faculty strives to be accessible to students and to provide them with guidance and supervision throughout the program. At the time of entry into the program, each student is assigned an academic advisor who assists with the completion of the program of studies, furnishes students with feedback as part of the annual review process, and is available to meet with the student whenever needed. The assignment of faculty advisor is generally made with the intention of pairing individuals with similar research agendas. Typically, all first-year students are assigned to work with their academic advisor or another faculty in the Department as a research assistant. This provides the student with an important opportunity for guidance and mentoring. Increasing numbers of faculty-student presentations at professional conferences and publication of journal manuscripts are evidence of the growing success of the research assistant/mentoring process. As discussed in Domain B, faculty members are also accessible to students as clinical supervisors during the initial Advanced Practicum.

A student and faculty listserv also provides a means for sharing of information and notices, such as professional development issues and opportunities, community and school activities, and other program issues. Additionally, student representatives attend
faculty meetings to facilitate an exchange of information and access student input on pertinent issues. As detailed in the survey data (see Appendices L & M), our students and alumni report that they have enjoyed considerable access to program faculty throughout their years at Boston College.

E3. Respect for Cultural and Individual Diversity. As discussed previously, the program strives to show respect for cultural and individual diversity among students and follows APA guidelines on respect for diversity. Indeed, the commitment to the rich complexity of our diverse society forms one of the central cornerstones for the program. The research agendas of the faculty and the composition of the faculty illustrate a program commitment to cultural and individual diversity. Furthermore, our recruitment of a diverse student body underscores our commitment and respect for diversity. Multiple criteria, including academic and community achievements that demonstrate an interest and ability to make a professional contribution in work with underserved populations, are taken into consideration in the admissions process (see Domain D for further specification of our efforts to enhance diversity in our training). In addition, we have implemented a number of other resources that manifest our commitment to respecting and affirming diversity, including the Town Hall meeting format and the diversity climate study, each of which was discussed in depth in Domain D.

E4. Program Expectations and Remediation Strategies. The Counseling Psychology Doctoral Student handbook, which is distributed prior to students arriving on campus (and is available online) and the University Bulletin, provide students with written policies and procedures regarding program and institution requirements concerning student performance, evaluation, academic standards, leaves of absence, continuation in the program, and termination. Students review the handbook in their first year during a series of cohort meetings with the Director of Training. At the end of that process, they sign an attestation indicating that they understand the policies and procedures detailed in the Handbook.

Students are encouraged to meet with their academic advisor periodically to develop and revise individual professional development plans for the development of competencies in research, counseling and the integration of science and practice. Faculty advisors also meet with students prior to completion of the Annual Student Evaluation to elicit an evaluation of their own progress in the program and involvement in professional activities. The student evaluation process begins in April of each year, when students are asked to complete a self-assessment, which forms the essence of a conversation that they have with their advisor. The self-assessment form is actually our evaluation form (as found in Appendix K), and provides extensive indices of student performance across the full scope of doctoral student life. As indicated earlier, the annual student evaluation process forms the cornerstone of our feedback and remediation system. Practicum evaluations from field supervisors also inform faculty discussions in the completion of the annual review. The faculty advisor discusses the written feedback with the student following the annual review. If there are problems or concerns related to the student’s
progress in the program identified through the evaluation, the faculty suggests courses of action aimed to address any of the issues related to the student’s successful completion of the program. These actions might include additional coursework, remedial clinical or research experiences, or recommendations that the student pursue his or her own counseling. (The precise format of our annual evaluation process is documented earlier in this report in Domain B, in the section entitled, Ensuring Satisfactory Competence—see page 13).

Oral and written comprehensive exams are another important component of the student evaluation process (see the doctoral handbook in Appendix A, which details the comprehensive examination and the feedback that results from the examination, pages 15-19). Students receive written notification of the results of comprehensives and a written notification of a plan for remediation, if necessary.

E5. Student Grievances. There have been no formal complaints lodged against the program during this self-study period.

