

2021

Tenure Standards, Scholarly Productivity, and Workloads of Counselor Educators at Doctoral and Master's-Only Counseling Programs

Gregory Hatchett
Northern Kentucky University, hatchettg@nku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/jcps>



Part of the [Counselor Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hatchett, G. (2021). Tenure Standards, Scholarly Productivity, and Workloads of Counselor Educators at Doctoral and Master's-Only Counseling Programs. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, 14(4). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/jcps/vol14/iss4/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@SHU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@SHU. For more information, please contact ferribyp@sacredheart.edu, lysobeyb@sacredheart.edu.

Tenure Standards, Scholarly Productivity, and Workloads of Counselor Educators at Doctoral and Master's-Only Counseling Programs

Abstract

This article describes the results of a survey that inquired about the tenure standards, scholarly productivity, and workloads of counselor educators ($N = 119$) at doctoral-level counselor education programs. These survey results were then compared to the results attained in an earlier study of counselor educators ($N = 168$) at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities (Hatchett, 2020). These two groups of counselor educators differed on the following variables: proportion of counselor educators with Ph.D.'s, binary gender, perceptions of tenure criteria, scholarly productivity on an annual basis and at the time of tenure applications, teaching schedules, distribution of work responsibilities, work hours, and income. Implications for counselor education and training are presented.

Keywords

counselor education, tenure and promotion, scholarly productivity, doctoral-level counseling programs

Counselor educators on the tenure track often struggle with the challenge of learning a new work role, a role in which they must find an adaptive balance—unique to each university—among the primary faculty responsibilities of teaching, scholarship, and service (e.g., Davis et al., 2006; Hill, 2004). Though teaching and service are important in the tenure evaluation process, counselor educators seem to be most concerned about meeting their universities' expectations for scholarly productivity (Hill, 2004). This fear is not unfounded. Not only is the benchmark for scholarly productivity often unclear, but expectations for scholarly productivity have increased in recent decades, especially for faculty at research-intensive universities (Henderson, 2011; McGrail et al., 2006).

Despite the importance of scholarly productivity for tenure and promotion decisions (e.g., Ramsey et al., 2002), there has been very little systematic research on the level of scholarly productivity that counselor educators will likely need to earn tenure and promotion to associate professor (Davis et al., 2006). At one level, it is impossible to precisely specify the level of scholarly productivity needed for a counselor educator to successfully earn tenure or promotion. Not only are tenure decisions subjective at the individual institutional level, but expectations for scholarly productivity vary widely across the different kinds of universities that comprise the Carnegie Classification system (e.g., Henderson, 2011). Nonetheless, nomothetic data on the level of scholarly productivity typically needed for successful tenure and promotion decisions could offer several benefits. For one, doctoral students in counselor education could use such information in making informed decisions about accepting faculty positions at particular types of universities. Specifically, doctoral students could weigh the typical level of scholarly productivity required at a university with their own interests in research and publishing. Second, this same kind of data could

provide decision-makers involved in the tenure and promotion process with more valid information for evaluating tenure candidates (Davis et al., 2006).

In one of the first studies that attempted to address this issue, Ramsey et al. (2002) surveyed 113 counselor educators about their scholarly productivity over the past three years, along with their perceptions of the importance of various scholarly artifacts in the tenure and promotion process. Ramsey et al. found a high level of variability in the scholarly productivity of their sample, which varied as a function of academic rank, institutional affiliation, gender, and tenure-track status. With regard to promotion and tenure decisions, the counselor educators who responded to this survey identified peer-reviewed journals as most important in the tenure and promotion process, followed by conference presentations, other published works (e.g., books), other written works (e.g., grants), leadership positions, the scholarship of teaching, and other professional activities (e.g., consultations). Though this study provided some needed information on counselor educators' scholarly productivity and its importance in the tenure and promotion process, this study did not directly assess the question as to how much scholarly productivity will likely be needed for successful promotion and tenure decisions.

To better directly address this later question, Davis et al. (2006) surveyed 74 CACREP liaisons as to their perceptions of the tenure and promotion policies at their respective universities. These liaisons reported that teaching, research, and service were equally valued in the tenure and promotion process, and the relative value of these activities did not differ between programs that offered only master's degrees and those that offered both master's and doctoral degrees. For promotion to associate professor, these liaisons estimated that a counselor educator would need to accrue .91 journal articles, 1.50 conference presentations, and .09 books on an annual basis; the corresponding estimates for promotion to full professor were 1.00, 1.62, and .19, respectively.

Regarding future research, Davis et al. (2006) recommended that researchers expand this line of research beyond CACREP liaisons and to also examine the cumulative records of those who had successfully earned tenure and promotion.

Building on Davis et al.'s (2006) research, Hatchett (2020) directly surveyed 168 counselor educators at master's-only counseling programs at comprehensive universities about their perceptions of the tenure process, their cumulative scholarly achievements, and their related work experiences. A few highlights of this survey will be summarized here. Consistent with the mission of a comprehensive university (Youn & Price, 2009), these counselor educators reported that teaching and service were more important than scholarly productivity in evaluating faculty for tenure and promotion. However, some level of scholarly productivity was still considered to be necessary for a successful tenure application. For example, these survey respondents indicated that a minimum of four peer-reviewed journal articles would be needed to attain tenure at their respective universities. Unique to this survey, counselor educators who had already attained tenure were asked to describe their scholarly productivity at the time of their tenure applications. Those with tenure reported accruing a median of 5.00 ($m = 5.90$) peer-reviewed publications in national/international journals, a median of 1.00 ($m = 1.68$) book chapter, a median of 1.00 ($m = 2.15$) successfully funded grant, a median of 10 ($m = 13.70$) presentations at national/international conferences, and a median of 8.00 ($m = 10.31$) presentations at regional/state conferences at the time of their tenure applications.

