Student retention is a longstanding central concern on college campuses across the United States (Barefoot, 2004; Braxton, 2008; Hamshire, Willgoss, & Wibberley, 2013; Mckendry, Wright, & Stevenson, 2014). National survey data indicate the retention rate for graduate education is 69.9% (ACT, 2015), suggesting nearly one third of graduate students do not complete their program of study. Low retention rates are problematic because attrition reduces student opportunities for personal and academic growth (Engstrom & Tinto, 2008). Additionally, attrition has a negative impact on program funding and is especially concerning to smaller programs that depend on student tuition to remain viable (Raisman, 2013). Thus, there is a need to investigate effective retention practices to increase graduate student degree completion rates (Casstevens, Waites, & Outlaw, 2012).

The first year of graduate education is a critical time when graduate students decide to remain in or leave their academic program (Gardner & Barnes, 2007). Researchers have found that the first year is the most significant time for the establishment of critical relationships that can decrease attrition (Hamshire et al., 2012; Nandeshwar et al., 2011). These relationships can be formed inside or outside of the classroom, with other students, faculty, or additional representatives from the educational setting (Tinto, 2006). Tinto's integration model (Tinto, 1975, 1997), one of the most comprehensive and established theories in the retention literature, examines students' perceptions of fit or sense of belonging to the institution in relation to completing their education. More specifically, when students perceive they are valued members of the university community, they are more likely to persist and complete their degrees (Flynn, 2014; Tinto, 2010). According to Tinto (1975), social integration with other students and connections with faculty are key components that impact undergraduate student retention.

Although the majority of studies examining student retention focus on increasing retention with undergraduate students (Crombie, Brindley, Harris, Marks-Marin, & Thompson, 2013), research also supports the importance of social integration in graduate student retention (Braxton, 2008; Casstevens et al., 2012; Gardner & Barnes, 2007; Hamblet, 2015; Stagg & Kimmins, 2014). Students in graduate programs report wanting greater partnerships with academic units, as well as more consistent and accurate communication from program faculty (Pontius & Harper, 2006). Additionally, connecting with other students and program faculty can deter non-traditional graduate students from departing from their programs by buffering them from feeling marginalized (Gardner, 2008).

One reason retention is important in Counselor Education (CE) programs is related to the amount of resources dedicated to the application process for master's students. The student admission process in CE programs is both time-intensive and critical to ensure the most highly qualified candidates are chosen each year to begin the program (McCaughan & Hill, 2015). The application generally includes a letter of interest, verification of academic aptitude and related experience, letters of reference, and, in many programs, an interview (Swank & Smith-Adcock, 2014). Additionally, accreditation standards limit the number of students that can be admitted into CE programs based on the 12:1 ratio of full-time equivalent (FTE) students to FTE faculty (Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Other Related Programs [CACREP], 2016). Therefore, there is a need to retain students enrolled to maintain program viability.

Although there is some literature investigating retention in graduate programs (Casstevens et al, 2012; Gardner & Barnes, 2007; Mullen, Goyette & Soares, 2003; Pontius & Harper, 2006; Stagg & Kimmins, 2014), there is comparatively little research conducted on retention among CE students (Jensen, Doumas, & Midgett, 2016). Qualitative research examining retention rates

among doctoral students suggest retention rates tend to be in the 50% range (Baltrinic, Waugh, & Brown, 2013; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Reasons for program discontinuation include programmatic and relational fit (Burkholder & Janson, 2013), as well as unmet personal and academic expectations (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005). These studies also suggest that variables consistent with Tinto's integration model (Tinto, 1975, 1997) are related to retention among doctoral CE students. Specifically, findings indicate CE doctoral student retention is related to faculty mentoring (Burkholder & Janson, 2013; Protivnak & Foss, 2009), positive student-faculty relationships (Baltrinic et al., 2013; Burkholder & Janson, 2013; Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005), a feeling of sense of community (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005), and support from peers (Burkholder & Janson, 2013). Additionally, qualitative findings from a study investigating reasons for departure among students who return to their program highlight the importance of faculty-student interactions (Burkholder, 2012).