Domain F: Program Self-Assessment and Quality Enhancement

Evaluation Overview

Consistent with the emerging trends in professional psychology, our program has been devoting considerable time and effort to formal, systematic, and long-term self-assessment and quality enhancement. Our program employs a variety of assessment tools and strategies to capture the full range and depth of both proximal and distal program outcomes. For the purposes of this report, we distinguish between attitudinal measures (as exemplified by the student and alumni survey and open-ended questions) and various behavioral and knowledge outcomes, thereby allowing for a comprehensive state-of-the-art approach to evaluation. Moreover, we have developed a systematic feedback process in which the data are reviewed and are used to inform decisions about quality enhancement. Based on the guidelines from the Committee on Accreditation (CoA) and related professional associations (CCPTP, Society of Counseling Psychology, APPIC, and APA), we are continually upgrading our evaluation processes, as summarized in the following sections. The evaluation processes that we have employed since our last accreditation have been consistent, multimodal, and have been critical in informing program decisions.

We have had annual retreats each June (in addition to weekly program meetings) consistently since our last accreditation to review program issues, discuss self-assessment issues, and to examine evaluation data in light of program goals and objectives. Moreover, the University’s Office of Institutional Research, in conjunction with the Director of Training, are implementing a systematic and consistent survey process (at a minimum of
every 3 years) with both current students and recent alumni to assess how well our program is fulfilling its goals, objectives, and competencies.

The primary assumptions of our evaluation and quality enhancement efforts are based on the use of multiple methods and multiple sources of data to organize our observations of program effectiveness. The multiple sources of feedback are then reviewed in program meetings and retreats, with the faculty exploring the data for common themes and issues that merit attention. This iterative process has been instrumental in the past 6 years in making numerous important changes in our program, such as revising our comprehensive exam process, developing a diversity self-study, revising the admissions process, defining program competencies, exploring student office space issues, refining faculty searches, and designing curricular modifications.

Sources of Information

We use a number of attitudinal and behavioral/knowledge sources to produce information for program assessment. These sources of information are detailed in Appendix Q. To summarize, we employ both attitudinal and behavioral/knowledge dimensions to capture a rich and informative set of possible outcomes.

A key component of the attitudinal outcomes is the survey that we have developed for both students and alumni. This survey was constructed similar to the one used in our most recent self-study process and was developed to capture the extent to which student and alumni report that they have fulfilled the goals and objectives of the program. The survey employs both Likert-type scales as well as open-ended questions. Copies of the surveys and the results (both quantitative and qualitative) are summarized in Appendices L and M.

The behavioral and knowledge dimensions of our outcome assessment were constructed based on the analysis of goals, objectives, and competencies detailed in Domain B (see page 3). The array of behavioral and knowledge outcomes is extensive and carefully constructed in accordance with the thematic nature of each of the given goals, objectives, and competencies.

In the first part of Domain F1 (F1a), we review our self-assessment procedures and describe the sources of information we use to evaluate our effectiveness in meeting our training goals, objectives, and competencies. In the second part of Domain F1 (F1b), we present material that describes how our goals and objectives are met through graduate education and professional training. In the third section of Domain F1 (F1c), we summarize the procedures used to maintain current achievements or to make program changes as necessary.

F1a & b: Self-Assessment Outcomes. As the data we present here indicate, our program is quite effective in meeting its goals and objectives. In this section, we review the most salient findings that provide evidence to support the position that our program is fulfilling its training mission. For a detailed overview of the self-assessment process and outcomes, please see Table 12 (former Table 10 from the previous self-study format guidelines, found on page 83). (To conserve space, we have used an abridged version of
our goals and objectives in this section; the full scope of the program goals, objectives and competencies are provided in Domain B and in Table 12. Consistent with the intention of maintaining brevity in the narrative, much of the empirical data supporting the self-assessment outcome analysis is provided in Table 12 and in Appendices L & M.)