The survey by Hatchett (2020) built upon the prior research by Ramsey et al. (2002) and Davis et al. (2006) and provided more detailed data about counselor educators' perceptions of the tenure evaluation process, their cumulative scholarly productivity—and unique to this survey—the scholarly productivity of counselor educators who had successfully attained tenure. An obvious

limitation to the survey by Hatchett (2020) was its exclusive focus on counselor educators at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities. To address this deficiency, Hatchett (2020) recommended that this research be extended to counselor educators at doctoral-level counselor education programs.

Accordingly, the purpose of the current study was to replicate and extend the survey research conducted by Hatchett (2020) to counselor educators at doctoral-level counselor education programs. This study had two major objectives. The first objective was to simply describe the survey responses of counselor educators at doctoral-level programs in terms of their perceptions of tenure criteria, their scholarly productivity, and their work experiences as counselor educators in doctoral-level programs. The second objective was to combine their survey responses with the responses provided by counselor educators at comprehensive universities (Hatchett, 2020), and to run several inferential statistical tests to directly compare these two groups of counselor educators. Based on general differences across different types of higher educational institutions (Boyer, 1990; Henderson, 2011; Ramsey et al., 2002; Youn & Price, 2009), three specific research hypotheses were tested: (1) Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs would report a higher value on scholarly productivity and lower values on teaching effectiveness and service in the tenure evaluation process compared to counselor educators at comprehensive universities; (2) Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs would report higher levels of scholarly productivity, both on an annual basis and at the time of their tenure applications, than counselor educators at comprehensive universities; and, (3) Counselor educators at comprehensive universities would report teaching more courses, spending more time on teaching and service, and spending less time on scholarship compared to counselor educators at doctoral-level programs.

Method

Participants

A total of 119 counselor educators at doctoral-level programs provided usable survey data for this study. Among this sample, 59 (50.9%) identified as female, 56 (48.3%) as male, and one (.9%) as non-binary. Three-fourths ($n = 87$; 75.0%) of the participants described themselves as white/Caucasian, 11 (9.5%) as black/African American, 6 (5.2%) as Hispanic/Latino, 5 (4.3%) as multiple races/ethnicities, 4 (3.4%) as Asian/Pacific Islander, and 3 (2.6%) identified as *other*. Their ages ranged from 28 to 76 ($Mdn = 44.00$, $M = 46.63$, $SD = 12.26$). Regarding relationship status, 86 (74.1%) described themselves as married, 14 (12.1%) as single/never married, 10 (8.6%) as divorced, and 6 (5.2%) as being in a committed partnership. Regarding dependent children, 70 (60.3%) of the respondents reported having no children under the age of 18, 21 (18.1%) reported having one child, 22 (19.0%) reported having two children, and 3 (2.6%) reported having three children.

Among this sample, 47 (40.9%) participants reported they held the rank of assistant professor, 27 (23.5%) the rank of associate professor, and 41 (35.7%) the rank of professor. Regarding tenure status, 59 (51.3%) participants reported they had already attained tenure, 48 (41.7%) reported being on the tenure-track, and 8 (7.0%) reported not having a tenure-track position. Regarding their terminal degrees, 109 (94.0%) participants reported having Ph.D.'s, and 7 (6.0%) reported having Ed.D.'s. Approximately three-fourths ($n = 90$, 77.6%) of the participants reported their degrees were in counselor education; this was followed by counseling psychology ($n = 10$, 8.6%), rehabilitation counseling ($n = 8$, 6.9%), educational leadership ($n = 1$, .9%), and *other* ($n = 7$, 6.0%). The *other* terminal degrees included adult education, developmental psychology, general psychology, rehabilitation psychology, and social/personality psychology. Approximately

three-fourths of the participants ($n = 89, 76.7\%$) reported their terminal degrees were attained from CACREP-accredited doctoral programs. The years during which these counselor educators earned their terminal degrees ranged from 1980 to 2019 ($Mdn = 2009.00, M = 2006.13, SD = 10.39$). Participants reported a median of 10 years of total experience as counselor educators ($M = 12.68, SD = 9.70$), and a median of 5 years of experience in their current faculty positions ($M = 8.57, SD = 7.88$). Participants were asked to identify the CACREP specialization with which they most strongly identified: 54 (46.6%) selected clinical mental health counseling, 18 (15.5%) school counseling, 12 (10.3%) clinical rehabilitation counseling, 7 (6.0%) marriage, couple, and family counseling, 3 (2.6%) addiction counseling, 2 (1.6%) rehabilitation counseling, 1 (.9%) college counseling and student affairs, 13 (11.2%) multiple specializations, and 8 (6.9%) *other* areas. Most ($n = 93, 80.2\%$) of these counselor educators were faculty at public universities, 13 (11.2%) were faculty at private, religious universities, and 10 (8.6%) were faculty at private, non-religious universities.

Survey Instrument

The survey used in the current study was a modification of the survey developed by Hatchett (2020) for a sample of counselor educators in master's-only programs at comprehensive universities (see Hatchett, 2020, for more details about its development.) Forty-five of the items on this modified survey were copied verbatim from the survey used by Hatchett (2020). The differences in the modified survey included the following: (1) three additional items were added on workload to better represent the work responsibilities of doctoral-level program faculty, (2) one additional item (i.e., grant funding) was added on tenure criteria, (3) two items that inquired about cumulative conference presentations were removed because of concerns with accurate recall, and (3) and the four items that inquired about perceptions of career preparation were changed from a

comprehensive university to a doctoral-level counselor education program. Items on both surveys were informed by other research on the tenure and evaluation process in counselor education (Davis et al., 2006; Ramey et al., 2002).