In contrast, the CE studies examining retention among master's level students have focused on the ethical practice of removing underperforming students from CE programs (Brown, 2013; Swank & Smith-Adcock, 2014; Ziomek-Daigle & Christensen, 2010) rather than reasons for self-initiated program discontinuation. As a first step to understanding factors related to retention among first year CE students, Jensen et al. (2016) developed a program to enhance social integration. Based on Tinto's integration model (Tinto, 1975, 1997) and findings from research on CE doctoral student retention (Baltrinic et al., 2013; Burkholder, 2012; Burkholder & Janson, 2013; Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005; Protivnak & Foss, 2009), the researchers designed the program activities to connect first year students with one-another, current students from other cohorts, and program faculty. Results of a qualitative study examining student response to this program indicated activities that promoted connections with peers and faculty fostered a sense of social

belonging that contributed to student satisfaction and intention to continue the program (Jensen et al., 2016). Although findings from this study are an important first step in understanding how the students experienced the program, this study did not examine whether or not the program increased actual retention rates.

The Current Study

The majority of the literature exploring retention in higher education has focused on undergraduate students (Crombie et al., 2013). Similarly, although Tinto's social integration model has been extensively studied in relation to undergraduate education (Braxton, 2008; Flynn, 2014; Hamblet, 2015), only a few researchers have examined his model at the graduate level (Casstevens et al., 2012; Gardner & Barnes, 2007; Mullen et al., 2003). Further, there is limited research examining self-initiated discontinuation in CE programs, with the majority of literature focusing on CE students at the doctoral level (Baltrinic et al., 2013; Burkholder, 2012; Burkholder & Janson, 2013; Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Taken together, these studies suggest that social integration, including relationships with faculty and peers, may be important to CE graduate student retention as well. Recent qualitative research indicates master's level CE students may also respond positively to activities designed to increase social integration (Jensen et al., 2016). However, a gap in the literature remains in evaluating the effectiveness of programs designed to increase retention rates in master's level CE programs. Thus, the purpose of this study was to extend our previous work by examining the effectiveness of the social integration program in increasing retention rates among first year master's level CE students.

To achieve this aim, we compared first year retention rates between a cohort of students who received the program and a control cohort comprised of students who were accepted into the program the year prior to program implementation. We asked the following research questions:

1) Did participating in the social integration program increase retention rates from orientation to Year 2 of the program? and 2) What, if any, effect did the program have on the timing of student-initiated program discontinuation (e.g., retention from orientation to fall enrollment and retention from fall enrollment to enrollment in Year 2 of the program).

Method

Participants

The sample included 44 students (84.1% female, 15.9% male) admitted to a Master's in Counseling Program at a university in the Northwestern United States. The sample consisted of students admitted over a two-year period (control cohort $n = 20$; program cohort $n = 24$). Ages ranged from 21-50 ($M = 29.68$, $SD = 7.89$). The majority of the sample was White (88.6%), with 9.1% Hispanic, and 2.3% Asian American, which accurately reflects the local demographic. The sample included school counseling students (68.2%) and addiction counseling students (31.3%). The researchers found no significant differences in age, $t(42) = -0.10$, $p = 0.92$, gender, $\chi^2(1) = 3.26$, $p = .07$, ethnicity, $\chi^2(1) = 1.29$, $p = .53$, or cognate, $\chi^2(1) = 0.17$, $p = .68$, between the two groups. To ensure that retention rates in the control cohort were representative of past cohorts, we ran a series of chi square analyses comparing the control cohort to the two prior cohorts. We found no differences in retention rates from orientation to fall Year 2, orientation to fall Year 1, and fall Year 1 to fall Year 2 between the control cohort and either of the two prior cohorts.

Procedures

This study is part of a larger study examining programming to increase retention among CE students. All students admitted to the CE program in the program implementation year were invited to participate in the study. During the mandatory orientation conducted in May, a member of the research team met with the first year cohort to provide a description of the purpose of the

new program activities planned for the year. A member of the research team informed students that they could also participate in a study evaluating the new activities, stressing that declining participation would in no way impact students' standing in the program and that program faculty would not be aware of students' decision to decline participation. The consent process was conducted by a doctoral student member of the research team to minimize the possibility of coercion. All students agreed to participation and signed informed consent forms. The researchers accessed archival data collected from the CE program to track retention from both the program cohort and control cohort for the data used in this study. All study procedures were approved by the University Institutional Review Board and adhered to the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES, 2011) ethical code guidelines.