Outcomes

Goal 1: Foundational knowledge essential for the scientific and professional practice of Counseling Psychology

Objective 1.1: Students will have knowledge of the theoretical and scientific foundations of Counseling Psychology. (Please see Domain B and Table 12 for the competencies.)

Summary of outcome data. The behavioral outcomes, as reflected by students’ performance in relevant courses, comprehensive exams, and licensing exam, all underscore students’ accomplishments in this area. Furthermore, the self-report attitudinal data are particularly compelling, with student means on relevant items ranging between “well” and “very well” (between 4 and 5 on a 5-point Likert scale) in response to items that ask respondents to indicate their views of how well the program prepared them to handle specific tasks. One of the indices of the high quality of our pedagogical and training efforts within this set of competencies is reflected in the impressive proportion of students (who have matriculated since 2000) who have presented papers at national conference (75%) and who have published journal articles or book chapters (67%). Another index of competence in this domain is the aggregate performance of Boston College graduates on the national psychology licensing exam. During the period of 1997-2005, our graduates had a mean score of 149.8, which is above the criterion-referenced passing score recommended by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB).

Objective 1.2: Students will have foundational knowledge of the professional practice of Counseling Psychology (including ethical principles) in research and practice.

Summary of outcome data: Student performance in relevant classes and in their practicum all point to considerable competency development in this realm of our training. The high proportion of our graduates who are moving into licensure and post-graduate employment as psychologists affirms the effectiveness of our training experiences in this domain. For example, 79% of our graduates who have graduated during the time period of 1999-2004 are now licensed in their state or province to practice psychology. The self-report data, as reported on the relevant student and alumni survey items, all point to the attainment of the aforementioned competencies.
Objective 1.3: Students will have attitudes essential for life long learning, scholarly inquiry, and professional problem solving as psychologists.

Summary of outcome data: The data available to support inferences about the effectiveness of training efforts designed to foster attitudes essential for life long learning, scholarly inquiry, and professional problem-solving are informative and affirming. For example, the program has developed a number of new initiatives designed to foster ongoing interest in research, scholarly inquiry, and life long learning. The use of the first-year presentation (for students to present their First-Year Experience) and the second-year presentation (for students to present an independent research study) serves to give students skills and performance accomplishments that are likely to enhance self-efficacy in these important domains. In addition, the current students are demonstrating considerable activity in the design and presentation of research and other scholarly contributions at conferences and in journals. One of the most important criteria to assess the program’s effectiveness in promoting lifelong learning is in the assessment of alumni behavior and knowledge. As reflected in Tables 9 and 12 (pages 74 and 83), our graduates are demonstrating a clearly evident commitment to continuing education, post-graduate training, and scholarly productivity. The attitudinal data, from both students and alumni, converge with the behavioral and knowledge-based results, affirming that the respondents believe that they are obtaining the requisite attitudes needed to support a lifelong commitment to learning and professional growth. (For both students and alumni, the responses on the relevant item assessing this set of attitudes were close to 5 on a 1-5 Likert scale, reflecting consistent endorsement of the program’s capacity to nurture lifelong learning; see Appendices L & M).

Goal 2: The ability to implement the scientist-practitioner model within the arenas of both research and clinical practice.

Objective 2.1: Students will have knowledge of research methodology to examine clinical, theoretical and societal questions.

Summary of outcome data: The available data convey a picture of students and alumni internalizing the scientific aspect of their professional identity, which are manifested in a number of ways. From the behavioral and knowledge standpoints, the data indicate that students and alumni are learning research skills, as reflected in high grades in their coursework and in the consistently high performance that students attain on their comprehensive exams and licensing exam. A relatively recent development in our program is that doctoral students are now serving as research assistants for at least two years, which represents a more sustained apprenticeship than our program had prior to the last self-study. Furthermore, students are now responsible for preparing two research projects prior to their dissertation research, which provide students with valuable opportunities to conduct their own research, in a closely supervised context, and then present their findings to their classmates (in the first year of the program) and to the
entire doctoral program community of faculty and students at the end of their second year. Many of these projects have served as the framework for students’ dissertations; moreover, some students have presented and published manuscripts derived from these requirements in our curriculum. From an attitudinal perspective, both students and alumni have reported relatively affirming views of the program’s capacity to provide sound training in research methodology needed to function as a competent scientist-practitioner (See Table 12, page 83 and Appendices L & M, for further details).