Altogether, the modified Qualtrics Survey included a total of 55 items; survey respondents who had already attained tenure were presented with all 55 items, whereas those who were untenured were presented with only 48 items. The survey items were organized into the following general categories: demographics (5 items), professional background (10 items), perceptions of tenure criteria (8 items), cumulative scholarly productivity (5 items), scholarly productivity at the time of one's tenure application (7 items), workload (14 items), salary (2 items), and perceived preparation for a faculty position in a doctoral-level counselor education program (4 items). Survey responses included a mixture of nominal, ordinal, and ratio-level data. The Qualtrics program did not collect participants' IP addresses, thereby offering another safeguard to protect participants' confidentiality.

Procedure

Prior to conducting this research, institutional IRB approval was secured, and subsequent study procedures complied with the *Code of Ethics* of the American Counseling Association (2014). During the fall of 2019, the online CACREP Directory was searched to identify accredited doctoral programs in counselor education and supervision; this resulted in the identification of 82 accredited doctoral programs. Similar to the decision made by Hatchett (2020), programs ($n = 7$) that denoted their entire faculty as CORE without any corresponding academic ranks were removed from consideration for this study. Such programs presumably have minimal expectations for scholarly productivity because their faculty cannot advance through a traditional promotional system. The 75 remaining doctoral programs were housed in universities with the following Carnegie

Classifications: 31 (41.3%) R1 (Doctoral Universities-Very High Research Activity), 29 (38.7%) R2 (Doctoral Universities-High Research Activity), 8 (10.7%) D/PU (Doctoral/Professional Universities), 6 (8.0%) M1 (Master's-Larger Programs), and 1 (1.3%) M3 (Master's-Smaller Programs) universities.

As a second step, the websites of these 75 accredited doctoral-level programs were searched to identify the names and email addresses of eligible counselor educators. Only faculty with traditional academic ranks (assistant professor, associate professor, professor) were deemed eligible for this study; faculty members who were denoted as instructors, lecturers, or clinical coordinators were excluded because these faculty members presumably have lower requirements for scholarly productivity than faculty with traditional academic ranks. After applying this criterion, a total population of 609 counselor educators were identified as eligible for study inclusion. During the fall of 2019, a personally addressed email with a link to a Qualtrics Survey was sent to each of these eligible counselor educators. A reminder email was sent approximately 7-14 days after the initial email, and a second reminder email was sent approximately 7-14 days after the first reminder email. To improve response rates, participants were given the opportunity to win one of four \$25 gift certificates.

Response Rate

From the total population of eligible counselor educators ($N = 609$), 138 individuals followed the email link to the Qualtrics website. However, 19 of these individuals did not complete at least half of the survey items, and, consequently, were removed from the study. This left a remaining sample size of 119. Compared to the original population of eligible counselor educators at doctoral-level programs ($N = 609$), this translates to a usable response rate of 19.5%.

Data Analysis Strategy

First, participants' responses were summarized using basic descriptive statistics. Second, the survey responses of these counselor educators were combined with the survey responses of counselor educators at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities (Hatchett, 2020) into a single SPSS dataset, and the two groups of counselor educators were compared on identical survey items using either chi-square analyses or independent samples t-tests.

Results

Comparison of the Two Samples on Demographic and Professional Characteristics

The counselor educators at doctoral-level programs were similar to the counselor educators at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities (Hatchett, 2020) in terms of race/ethnicity [$\chi^2(5) = 3.00, p = .70, V = .10$], age [$t(277) = .95, p = .34, d = .12$], relationship status [$\chi^2(4) = 5.08, p = .28, V = .14$], and the frequency of having children under the age of 18 [$\chi^2(5) = 2.98, p = .70, V = .10$]. The two samples of counselor educators did differ in terms of binary gender identity [$\chi^2(1) = 4.769, p = .03, V = .13$]. Female counselor educators represented a higher percentage of the faculty at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities (63.1%) compared to their representation (50.9%) among faculty at doctoral-level programs (*adjusted standardized residual* 2.2). (Counselor educators who reported a non-binary gender identify were not included in this analysis because of their small cell sizes.)

The counselor educators employed in doctoral-level programs were similar to the counselor educators at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities (Hatchett, 2020) in terms of academic rank [$\chi^2(2) = 3.79, p = .15, V = .12$], tenure status [$\chi^2(2) = 1.45, p = .49, V = .07$], discipline of terminal degree [$\chi^2(5) = 6.04, p = .30, V = .15$], the likelihood of having a terminal

degree from a CACREP-accredited program [$\chi^2(1) = .25, p = .62, V = .03$], year of degree attainment [$t(218) = 1.02, p = .31, d = .13$], total years of experience [$t(209) = -1.50, p = .14, d = -.19$], years of experience in current position [$t(208) = -1.25, p = .21, d = -.16$], CACREP specialization [$\chi^2(8) = 6.74, p = .57, V = .15$], and the institutional affiliations of their current universities [$\chi^2(2) = 4.78, p = .09, V = .13$]. The two groups of counselor educators differed in their distribution of terminal degrees [$\chi^2(3) = 9.50, p = .02, V = .18$]: 94.0% ($n = 109$) of the counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported having had Ph.D.'s compared to 83.3% ($n = 140$) of the counselor educators at comprehensive universities (*adjusted standardized residual 2.7*).

Perceptions of Tenure Criteria

Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs were asked to rate the perceived importance of six professional activities (teaching, scholarship, grant work, institutional service, professional service, and community service) in evaluating counselor educators for tenure at their respective universities. These survey questions and the participants' responses are organized in Table 1.