Instruments

Researchers accessed archival retention data from the CE program student data tracking files. We operationalized fall retention as students being enrolled for fall courses on the 10th day of semester. We operationalized Year 2 retention as students being enrolled for fall courses on the 10th day of semester during their second year. We used a dichotomous scale of 0 (student did not enroll for fall courses) or 1 (student enrolled for fall courses) to measure retention.

Retention Activities

Researchers designed the program activities based on a thorough analysis of the literature focusing on effective practices for student engagement (Ethington & Smart, 1986; Flynn, 2014; Gardner, 2008; Nerad & Miller, 1996; Pontius & Harper, 2006; Tinto, 2006). The primary purpose of the program was to increase retention through providing activities that enhance opportunities for social integration, which has been identified as an integral part of building relationships that increase retention (Flynn, 2014; Tinto, 2010). The program included five activities designed to

increase social integration: a) an orientation dinner in May after admission to the program, b) peer mentoring, which began with the assignment of peers during the May orientation dinner and continued throughout Year 1, c) a community project during the summer prior to Year 1 of the program, d) a fall picnic, which took place in October of Year 1 of the program, and e) individual advising meetings, which occurred during the fall semester of Year 1.

Orientation dinner. The orientation dinner occurred after an hour and a half advising meeting. Program cohort students had an opportunity to meet one-another, current students from other cohorts, and program faculty and staff at a dinner provided by the CE program held at the university's student union. The orientation dinner was paid for by the CE department and all incoming students were required to attend. The orientation and dinner occurred in May after acceptance into the program, which started the following August.

Peer-mentoring program. Researchers partnered with the Chi Sigma Iota student chapter to assign each incoming student a peer-mentor. Students currently enrolled in their second year in the program served as peer-mentors. The purpose of the mentoring relationship was for incoming students to have an opportunity to develop a meaningful relationship with another student who could provide information about the program, as well as support. Program faculty worked with Chi Sigma Iota officers on the peer-mentoring program, and students were paired based on cognate (school or addiction) areas. First year students met their peer-mentor during orientation through an icebreaker activity prepared by Chi Sigma Iota officers. Program faculty requested that peer-mentors and mentees plan on follow-up times throughout the semester. Often, these meetings occurred at coffee shops or over lunch. The meetings among mentors and first year students were voluntary with no set amount of meetings required by the program.

Summer community project. The researchers partnered with the program's Counselors for Social Justice (CSJ) student organization to coordinate a community service project held during the summer prior to students beginning their course work. In collaboration with CSJ members, researchers sent an email to all new students inviting them to participate along with a survey to help organize the project (e.g., selecting a time and date for the project). CSJ officers selected an agency with the mission to address local community needs by providing a sustainable model of food training and educational programs. Students worked together on a farm engaging in a variety of activities such as creating farm signage, painting, woodwork, and basic farm needs. After students completed their initial tasks, students worked in the agency's kitchen preparing a meal from sustainable farming practices while staff taught students about food production, hand labeling and packaging, and other issues related to sustainable farming and food training. The project concluded with a meal for all student participants. The community service project took place in July. Although the project was available to all students, not all first year students participated, and students in the second and third year cohorts were also involved.

Fall picnic. Researchers coordinated a picnic for first year students, their families, and program faculty and staff in a city park adjacent to the university. First year students and their families, faculty, and staff interacted during unstructured time in a setting away from campus. Icebreaker questions were available on tables as an option to encourage socialization while eating a catered meal provided by the CE Department. Students were able to meet the spouses, partners, parents, and children of their classmates and faculty, providing opportunity for a more personal connection to take place. All faculty attended the picnic and the majority of first year students also attended, with many bringing family members. The picnic was catered by the CE department.

Candy and icebreaker questions were placed on each table to encourage communication and conversations.