Objective 2.2: Students will have knowledge to evaluate psychological research, learn to incorporate psychological research into practice, and know about relevant practice issues to inform programs of research.

Summary of outcome data: The evaluation of this objective and competency seeks to assess how well the program provides instruction, training, mentorship, and supervision in the integration of science and practice. As reflected in Table 12 (see page 83), our students have demonstrated high pass rates in the comprehensive exams, which are structured to assess students’ synthesis of research and practice. In addition, practicum supervisors rate our students highly on rating scales that pertain to the integration of theory and practice. Furthermore, a review of student publications reveals that many of the issues that students explore in their research are located at the intersection of research and practice. A review of the alumni survey also revealed that our graduates are implementing the scientist-practitioner role in their work, as further reflected in Table 9 (see page 74). For example, several of our graduates have been successful in authoring journal articles and books. Moreover, they are clearly engaged in employment activities that reflect the mission of our program. The attitudinal data, detailed in Appendix L and M, also support the efficacy of our training efforts in this realm in that the responses to the relevant survey items were quite high for both students and alumni.

Objective 2.3: Students will have developmentally appropriate skills in counseling psychology practice and advocacy, including the design and implementation of psychological interventions at the individual, group, and systemic levels.

Summary of outcome data: In comparison to our previous self-study report, our program has continued to expand its focus on underserved populations and on the development of student skills in social advocacy, consultation, and program development. Our ongoing assessment of these skills has yielded promising results. Student performances in practicum placements have been consistently high throughout the past 7 years. In addition, our students have been highly competitive in obtaining prestigious practicum placements and equally prestigious internship placements. Students have demonstrated competency in their courses and practicum seminars, as reflected by student grades and evaluations by faculty supervisors and instructors. Students also have
performed well, as evidenced in the annual evaluations by faculty, in their placements in such program initiatives as Tools for Tomorrow, Boston Connects, and the various ISPRC activities, each of which involves outreach, social advocacy, and program development. The fact that all of our students are involved in social advocacy roles at some point in the program affirms the effectiveness of our training model in implementing this critical component of our program’s training mission. In addition to these knowledge and behavioral outcomes, students and alumni reported high levels of learning with respect to their practice and social advocacy roles, as reflected in their responses to the surveys (see Appendices L1 & M1 for copies of the surveys). Furthermore, the questions that assess students’ capacity to connect practice to research affirm the effectiveness of our program’s scientist-practitioner model in our practice-oriented training initiatives.

Goal 3: The ability and knowledge to enable the growth of the individuals, families, and systems with whom they work and the good of the community at large in both their research and practice.

Objective 3.1: Students will obtain knowledge necessary to understand individual, family, and community strengths in the context of their socio-cultural milieu.

Summary of outcome data: The program’s commitment to diversity training is central to the mission. The outcome data available to assess how effective the program is in attaining its goal of enhancing students’ knowledge of socio-cultural factors in human behavior are consistently affirming of our training goals. Students’ grades in their courses coupled with faculty evaluations of student performance in the wide array of responsibilities that exist in our program are all favorable with respect to diversity issues. The survey responses, which include the extensive set of questions we posed about the social justice aspect of our mission, were responded to favorably by students and alumni (see questions # 20-23, as found in Appendices L & M).