Table 1*Perceptions of Tenure Criteria in Doctoral-Level Counselor Education Programs*

Survey Item	<i>Extremely Important</i>	<i>Very Important</i>	<i>Moderately Important</i>	<i>Slightly/Not Important</i>
At your current university, what is the value placed on <i>teaching effectiveness</i> in evaluating candidates for tenure?	30 (26.5%)	51 (45.1%)	24 (20.2%)	8 (7.1%)
At your current university, what is the value placed on <i>research and scholarship</i> in evaluating candidates for tenure?	65 (57.5%)	26 (23.0%)	13 (11.5%)	9 (8.0%)
At your current university, what is the value placed on attaining <i>grant funding</i> in evaluating candidates for tenure?	20 (18.0%)	34 (30.6%)	29 (26.1%)	28 (25.2%)
At your current university, what is the value placed on <i>institutional service</i> in evaluating candidates for tenure?	6 (5.4%)	22 (19.6%)	54 (48.2%)	30 (26.8%)
At your current university, what is the value placed on <i>professional service</i> in evaluating candidates for tenure?	3 (2.7%)	22 (19.6%)	59 (52.7%)	28 (25.0%)
At your current university, what is the value placed on <i>community service</i> in evaluating candidates for tenure?	1 (.9%)	11 (9.9%)	35 (31.5%)	64 (57.6%)

The next set of analyses evaluated whether their perceptions of tenure criteria differed from the perceptions of counselor educators at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities surveyed by Hatchett (2020). (Counselor educators at comprehensive universities were not asked to rate the perceived value of grant work, so this item was excluded from the subsequent analyses.)

To facilitate these comparisons, the response options in both surveys were assigned the following numerical values: 1 = *extremely important*, 2 = *very important*, 3 = *moderately important*, and 4 = *slightly/not important*. Counselor educators at comprehensive universities ($m = 1.42, sd = .67$) reported that teaching effectiveness was more important in the tenure evaluation process than counselor educators at doctoral-level programs ($m = 2.10, sd = .90$): $t(267) = -7.02, p < .001, d = -.80$). Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs ($m = 1.71, sd = .99$) reported that research/scholarship was more important in the tenure evaluation process than counselor educators at comprehensive universities ($m = 2.46, sd = .95$): $t(264) = 6.30, p < .001, d = .73$). Counselor educators at comprehensive universities ($m = 2.15, sd = .70$) reported that institutional service was more important in the tenure evaluation process than counselor educators at doctoral-level programs ($m = 2.99, sd = .88$): $t(189) = -7.08, p < .001, d = -.92$). Counselor educators at comprehensive universities ($m = 2.63, sd = .96$) reported that professional service was more important in the tenure evaluation process than counselor educators at doctoral-level programs ($m = 3.04, sd = .83$): $t(254) = -3.76, p < .001, d = -.45$). Finally, counselor educators at comprehensive universities ($m = 2.78, sd = 1.06$) reported that community service was more important in the tenure evaluation process than counselor educators at doctoral-level programs ($m = 3.59, sd = .88$): $t(264) = -6.66, p < .001, d = -.77$).

The counselor educators at doctoral-level programs were asked to rank-order the value of seven scholarship products in the tenure evaluation process at their respective universities. Peer-reviewed journal articles were rated highest ($m = 1.29, sd = .75$), followed by grant funding ($m = 2.77, sd = 1.45$), complete books ($m = 3.92, sd = 1.67$), book chapters ($m = 3.96, sd = 1.12$) and national or international conference presentations ($m = 3.96, sd = 1.15$), regional or state conference presentations ($m = 5.38, sd = 1.15$), and newsletter articles ($m = 6.72, sd = .81$). The corresponding

rankings provided by counselor educators at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities (Hatchett, 2020) were peer-reviewed journal articles ($m = 1.36, sd = .83$), national or international conference presentations ($m = 3.34, sd = 1.35$), book chapters ($m = 3.63, sd = 1.33$), published books ($m = 4.17, sd = 1.90$), grant funding ($m = 4.29, sd = 1.70$), regional or state conference presentations ($m = 4.63, sd = 1.46$), and articles published in newsletters ($m = 6.57, sd = .77$).

Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs were asked to record their perceptions as to the number of peer-reviewed journal article publications that would be needed to earn tenure at their respective institutions. As predicted, counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported that more journal article publications ($m = 10.49, sd = 5.83$) would be needed for a successful tenure application compared to their colleagues at comprehensive universities ($m = 4.17, sd = 2.87$): $t(152) = -10.36, p < .001, d = -1.17$.

Scholarly Productivity

The counselor educators at doctoral-level programs were asked about their cumulative scholarly productivity across five common indices: national/international journal article publications, state-level journal article publications, book chapters, books, and successfully funded grants. To control for differences in work experience, scholarly productivity was estimated on an annual basis by taking the number of scholarly products in each area and dividing this sum by the total number of years of experience reported as a counselor educator. The average annual scholarly productivity reported by these counselor educators is summarized in Table 2, together with the same summary statistics reported by the counselor educators at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities (Hatchett, 2020). The counselor educators at doctoral-level programs who had already attained tenure ($n = 59$) were directed to a separate set of survey questions that inquired about their scholarly probability *at the time* of their tenure applications. Their scholarly

productivity at the time of their tenure applications is summarized at the bottom of Table 2, along with the corresponding summary statistics for the counselor educators at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities (Hatchett, 2020).