Individual advising meeting. Incoming students in the program cohort completed a survey during orientation. The survey included items assessing employment responsibilities outside of school, desire to complete the program, campus involvement, and previous educational experience (see Appendix A for the Counselor Education Advising Questionnaire). After students completed the assessment, a member of the researcher team reviewed responses and provided the faculty advisor with information regarding areas individual students endorsed which could be potential risk factors in retention (Gardner & Barnes, 2007; Mullen et al., 2003). The survey included items assessing employment responsibilities outside of school, desire to complete the program, campus involvement, and previous educational experience. The purpose of providing this information to the faculty advisor was to guide her conversation with students during individual advising meetings conducted during the fall semester. Students were required to attend one meeting with their advisor. The meetings took place throughout the fall semester and all students attended their individual meeting.

Data Analysis

All analyses were conducted using SPSS version 23.0. The researchers conducted three separate 2 (program cohort; control cohort) x 2 (retained; discontinued) chi square analyses to examine differences in retention from May orientation to fall of Year 2 (enrollment on 10th day of class), May orientation to fall of Year 1 (enrollment on 10th day of class), and fall of Year 1 to fall of Year 2. The authors used an alpha level of $p < .05$ to determine statistical significance and used Phi (φ) as measures of effect size. Power calculations indicated the current sample size should

yield power of ≥ 0.80 to detect a medium effect size for a 2 x 2 chi square analysis. Please refer to Table 1 for retention rates for the two cohorts.

Table 1.

Program Retention by Timeframe

	Control Cohort	Program Cohort
Orientation to Fall Year 1	70.0%	100.0%
Orientation to Fall Year 2	60.0%	87.5%
Fall Year 1 to Fall Year 2	87.5%	87.5%

Results

Retention from Orientation to Fall Year 2

Results indicated a significant difference for retention rates from orientation through fall of Year 2, $\chi^2(1) = 4.40$, $p < .04$, $\varphi = 0.32$. Examination of the φ coefficient indicates the effect size is medium. As seen in Table 1, a significantly higher percentage of students in the program cohort remained enrolled from orientation through fall of Year 2 (87.5%) relative to retention rates for students in the control cohort (60.0%).

Retention from Orientation to Fall Year 1

Results indicate a significant group difference for retention rates from orientation through fall of Year 1, $\chi^2(1) = 8.34$, $p < .01$, $\varphi = 0.44$. Examination of the φ coefficient indicates the effect size is medium to large. As seen in Table 1, a significantly higher percentage of students in the program cohort remained enrolled from orientation through fall of Year 1 (100.0%) relative to students in the control cohort (70.0%).

Retention from Fall Year 1 to Fall Year 2

Results indicate no significant group difference for retention rates from fall of Year 1 to fall of Year 2, $\chi^2(1) = 0.03$, $p = 0.88$, $\varphi = 0.03$. As seen in Table 2, findings indicate no differences in retention from fall Year 1 to fall Year 2 between in the program cohort (87.5%) and control cohort (87.5%).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to extend the literature by evaluating the effectiveness of a program designed to increase retention among master's level CE students. Because research indicates the first year of graduate education is the most significant time for preventing student attrition (Gardner & Barnes, 2007), it is important to identify effective activities that can be implemented for CE students during this time. Overall, results provided support for the effectiveness of a program developed to increase retention from orientation to enrollment in the first semester of an master's in CE program by providing activities designed to increase social integration among first year students.

Findings indicated that the cohort that participated in activities designed to increase social integration had significantly higher rates of retention from orientation to fall of Year 2 compared to the control cohort. This finding is consistent with undergraduate research demonstrating the positive impact of integrating a first-year experience program on student retention by helping students actively seek connections to other students, faculty, and staff (Hernandez & Lopez, 2004). Findings are also consistent with qualitative research on the retention of doctoral level CE students, suggesting that retention is associated with positive faculty-student relationships (Baltrinic et al., 2013; Burkholder, 2012; Burkholder & Janson, 2013; Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005; Protivnak & Foss, 2009), peer support (Burkholder, 2013), and a sense of community (Hoskins & Goldberg,

2005). To our knowledge this is the first study to investigate the effectiveness of a program designed to provide activities that increase social for master's level CE students. Thus, our findings add to the body of literature supporting implementation of activities that foster connection to increase retention during the first year for CE students.