Objective 3.2: Students will develop competence in counseling practice and research to work with persons who are under-served by society and psychology, including persons of varying racial or ethnic backgrounds, disenfranchised classes, genders, sexual orientations, and those differently-abled

Summary of outcome data: This objective and competency, which examine how well the knowledge assessed in Objective 3.1 is translated into research, practice, and social advocacy, yielded a wide array of outcomes that consistently convey a positive portrayal of the program’s efforts in this area. The behavioral/knowledge domains reveal considerable research outcomes, such as papers and presentations that include a specific focus on underserved populations. Moreover, student performance in courses and comprehensive exams, most of which include some focus on diversity, reflects student learning and internalized knowledge. Furthermore, the program’s use of town hall
meetings and a diversity climate study provide behavioral evidence of a serious and thoughtful commitment to social justice and a focus on underserved populations. In addition, the responses on the survey questions in this area were all ranked quite highly, affirming the program’s effectiveness in manifesting this critical aspect of our training mission (see the data reported in Table 12 and Appendices L & M).

F1c: Maintaining Current Achievements and Making Program Changes. The extensive efforts devoted to program and student evaluation are directed toward informing program decisions. We have established several mechanisms to ensure that we are well positioned to consolidate our gains and to further refine our program. The Director of Training meets at least once each semester with each cohort; for students in the first two years, these meetings are held twice a semester. These meetings provide a valuable informal means of providing immediate feedback on student life. In addition, the faculty meets weekly to review program issues and has an annual retreat which is devoted to assessing program goals and objectives as well as more specific issues, such as curriculum changes, comprehensive exam format, and practicum experiences. The use of the Town Hall meetings and the Diversity Climate study, described previously in this report, also exemplify our commitment to learning about and enhancing our program’s effectiveness. The use of formal mechanisms of assessment, such as the student and alumni survey, evaluation of comprehensive exam performance, and the annual student evaluations, are employed rigorously in providing feedback to our entire community. For example, if a group of students struggle with a given area of the comprehensive exam, we typically challenge ourselves to explore the curriculum in this area.

In addition, the faculty complete a self-assessment each year that is reviewed by the Chair, Associate Dean, and Dean, which culminates in a formal evaluation letter sent by the Dean to each faculty member in the spring. An annual report of the Department includes specific reference to the doctoral program and is evaluated by the Dean and the Academic Vice President. Moreover, the University is now engaging in a systematic self-study of all programs and department, which will necessitate further evaluation, feedback, and program refinement.

F2a. Institution Mission. The Counseling Psychology program is uniquely tailored to be consistent with national trends in our field and with the specific intellectual climate of Boston College. Both the overall Boston College mission and the Counseling Psychology training mission are focused to a great extent on social justice. While the concept of social justice is often used in diverse ways by different entities, the way in which our program and our host institution conceptualize this concept is quite analogous.

F2b. Local, regional, and national needs for psychological services. The faculty have sought to ensure that the program’s training model is consistent with the needs and norms of our local, regional, and national community. From a local and regional perspective, the Director of Training is a member of the council of local directors of training organized by the Massachusetts Psychological Association, which has been very
effective in developing a supportive community to address local needs and training issues. This council also has been informative to the faculty in learning about the unique mental health, educational, and social needs of the Boston and New England regions. The faculty are also closely involved in local and regional efforts. Two of our faculty have served as members of the Massachusetts Board of Registration for Psychologists, with Dr. Walsh currently serving as the Board’s Chair. The faculty are closely involved with numerous agencies in the community, serving as consultants and program advisors.

The Counseling Psychology program is also closely rooted in the national counseling psychology community. The Director of Training has served on the Board of the Council of Counseling Psychology Training Programs (CCPTP) and has attended each of its annual conferences for the past 6 years. Moreover, the faculty have been consistently updated on new developments nationally, including the new practicum guidelines developed by the Association of Directors of Psychology Training Clinics (ADPTC) Practicum Competencies Workgroup (which forms the essence of our new practicum evaluation process), recent developments in competency-based doctoral education, and multicultural initiatives from CCPTP and the Society of Counseling Psychology. The faculty are all involved in national professional associations and initiatives. Indeed, one of our faculty members has been a Council Representative for APA (Dr. Helms) and the current President of APA (Dr. Koocher) is a member of our adjunct faculty. These formal and informal connections to the national psychological community have helped to maintain the program’s currency and leadership role in counseling psychology.