Table 2

Comparison of the Scholarly Productivity of Counselor Educators at Doctoral-Level and Master's-Only Programs at Comprehensive Universities

Scholarly Artifacts	Doctoral-Level		Master's-Only		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>m</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>sd</i>		
<i>Annual Scholarly Productivity</i>						
National/International Journal Articles	2.46	2.05	.81	1.06	-7.58***	-.95
State-Level Journal Articles	.14	.28	.13	.27	-.23	-.04
Book Chapters	.70	.99	.27	.66	-3.97***	-.51
Books	.06	.11	.05	.13	-.67	-.08
Grants	.61	.85	.34	.68	-2.63**	-.36
<i>Cumulative Scholarly Productivity at the Time of Tenure Applications</i>						
National/International Journal Articles	16.44	9.17	5.90	5.66	-7.07***	-1.13
State-Level Journal Articles	1.38	2.20	1.28	2.12	-.27	-.05
Book Chapters	3.72	3.36	1.68	1.91	-3.99***	-.72
Books	.41	.74	.51	2.20	.32	.06
Grants	2.79	3.14	2.15	4.86	-.84	-.15
National/International Presentations	26.71	17.70	13.70	13.90	-4.30***	-.77
Regional/State Presentations	14.92	12.06	10.31	8.64	-2.41*	-.44

Note. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Teaching Loads, Work Allocations, and Financial Compensation

Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported teaching an average of 2.32 ($sd = .69$) courses each fall and spring semester, which was significantly fewer courses than the counselor

educators at comprehensive universities ($m = 3.15$, $sd = .83$) surveyed by Hatchett (2020): [$t(282) = 8.84$, $p < .001$, $d = .94$]. Forty-eight (41.4%) of the counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported receiving reassigned time from teaching for other faculty responsibilities, which included administration ($n = 34$), research ($n = 16$), and *other* ($n = 7$) activities. This percentage of reassigned time was similar to that reported by counselor educators at comprehensive universities (49.4%): [$\chi^2(1) = 1.91$, $p = .17$, $V = .08$]. Regarding summer teaching, 79.3% ($n = 92$) of the counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported teaching during the summer semester, teaching an average of 1.98 courses ($sd = .89$). These counselor educators were less likely to teach during the summer semester than their colleagues at comprehensive universities (88.7%): [$\chi^2(1) = 4.70$, $p = .03$, $V = .13$]. The counselor educators at doctoral-level programs were also asked about their participation on dissertation committees, which was unique to this sample. At any one time, these counselor educators reported chairing a median of 2 ($M = 2.15$, $SD = 2.20$) dissertations and serving as non-chair committee members on a median of 4 ($M = 4.44$, $SD = 3.67$) dissertations.

The counselor educators in doctoral-level programs were asked to indicate the percentage of their workload spent across four counselor education activities: teaching, research/scholarship, administration, and service. For the most part, these percentages diverged in the predicted directions from their colleagues at comprehensive universities. Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported spending less time on teaching-related responsibilities ($m = 36.19$, $sd = 15.49$) than their colleagues at comprehensive universities ($m = 47.62$, $sd = 18.84$): [$t(277) = 5.60$, $p < .001$, $d = .62$]. Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported spending more time involved in research/scholarship ($m = 29.21$, $sd = 14.41$) than their colleagues at comprehensive universities ($m = 13.73$, $sd = 9.61$): [$t(188) = -10.20$, $p < .001$, $d = -1.10$]. Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported spending less time on administrative tasks ($m = 13.31$, $sd = 15.25$)

than their colleagues at comprehensive universities ($m = 19.22$, $sd = 17.98$): [$t(273) = 2.99$, $p = .003$, $d = .35$]. (The degrees of freedom in these three analyses were reduced to compensate for violating the homogeneity of variance assumption.) However, contrary to what was predicted, counselor educators at doctoral-level programs ($m = 17.90$, $sd = 9.44$) and comprehensive universities ($m = 16.94$, $sd = 9.84$) reported spending comparable percentages of their workloads in service-related activities: [$t(276) = -.82$, $p = .41$, $d = -.10$]. Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs were also asked to estimate the total number of hours they spent working on faculty-related responsibilities in a typical workweek; their responses are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

Time Spent on Faculty-Related Responsibilities in a Typical Week

Work Pattern	<i>n</i>	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Less than 20 hours a week	2	1.7%	1.7%
20-25 hours a week	5	4.3%	6.0%
26-30 hours week	7	6.0%	12.1%
31-35 hours a week	3	2.6%	14.7%
36-40 hours a week	13	11.2%	25.9%
41-45 hours a week	18	15.5%	41.4%
46-50 hours a week	25	21.6%	62.9%
51-55 hours a week	22	19.0%	81.9%
56-60 hours a week	12	10.3%	92.2%
More than 60 hours a week	9	7.8%	100.0%

Overall, counselor educators in doctoral-level programs reported working more hours each week than their colleagues at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities: $U = 12074$, $p < .001$.

As one example of this pattern, 74.1% of the counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported working more than 40 hours a week, whereas only 46.5% of the counselor educators at comprehensive universities reported doing so.

Doctoral-level counselor educators were asked to report their faculty salaries for both the academic (9/10 months) and full calendar years. (Participants were explicitly instructed to exclude any income from outside sources.) The academic year (9/10 month) salaries for these counselor educators ranged from \$53,530 to \$192,500 ($Mdn = \$74,000$, $M = \$81,159$, $SD = \$21,345$). These salaries varied as a function of academic rank [$F(2,102) = 27.91$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .35$]: assistant professors ($m = \$67,664$, $sd = \$6,871$), associate professors ($m = \$81,206$, $sd = \$15,408$), and professors ($m = \$97,166$, $sd = \$25,744$). Their 12-month salaries ranged from \$53,530 to \$192,500 ($Mdn = \$81,750$, $M = \$88,166$, $SD = \$23,957$). These twelve-month salaries also varied as a function of academic rank [$F(2,100) = 20.01$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .29$]: assistant professors ($m = \$75,699$, $sd = \$12,673$), associate professors ($m = \$89,679$, $sd = \$17,328$), and professors ($m = \$105,488$, $sd = \$29,069$). Overall, counselor educators at doctoral-level programs earned more than counselor educators at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities during both the academic [$F(1, 261) = 35.92$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$] and full calendar years [$F(1,259) = 23.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .08$]; specifically, counselor educators at doctoral-level programs earned, on average, \$13,563 more than counselor educators at comprehensive universities during the academic year and \$12,821 more during the calendar year.