The program cohort also had significantly higher retention rates from orientation through enrollment in courses in fall of Year 1. In contrast, we did not find a significant difference in retention rates from enrollment in fall Year 1 to enrollment in fall Year 2. One possible explanation for this difference is that engaging students prior to their first fall semester provided an opportunity for them to make connections to the program during summer, a time in which there is no coursework or other interaction with the program. Consistent with the explanation, historical retention data from our CE program suggests that the largest rates of attrition in the first year occur from orientation to enrollment in fall semester. During the summer, students may question the commitment to graduate school or the financial cost associated with higher education. Non-traditional students may doubt the benefit of additional schooling or their ability to relate to younger students. It is possible that the development of friendships and personal connections in the absence of pressure from full time coursework and academic responsibilities creates an opportunity for stronger bonds to develop than would develop otherwise in the context of other pressure.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

While this study extends the literature by investigating how to increase first year master's level CE student retention through activities designed to increase social integration, certain limitations should be considered. First, a largely White and female student population limit the generalizability of the results. These student characteristics, however, are consistent with the

national CE master's student makeup, with 60% of students identifying their ethnicity as White and 82.52% of students reporting gender as female ([CACREP], 2014). Next, cohort effects impact the internal validity of the study. Specifically, students in the program cohort and control cohorts may have had different experiences they share as participants in an intensive graduate program. Thus, it is unclear if the differences in retention between the two cohorts are due to a program effect or are confounded by a cohort effect. Further, with the exception of the orientation dinner and the advising meetings, students were not required to participate. Additionally, although faculty strongly encouraged students to attend all program activities by sending students email invitations and reminders, we did not track participation in the voluntary activities.

Finally, although the current study represents an important first step in evaluating the effectiveness of social integration activities in retention of master's level CE first year students from orientation through the fall of the second year, this study did not examine other factors that can also impact retention including subgroups of students for whom the program is more or less effective and processes by which the program impacts retention rates. Thus, future research examining possible mediators (e.g., student satisfaction or academic climate), as well as examining possible moderators (e.g., age or employment status) would be beneficial.

Implications for Counselor Education

This study has practical implications for counselor educators and first year master's level CE students. First, because CE programs can have restrictions in the number of students that can be admitted due to accreditation requirements, it is important to implement strategies to increase student retention to promote program sustainability. Further, since the first year of graduate education is critical for retaining students, there is a need to develop activities that can be implemented for CE during their first year in the program. When a cohort of first year CE students

participated in activities designed to increase retention through social integration, the cohort had higher rates of retention than a control cohort. CE faculty can build on these findings and engage first year students in activities to encourage retention.

Additionally, since the activities were most effective from orientation to fall of Year 1, for programs that schedule orientation in this way, faculty can focus on engaging students in activities during the summer months prior to students first fall semester. For example, program faculty can coordinate a summer service project to help first year students build a sense of cohesion and integration by developing relationships with one another and the local community. Furthermore, faculty can work with CE student organizations such as a local chapter of CSJ or Chi Sigma Iota to coordinate summer activity such as a picnic to welcome first year students and their families to the program. Although our findings indicate summer activities can increase retention, coordinating these activities can be time consuming and occur while most faculty are not contracted to work. Thus, planning in advance and working with students who are entering their second or third year in the program to implement activities can be helpful. Further, another potential barrier to implementation is financial resources can be required from the department. Therefore, faculty can plan free or low-cost activities such as volunteering in a community agency or gathering with students at a local park for a potluck.

Conclusion

This study evaluated the effectiveness of a program developed to increase retention by implementing activities designed to connect first year master's level CE student with one another, current students enrolled in other cohorts, and program faculty. Findings indicated the cohort of students who participated in the program had a higher rate of retention compared to the control cohort. Overall, results suggest that integrating activities designed to increase social integration

are a promising approach to retaining first year master's level CE students and maintaining program viability.