F2c. National standards of professional practice. In light of the recommendations raised in our previous accreditation review, the program has initiated the following modifications:

- In the 2000 accreditation review, the CoA observed that the program did not note how students demonstrate substantial understanding of and competence in professional consultation. The program now has several explicit pedagogical opportunities for students to learn about and practice consultation as part of their identity as psychologists. The PY 844 course (Counseling Psychology in Context) reviews consultation in relation to social advocacy roles, which are central in our training mission. In addition, students further explore the psychological consultation literature in the PY 846.02 seminar (Advanced Practicum in Counseling Psychology: Advanced Seminar in Practice, Supervision, and Consultation; see the relevant course syllabus). Taken together, the two courses, coupled with the First-Year Experience and other programmatic projects (e.g., Tools for Tomorrow, Boston Connects) expose students to a full array of training opportunities in consultation that are theory-driven and based on best practices in counseling psychology.
- The CoA noted the complexities of delivering training to a large Master’s program in conjunction with our doctoral program as an issue requiring some careful thought and attention in the next self-study. We have devoted extensive time to
this issue and we believe that we have developed some useful mechanisms for balancing our professional responsibilities. With the explicit assistance of the University, we have been able to maintain a full-time non-tenure track line for Dr. Robert Romano throughout the time frame of this self-study, who teaches a 3/3 load and provides considerable advisement, primarily to MA students. In addition, the faculty size has remained stable at 9 core faculty and 2 non-core faculty since the last self-study (which was not the case during the prior self-study period), thereby representing a consistent resource that has been able to deliver high quality training for both MA and Ph.D. students. With the addition of Dr. Franklin in January 2007, our faculty size will increase by one slot, further expanding our human resources. Furthermore, the University has provided additional resources for the MA programs, including graduate assistants to help us administer these programs. Moreover, effective September 2006, the Lynch School is opening a newly designed support service to assist in advising and career planning of MA students. These initiatives, when considered collectively, reflect careful and effective solutions to the challenge of sustaining excellence in doctoral education while also maintaining strong Master’s programs.

- The program has been reasonably successful in obtaining more space in recent years, which addresses an issue raised by the CoA in their last evaluation of our program. In large measure, the space needs have been addressed by faculty with external funding receiving additional office space to work on their projects. Several faculty have obtained office space outside of Campion Hall for their projects, which is primarily used by doctoral students working on these research projects. In addition, the existing student space has been upgraded since the last site visit with computers in each office and access to printers.

- The CoA noted a concern regarding how students learn about working with clients of varying sexual orientations and differing levels of physical ability. We have made several modifications in this area to enhance student learning opportunities in these critical areas. First, our courses include more explicit attention to these sources of diversity (see, for example, the course syllabi for PY 843 and PY 846.02). Second, students are increasingly involved in practicum experiences with clients from diverse sexual orientations and differing levels of physical ability. A number of students in our program have been placed at the Fenway Community Health Center, which is a major resource in Boston for LGBT clients. Third, we are focusing greater attention to issues pertaining to differences in physical ability in a number of our courses (e.g., PY 843 and PY 846.02) and in many practicum sites. Indeed, in nearly every practicum site, our students are exposed to clients with differences in physical ability. These issues routinely arise in practicum seminars and are discussed in depth and are related to the literature on disabling conditions. Furthermore, the program is initiating a non-credit seminar during the 2006-07 year to discuss issues of diversity in physical abilities, which will help to integrate existing efforts that are infused throughout the program curriculum.
• Consistent with the recommendations of the CoA, we have made several modifications to our program self-assessment and quality enhancement. As reflected in this self-study, we have developed a more balanced approach to the importance of both proximal and distal outcomes; the distal outcomes are exemplified by evaluating alumni scores on the licensing exam, their employment history, their publication and presentation records, as well as other behavioral indices of competence and implementation of our training model. In addition, we have developed operational competencies for each goal and objective; moreover, we are adopting a competence-based training and evaluation model throughout our program. Finally, our students are in fact applying for and accepting internships outside of the Boston area. During the self-study period, 52% of our students have accepted internships outside of the Boston regional area.