Additional survey items inquired about participants' involvement in remunerated professional activities apart from their regular faculty responsibilities. Fifty (43.1%) of the counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported receiving supplemental financial compensation from professional activities outside their regular faculty salaries. In this subsample,

the most commonly reported remunerated activities included consultation ($n = 24$), clinical practice ($n = 16$), clinical supervision ($n = 13$), adjunct teaching ($n = 7$), and *other* activities ($n = 17$). Both groups of counselor educators were equally likely to participate in outside remunerated activities: $\chi^2(1) = .01, p = .92, V = .01$. Finally, unique to this survey, doctoral-level counselor educators were asked if they were required to attain grant funding to support at least part of their faculty salaries: 26 (22.8%) participants reported this was a requirement, whereas 88 (77.2%) responded this was unnecessary.

Perceived Preparation for a Faculty Position in a Doctoral-Level Program

Finally, counselor educators at doctoral-level programs were asked to evaluate how well prepared they believed themselves to be for a faculty member in a doctoral-level counselor education program. First, these counselor educators were asked a general question about their overall level of preparation: *Overall, how well did your doctoral program prepare you to be successful as a faculty member in a doctoral-level counselor education program?* In response, 37 (32.7%) reported they were *extremely well prepared*, 36 (31.9%) reported *very well prepared*, 30 (26.5%) reported *moderately well prepared*, 8 (7.1%) reported *slightly well prepared*, and 2 (1.8%) reported *not prepared at all*. As a follow-up, participants were then asked to evaluate how well they were prepared for a faculty position at a doctoral-level counselor education program in three specific domains of counselor education: course preparation and teaching, research and scholarship, and clinical supervision. Their responses are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4*Perceptions of Preparation for a Faculty Position in a Doctoral-Level Program*

Competency	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Well</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Terrible</i>
<i>Course Preparation & Teaching</i>	33(29.2%)	41(36.3%)	23(20.4%)	14(12.4%)	2(1.8%)
<i>Research & Scholarship</i>	54(47.8%)	28(24.8%)	21(18.6%)	9(8.0%)	1(.9%)
<i>Clinical Supervision</i>	50(44.6%)	39(34.8%)	16(14.3%)	5(4.5%)	2(1.8%)

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to extend the survey research conducted by Hatchett (2020) to counselor educators employed in doctoral-level counselor education programs. In addition to describing the survey responses of counselor educators at doctoral-level programs, their responses were combined with the responses of counselor educators at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities (Hatchett, 2020), and a number of inferential statistical tests were run to directly compare the two groups of counselor educators on identical survey items. In addition to a number of exploratory analyses, three specific hypotheses were evaluated: (1) Counselor educators at doctoral-level universities would report a higher value on research/scholarly productivity and lower values on teaching and service in the tenure evaluation process compared to their colleagues at comprehensive universities; (2) Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs would report higher levels of scholarly productivity, both on an annual basis and at the time of their tenure applications, compared to counselor educators at comprehensive universities; and, finally, (3) congruent with what is valued in the tenure evaluation process, counselor educators at doctoral-level programs would report teaching fewer courses, spending more time on research, and spending less time on teaching and service compared to their colleagues at comprehensive universities.

Before discussing the evidence for these hypotheses, the next section will briefly discuss the extent to which these two samples of counselor educators differed on basic demographic and professional characteristics.

Demographic and Professional Characteristics

The counselor educators at doctoral-level programs were similar to counselor educators at master's-only counseling programs at comprehensive universities (Hatchett, 2020) on most of the demographic and professional characteristics tested. There were only two statistically significant differences between these two groups of counselor educators. Though female counselor educators represented the majority of faculty at both types of programs, there was a higher percentage of female faculty employed at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities than at doctoral-level counselor education programs. Other studies have also found a higher percentage of male faculty in doctoral-level counselor education programs (e.g., Lambie et al., 2013). One plausible explanation—and one consistent with the data from the current study—is that faculty in doctoral-level programs spend more time on work-related responsibilities, leaving less time for family and caregiving responsibilities. Given that women often spend more time than men on family and caregiving responsibilities (e.g., Neal et al., 1997), female counselor educators may be more interested in faculty positions at comprehensive universities where a healthier work life balance may be more feasible. On the other hand, these gender differences could be the result of biases in the hiring process in which women are perceived as less capable of scholarly productivity than men (e.g., Moss-Racusin et al., 2012). Both of these potential explanations are speculative. Future research should attempt to more intentionally investigate female counselor educators' perceptions and experiences of the job search process.

Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs were more likely to have Ph.D.'s compared to their colleagues at comprehensive universities. Traditionally, Ph.D. degree programs have been designed to prepare graduates for careers in research and higher education, whereas Ed.D. degree programs have been designed to offer advanced training to individuals in applied professional careers, most often in the area of educational leadership (e.g., Dill & Morrison, 1985). Thus, it might be expected that a higher percentage of counselor educators who are faculty in doctoral-level counseling programs, which are disproportionately housed in research-intensive universities, would have a higher percentage of faculty with Ph.D. degrees. Yet, in actual practice, researchers have often found that both types of degree programs are very similar in terms of coursework and required research competencies (e.g., Kolbert et al., 1999; Osguthorpe, & Wong, 1993). Ed.D. degrees continue to be offered in counselor education; at the time of this writing, 10 accredited doctoral programs still offer this degree. However, research on the role of the Ed.D. in counselor education is now dated (Kolbert et al., 1999), so future research might be directed to understanding the current role of the Ed.D. in counselor education, how Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs systematically differ, and how an Ed.D. degree might limit faculty employment opportunities in doctoral-level counselor education programs.

Perceptions of Tenure Criteria

Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs and master's-only programs at comprehensive universities diverged in their perceptions as to what is most valued in the tenure evaluation process. As predicted, counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported that research/scholarly productivity was more important in evaluating tenure cases at their respective universities than counselor educators at comprehensive universities. Consistent with this difference, counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported more than double ($m = 10.49$) the number

of journal article publications needed for a successful tenure application than their colleagues at comprehensive universities ($m = 4.17$). Also, as predicted, counselor educators at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities reported that teaching effectiveness and all three types of service—institutional, professional, community—were more important in the tenure evaluation process than their colleagues at doctoral-level programs.