References

ACT (2015). Retention trends 1983 - 2015. *2015 Retention/Completion Summary Tables.* Retrieved from www.act.org

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision [ACES] Taskforce on Best Practices in Clinical Supervision. (2011). Best practices in clinical supervision. Retrieved from www.acesonline.net/resources/best-practices-clinical-supervision

Baltrinic. E. R., Waugh, J. A., & Brown, S. (2013). Faculty and student perspectives on what helps counselor education doctoral students towards program completion. *The International Journal of Q Methodology, 36*(4), 253-271. doi:10.15133/j.os.2012.014

Barefoot, B. (2004). Higher education's revolving door: confronting the problem of student drop out in US colleges and universities. *Open Learning, 19*(1), 9-18. doi:10.1080/0268051042000177818

Braxton, J. M. (2008). Toward a scholarship of practice centered on college student retention. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning, 115*, 101-112. doi:10.1002/tl.328

Brown, M. (2013). A content analysis of problematic behavior in counselor education programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 52*(3), 179-192. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2013. 00036.x

Burkholder, D. (2012). Returning counselor education doctoral students: Issues of retention, attrition, and perceived experiences. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision, 4*(2), 6-23. doi:10.7729/42.0027

Burkholder, D., & Janson, C. (2013). Supporting PhD completion: Student and faculty perspectives. *The International Journal of Q Methodology, 36*(4), 272-287. doi:10.15133/j.os.2012.015

Casstevens, W. J., Waites, C., & Outlaw, N. (2012). Non-traditional student retention: Exploring perceptions of support in a social work graduate program. *Social Work Education, 31*(3), 236-268. doi:10.1080/02615479.2011.556188

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (2014). *CACREP Vital Statistics.* Alexandria, VA. Retrieved from www.cacrep.org/about-cacrep/ publications/cacrep-annual-reports/

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs. (2016). *2016 standards.* Alexandria, VA. Retrieved from www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards/

Crombie, A., Brindley, J., Harris, D., Marks-Marin, D., & Thompson, T. M. (2013). Factors that enhance rates of completion: What makes students stay? *Nurse Education Today, 33,* 1282-1287. doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2013.03.020

Engstrom, C., & Tinto, V. (2008). Access without opportunity is not opportunity. *Change, 40*(1), 46-50. doi:10.3200/CHNG.40.1.46-50

Ethington, C. A., & Smart, J. C. (1986). Persistence to graduate education. *Research in Higher Education, 24*(3), 287-303. doi:10.1007/BF00992076

Flynn, D. (2014). Baccalaureate attainment of college students at 4-year institutions as a function of student engagement behaviors: Social and academic student engagement behaviors matter. *Research in Higher Education, 55,* 467-493. doi:10.1007/s11162-013-9321-8

Gardner, S. K. (2008). Fitting the mold of graduate school: A qualitative study of socialization in doctoral education. *Innovative Higher Education, 33,* 125-138. doi:10.1007/s10755-008-9068-x

Gardner, S. K., Barnes, B. J. (2007). Graduate student involvement: Socialization for the professional role. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(4), 269-387. doi:10.1353/csd.2007.0036

Hamblet, E. C. (2015). Understanding the myriad factors affecting student attrition. *Disability Compliance for Higher Education, 20*(9), 6. doi:10.1002/dhe.30047

Hamshire, C., Willgoss, T. G., & Wibberley, C. (2012). "The placement was probably the tipping point" – The narratives of recently discontinued students. *Nurse Education in Practice, 12*(4), 182-186. doi:10.1016/j.nepr.2011.11.004

Hamshire, C., Willgoss, T. G., & Wibberley, C. (2013). Should I stay or should I go? A study Exploring why healthcare students consider leaving their programme. *Nurse Education Today, 33*(8), 889-895. doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2012.08.013

Hernandez, J. C., & Lopez, M. A. (2004). Leaking pipeline: Issues impacting Latino/a college student retention. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice, 6*(1), 37-60. doi:10.2190/FBLY-0UAF-EE7W-QJD2

Hoskins, C. M., & Goldberg, A. D. (2005) Doctoral student persistence in counselor education programs: Student-program match. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 44,* 175-188. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2005.tb01745.x

Jensen, J. D., Doumas, D. M., & Midgett, A. (2016). Enhancing program satisfaction and retention among first-year master of arts in counseling students: A qualitative study. In *Ideas and research you can use: VISTAS 2016.* Retrieved from www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/vistas/article_334cfd25f16116603 abcacff0000bee5e7.pdf?sfvrsn=4

McCaughan, A. M., & Hill, N. R. (2015). The gatekeeping imperative in counselor education admission protocols: The criticality or personal qualities. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling, 37*, 28-40. doi:10.1007/s10447-014-9223-2