• The CoA noted that the relationship between domains B and F is indeed critical in considering the question of our effectiveness in implementing our training model. We have increased the depth and breadth of our data collection, including attitudinal, behavioral, and knowledge-based outcomes. We are also relying more extensively on distal outcomes in our ongoing evaluation efforts, as reflected in our use of licensure data, alumni career paths and achievements, and related outcomes for our graduates. In addition, the program is implementing a triennial cycle of surveys of students and alumni, which will supplement the existing data that we obtain and use in program decision making.

F2d. Scientific and professional knowledge serving as the basis of practice.
Program faculty are dedicated to learning about (and contributing to) the evolving body of knowledge that informs practice. In support of this statement, we cite the faculty’s commitment to understanding how professional psychologists’ roles and responsibilities are changing in light of shifts in research findings, market place issues, and practice norms. The faculty infuse the most recent research findings into their courses and seminars, and modify their syllabi accordingly. Given that psychologists are increasingly functioning as supervisors and consultants for Master’s level trained clinicians, we have expanded our coverage of these critical fields in our courses, assistantship opportunities, and in our overall training model. Another example in the research realm is the requirement that students have skills in both qualitative and quantitative methods, which reflects a contemporary understanding of the importance of multiple approaches to scholarship. Faculty model the importance of staying abreast of changes in the field by attending professional conventions, conferences, and continuing education seminars. Moreover, the tight linkage between science and practice, which forms a cornerstone of our program, is consistently exemplified in our program’s curriculum and extra-curricular activities.

F2e. Graduate job placements and career paths. The career pathways of our graduates are central in program assessment and quality enhancement. We consistently monitor our students’ job options, with continual mentoring provided by our faculty well after students graduate. Several of our graduates continue to work with faculty in
research, supervising, and in teaching. The career paths that our students engage in reflect the multiple dimensions of our training model. Those students who move into the practice world generally work with underserved client populations and often move into leadership roles as supervisors and managers, thereby manifesting our intention to train psychologists for leadership positions that enhance their impact. A number of our students are moving into careers in academia or public policy (as exemplified by graduates working at Fordham University, Michigan State University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the World Health Organization), which also fits our training model. A review of Table 9 (see page 74) reflects an optimal set of outcomes for a program like ours with a clear scientist-practitioner emphasis coupled with a focus on social justice and community-based interventions.

Domain G: Public Disclosure

The program demonstrates its commitment to public disclosure through its written materials and other communications that accurately represent it to the public. These materials include program descriptions and applications sent to prospective students, the Counseling Psychology Doctoral Handbook distributed to enrolled students and updated annually by the Director of Training, and information available on our website including the Handbook and related information. The program website now includes extensive information for potential applicants as well as links to various related organizations and professional associations. These materials describe the Program’s goals, objectives, competencies, training model, requirements for admission and graduation, curriculum, faculty, students, facilities, administrative policies and procedures, research and practicum experiences, and APA accreditation status. Within the program, the Director of Training maintains an active listserv, which provides a focal point for program news and developments.

Domain H: Relationship with Accrediting Body

The Program has fulfilled its responsibilities and abided by all policies and procedures of the Committee on Accreditation (CoA). The program has paid all fees associated with the maintenance of our accredited status, submitted annual reports on our students, notified the Committee regarding changes in leadership, and been responsive to the feedback received in our last accreditation report. We have not made any major changes in the program since the last accreditation evaluation. Therefore, aside from the letter sent in 2001 to address the issues raised in the most recent accreditation report, we have relied on the annual reports to keep the CoA updated on the program. Furthermore, we maintain close connection to evolving policy changes in accreditation criteria. The Director of Training attends the CCPTP meeting annually and also attends relevant workshops at the annual APA convention on changes and potential shifts in accreditation criteria. This information is routinely shared with faculty and students.