Scholarly Productivity

As predicted, counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported substantially more scholarly productivity than their colleagues at comprehensive universities both on an annual basis and at the time of their tenure applications. Nonetheless, it is important to recognize the large within-group variability on many of the scholarly indices; the standard deviations of many of these indices were often as large as the corresponding mean values. As just one example of this within-group variability, the lowest 10% of counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported less than .3 national/international journal articles per year, whereas the top 10% of counselor educators at comprehensive universities reported a minimum of 2 national/international journal articles per year (Hatchett, 2020).

Workloads

Consistent with their perceptions of the tenure evaluation process, counselor educators at doctoral-level programs and master's-only programs at comprehensive universities diverged in how they partitioned their work responsibilities. Counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported spending proportionally more time on scholarship, whereas counselor educators at comprehensive universities reported spending more time on teaching and administrative responsibilities. Counselor educators in both groups reported spending comparable proportions of time in service activities, which was contrary to that predicted. While it may certainly be true that

both groups of counselor educators spend equal amounts of time on service, this result may have also resulted from difficulties in differentiating service from administrative responsibilities. These two activities were not operationally defined in the survey questions, so survey responders may have confounded the two types of faculty responsibilities. Finally, counselor educators at doctoral-level programs reported working more hours each week than their colleagues at comprehensive universities. Though this finding may seem intuitive, very few studies have actually compared the workloads of faculty at comprehensive and research-focused universities. In one of the few studies of this nature, Townsend and Rosser (2007) found that workload differences were minimal; specifically, they found that faculty at comprehensive universities reported working an average of 53.15 hours a week compared to an average of 54.71 hours a week for faculty at research-oriented universities.

Preparation for a Doctoral-Level Counseling Program

The final set of survey items asked survey respondents to rate their perceived preparation for a faculty position in a doctoral-level counselor education program. Compared to their ratings in research and clinical supervision, these counselor educators rated their training in course preparation and teaching relatively lower. For example, 29.2% of these counselor educators rated their preparation in course preparation and teaching as *excellent*; the corresponding *excellent* ratings in research and clinical supervision were 47.8% and 44.6%, respectively. Counselor educators at master's-only programs at comprehensive universities also rated their preparation in teaching lower than the other two domains. These findings are also consistent with the concerns expressed by other counselor educators as to the relative weakness of pedagogical training in the field of counselor education (e.g., Barrio Minton, et al., 2014; Orr et al., 2008).

Limitations

There are several limitations to this survey research, three of which will be highlighted below. One clear limitation is the low response rate to this survey. Even after two email reminders, slightly less than 20% of the eligible counselor educators at doctoral-level programs completed the survey. Though a relatively low response rate, the response rate attained in the current study was comparable to the response rate attained by Hatchett (2020) in a similar survey of counselor educators at comprehensive universities, and it was similar to the response rates reported in other recent surveys of counselor educators (e.g., Stebnicki et al., 2017; Welfare et al., 2017). Relatedly, a second limitation to the generalizability of this survey's results may be a function of the particular counselor educators who chose to complete a survey of this nature. The counselor educators who took the time to complete this survey should not automatically be viewed as a representative sample of the total population of counselor educators at doctoral-level programs. Though speculative, it seems plausible that the counselor educators who took the time to complete this somewhat lengthy survey may be more interested in scholarship—or at least the tenure and promotion process—than those counselor educators who chose not to participate. A third limitation to consider is the possibility of Type I errors as a result of conducting multiple inferential statistical tests. In addition to testing three distinct research hypotheses, many additional inferential tests were conducted on an exploratory basis.

Implications for Counselor Education

This research—along with that conducted by Hatchett (2020)—provides doctoral students and counselor educators with entries in a proverbial occupational handbook. The results from these studies can inform both future and current counselor educators about the work experiences of counselor educators in both types of programs across several important domains: teaching loads,

salaries, participation in outside employment, time spent on various faculty activities, perceived tenure criteria, and typical scholarly productivity. However, in making sense of this occupational information, counselor educators need to carefully consider the high levels of within-group variability in these counselor educators' responses. These distributions of the two populations overlap considerably on a number of variables, so it is not possible to make clear-cut inferences about tenure expectations, scholarly productivity, and work experiences based solely on the nature of the counselor education program (master's-only at comprehensive universities vs. doctoral-level).

A second implication from the current research, one also evident in the prior survey by Hatchett (2020), is the need for a stronger focus in counselor education programs on training students in course preparation and teaching. Counselor educators at both comprehensive universities and doctoral-level programs reported being less well prepared in teaching relative to scholarship and clinical supervision. Yet, teaching is the area in which counselor educators at both types of programs reported spending a plurality of their worktime.

Recent research by Hall and Hulse (2010) may be informative in better preparing new counselor educators in the important task of teaching. In their survey of counselor educators, Hall and Hulse found that perceptions of teaching preparedness were associated with the following training experiences in graduate school: actual teaching experiences, faculty supervision of teaching, frequent feedback about teaching, opportunities for reflecting on this feedback, and discussions with fellow students and faculty on teaching. As part of an open-ended question, the counselor educators surveyed by Hall and Hulse also reported that the following experiences would have better prepared them to be successful teachers: mentoring, participation in teaching practicums, coursework on teaching, as well as more observation and feedback from experienced

faculty. To complement the research by Hall and Hulse (2010), counselor educators should also consider experimental designs to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of various training experiences in improving the teaching competencies of doctoral students in counselor education. Along this line, the counselor education literature would also benefit from more general research on the relative effectiveness of various pedagogical strategies—lectures, experiential activities, flipped classrooms, group discussions, reflective activities—in training future counselors.