Mckendry, S., Wright, M., & Stevenson, K. (2014). Why here and why stay? Students' voice on the retention strategies of a widening participation university. *Nurse Education Today, 34*(5), 872-877. doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2013.09.009

Mullen, A. L, Goyette, K. A., & Soares, J. A. (2003). Who goes to graduate school? Social and academic correlates of educational continuation after college. *Sociology of Education, 76,* 143-169. doi:10.2307/3090274

Nandeshaw, A., Menzies, T., & Nelson, A. (2011). Learning patterns of university student retention. *Expert Systems with Applications, 38*(12), 14984-14996. doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2011.05.048

Nerad, M., & Miller, D. S. (1996). *Increasing student retention in graduate and professional programs, 92,* 61-76. doi:10.1002/ir.37019969207

Pontius, J. L., & Harper, S. R. (2006). Principles for good practice in graduate and professional student engagement. *New Direction for Student Services, 115*, 47-58. doi:10.1002/ss.215

Protivnak, J. J., & Foss, L. L. (2009). An exploration of themes that influence the counselor education doctoral student experience. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 48,* 239-256. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2009.tb00078.x

Raisman, N. A. (2013). The cost of college attrition at four-year colleges & universities: An analysis of 1669 U. S. institutions. *The Educational Policy Institute.* Retrieved from www.educationalpolicy.org/pdf/1302_PolicyPerspectives.pdf

Stagg, A., & Kimmins, L. (2014). First year in higher education (FYHE) and the coursework

post-graduate student. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 40*, 142-151. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2014.02.005

Swank, J. M., & Smith-Adcock, S. (2014). Gatekeeping during admissions: A survey of counselor education programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 53*(1), 47-61. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00048.x

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropouts for higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research, 45*, 89-125. doi:10.3102/00346543045001089

Tinto, V. (1997). Classrooms as communities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68*(6), 599-623. doi:10.2307/2959965

Tinto, V. (2006). Research and practice of student retention: What next? *Journal of College Student Retention, 8*(1), 1-19. doi:10.2190/4YNU-4TMB-22DJ-AN4W

Tinto, V. (2010). From theory to action: Exploring the institutional conditions for student retention. *Higher Education, 25*, 51-89. doi:10.1007/978-90-481-8598-6_2

Ziomek-Daigle, J., & Christensen, T. M. (2010). An emergent theory of gatekeeping practices in counselor education. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 88*(4), 407-415. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00040.x

Appendix A

Counselor Education Advising Questionnaire

I understand that participation in this survey is voluntary. Please answer honestly and thoroughly.
Information from the survey will be shared with your advisor in the Counselor Education
Department to help to improve your experience in the program.

Name: _____   Date: _____

Program Area of Focus: _____

Where did you obtain your undergraduate degree? _____ GPA:_____

1.   Are you _____Male   _____Female

2.   What is your age? _____

3.   Please indicate your highest degree received.
      _____Bachelors
      _____Masters
      _____Doctorate

4.   Please indicate your highest <u>expected</u> academic degree.
      _____Bachelors
      _____Masters
      _____Doctorate
      _____Other, please specify _____

5.   Which of the following best describes your ethnic group?
      _____Native American
      _____White/Caucasian
      _____African-American
      _____Hispanic
      _____Asian
      _____Other, please specify _____

6.   What is/was your father's highest formal education level?
      _____Less than high school diploma
      _____GED
      _____High school diploma
      _____Associates
      _____Bachelors
      _____Masters
      _____Doctorate
      _____Other

7.   What is/was your mother's highest formal education level?
     _____Less than high school diploma
     _____GED
     _____High school diploma
     _____Associates
     _____Bachelors
     _____Masters
     _____Doctorate
     _____Other

8.   How important is it for you to obtain your Master's degree?
     _____Very Important
     _____Important
     _____Somewhat important
     _____Not important
     _____Unsure

9.   Where does Boise State rank as your college of choice?
     _____Boise State was my first choice
     _____Boise State was my second choice
     _____Boise State was my third choice
     _____Boise State was my fourth choice
     _____Given my circumstances, I felt Boise State was my only choice

10. How confident are you that choosing Boise State was the right choice?
     _____Very confident
     _____Confident
     _____Somewhat confident
     _____Not confident
     _____Not sure

11. What is your involvement in extracurricular activities (e.g., student government, community service, student committees)?
     _____Four or more hours a week
     _____Two or three hours a week
     _____Less than two hours per week
     _____No involvement

12.	Below is a list of typical out-of-class contacts with faculty. Please mark your estimations of the average number of times per month you engage in this type of contact for at least 10 minutes with faculty.