Recommendations for Future Research

Given the few studies in this area, there exists many opportunities for follow-up research studies. One avenue for better understanding the tenure and evaluation process in counselor education would be to conduct quantitative or qualitative research on the expectations and decision-making processes of those involved in making tenure and promotion decisions. Such research might include tenured counselor educators who serve on tenure and promotion committees, department chairs, deans, or provosts. Research of this nature might better illuminate the criteria, both implicit and explicit, that decision makers use in evaluating counselor education faculty for tenure and promotion. Second, researchers might also develop and investigate more sophisticated metrics for evaluating the scholarly productivity of counselor educators. So far, the research on expected scholarly productivity has focused exclusively on the *numbers* of scholarly artifacts. Though easy to measure and count, the number of scholarly artifacts produced by a counselor educator does not adequately represent that individual's contribution to the counselor education literature. To state the obvious, not all journal article publications are created equal. Being the sole author on a groundbreaking study published in a top journal will likely carry more weight in the tenure and promotion process than being the eighth of eight authors on a minor study published in a lower-tiered journal. To address such discrepancies, researchers in other disciplines have attempted to create

standardized metrics to more accurately assess the value of a researcher's scholarly productivity, such as the commonly referenced h-index (Hirsch, 2005). Recently, the h-index has been applied to scholars in both social work (Lacasse et al., 2011) and psychology (Buela-Casal et al., 2011). Perhaps, researchers could validate the h-index or another metric as a means for more accurately describing the scholarly productivity of counselor educators.

References

- American Counseling Association. (2014). *ACA code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Barrio Minton, C. A., Morris, C. A. W., & Yaites, L. D. (2014). Pedagogy in counselor education: A 10-year content analysis of journals. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 53*, 162–177. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00055.x>
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton University Press.
- Buela-Casal, G., Olivas-Avila, J. A., Musi-Lechuga, B., & Zych, I. (2011). The h index of the presidents of the American Psychological Association (APA) through journal articles included in the Web of Science database. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 11*, 95–107. Retrieved from <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/337/33715423006.pdf>
- Davis, T. E., Levitt, D. H., McGlothlin, J. M., & Hill, N. R. (2006). Perceived expectations related to promotion and tenure: A national survey of CACREP Program liaisons. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 46*, 146–156. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00019.x>
- Dill, D. D., & Morrison, J. L. (1985). EdD and PhD research training in the field of higher education: A survey and a proposal. *The Review of Higher Education, 8*, 169–186. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/645315/summary>
- Hall, S. F., & Hulse, D. (2010). Perceptions of doctoral level teaching preparation in counselor education. *The Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision, 1*(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7729/12.0108>
- Hatchett, G. T. (2020). Perceived tenure standards, scholarly productivity, and workloads of counselor educators at comprehensive universities. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision, 13* (4). Retrieved from <https://repository.wcsu.edu/jcps/vol13/iss4/9>
- Henderson, B. B. (2011). Publishing patterns at state comprehensive universities: The changing nature of faculty work and the quest for status. *Journal of the Professoriate, 5*, 35–66. Retrieved from http://caarpweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/5-2_Henderson_p.35.pdf
- Hill, N. R. (2004). The challenges experienced by pretenured faculty members in counselor education: A wellness perspective. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*, 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2004.tb01866.x>
- Hirsch, J. E. (2005). An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 102*, 16569–16572. Retrieved from <https://www.pnas.org/content/102/46/16569?pagewanted=all>
- Kolbert, J. B., Brendel, J. M., & Gressard, C. F. (1997). Current perceptions of the Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Education degrees in counselor preparation. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 36*, 207–215. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1997.tb00387.x>
- Lacasse, J. R., Hodge, D. R., & Bean, K. F. (2011). Evaluating the productivity of social work scholars using the h-index. *Research on Social Work Practice, 21*, 599–607. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731511405069>
- McGrail, M. R., Rickard, C. M., & Jones, R. (2006). Publish or perish: A systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates. *Higher Education Research & Development, 25*, 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360500453053>
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109*, 16474–16479. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211286109>

- Neal, M. B., Ingersoll-Dayton, B., & Starrels, M. E. (1997). Gender and relationship differences in caregiving patterns and consequences among employed caregivers. *The Gerontologist*, 37, 804-816. <https://doi.10.1093/geront/37.6.804>
- Osguthorpe, R. T., & Wong, M. J. (1993). The Ph. D. versus the Ed. D.: Time for a decision. *Innovative Higher Education*, 18, 47-63. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF01742197>
- Orr, J. J., Hall, S. F., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2008). A model for collaborative teaching teams in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 47, 146-163. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2008.tb00046.x>
- Ramsey, M., Cavallaro, M., Kiselica, M., & Zila, L. (2002). Scholarly productivity redefined in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 42, 40-57. <https://doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2002.tb01302.x>
- Stebnicki, M. A., Clemmons-James, D., & Leierer, S. (2017). A survey of military counseling content and curriculum among Council on Rehabilitation Education- and Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs-accredited programs. *Rehabilitation Research, Policy and Education*, 31, 40-49. <https://doi.org/10.1891/2168-6653.31.1.40>
- Townsend, B. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2007). Workload issues and measures of faculty productivity. *Thought & Action*, 23, 7-19. Retrieved from http://whp-template.nea.org/assets/img/PubThoughtAndAction/TAA_07_02.pdf
- Welfare, L. E., Wagstaff, J., & Haynes, J. R. (2017). Counselor education and Title IX: Current perceptions and questions. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 56, 193-207. <http://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12072>
- Youn, T. I. K., & Price, T. M. (2009). Learning from the experience of others: The evolution of faculty tenure and promotion rules in comprehensive institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80, 204- 237. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/255>