Type of contacts	Average Times per month of Contact with faculty (please circle)				
A. Getting basic information about my academic program	0	1	2	3	4+
B. Discussing intellectual or course-related matters	0	1	2	3	4+
C. Discussing matters related to my future career	0	1	2	3	4+
D. Talking informally	0	1	2	3	4+
E. Discussing a campus issue or problem	0	1	2	3	4+
F. Helping resolve a personal problem	0	1	2	3	4+

13.	Are you currently employed?

	_____Yes

	_____No

14.	If you are employed please complete the following: I'm employed for

	_____1-10 hours per week

	_____11-20 hours per week

	_____21-30 hours per week

	_____31-40 hours per week

	_____Over 40 hours per week

15.	Below is a list of statements about your previous academic experience. Please read each statement and indicate how accurate you feel it is on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is very true and 7 is very untrue.

	Very true						Very Untrue
a. I am satisfied with the extent of my intellectual development	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. My academic experience has had a positive influence on my intellectual growth and interest in ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Few of the faculty members I have had contact with are genuinely interest in students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

d. The student friendships I have developed   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
     have been personally satisfying

e. My non-classroom interactions with faculty   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
     have had a positive influence on my positive
     influence on my personal growth, values,
     and attitudes

f. My non-classroom interactions with faculty   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
     have had a positive influence on my career
     goals and aspirations

16. How sure are you about your career goals to become a counselor?
      _____Very sure
      _____Sure
      _____Somewhat sure
      _____Unsure
      _____Very unsure

17. How confident are you in your ability to perform the duties of a counselor?
      _____Highly confident
      _____Confident
      _____Uncertain
      _____Not confident

18. Please rate your overall desire to become a counselor.
      _____Very strong desire
      _____Strong desire
      _____Some desire
      _____No desire
      _____Unsure

19. How sure are you that you want to be a counselor?
      _____Very sure
      _____Sure
      _____Somewhat sure
      _____Unsure
      _____Very unsure

20. How frequently have you observed the following in your previous classes?
(Please check or circle the 'o' for one selection for each question)

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
a. The instructor's presentation of materials is well-organized	o	o	o	o
b. The instructor is well prepared for class	o	o	o	o
c. The instructor uses class time effectively	o	o	o	o
d. The instructor clearly explains course requirements	o	o	o	o
e. The instructor has a good command of what he/she is teaching	o	o	o	o

21. How frequently have you observed the following in your previous classes?
(Please check or circle the 'o' for one selection for each question)

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
a. The instructor gives clear examples	o	o	o	o
b. The instructor makes good use of	o	o	o	o
c. The instructor effectively reviews and summarizes the material	o	o	o	o
d. The instructor interprets abstract ideas and theories clearly	o	o	o	o
e. The instructor answers students' questions in a way that helps students understand the materials	o	o	o	o

22. Please indicate how well you agree with the following statements:
(Please check or circle the 'o' for one selection for each question)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. It is not important to graduate from Boise State	o	o	o	o
b. I am confident I made the right decision to attend Boise State	o	o	o	o
c. I am sure that Boise State is the right place for me.	o	o	o	o

23. How likely is it that you will attend Boise State in the fall of 2015?

_____Extremely unlikely

_____Unlikely

_____Unsure

_____Likely

_____Extremely likely

24. How likely is it that you will be enrolled at Boise State one year from today?

_____Extremely unlikely

_____Unlikely

_____Unsure

_____Likely

_____Extremely likely

25. How fairly have you been treated by Boise State University?

_____Very fairly

_____Fairly

_____Unsure

_____Unfairly

_____Very unfairly

26. How fairly have you been treated by the Counselor Education Department at Boise State University?

_____Very fairly

_____Fairly

_____Unsure

_____Unfairly

_____Very unfairly