

LSU Health Sciences Center – New Orleans

Department of Clinical Rehabilitation and Counseling

2018-2019 Annual Report

Program Outcomes

The Department of Clinical Rehabilitation and Counseling in the School of Allied Health Professions at Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center in New Orleans is fully accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs (CACREP) through 2023. The department awards the Master of Health Sciences degree in Clinical Rehabilitation and Counseling (MHS- CRC) upon successful completion of 60 credit hours of required coursework and fieldwork. All academic courses are classroom-based and the fieldwork courses (Practicum and Internship I & II) include a weekly supervision seminar facilitated by 1-2 faculty members in the department. Students in the Practicum and Internship courses are supervised and formally evaluated by both a staff member (licensed supervisor) on site at the assigned agency and by 1-2 member(s) of the department faculty. There are five full-time faculty in the department. All full-time faculty members hold the doctoral degree and two of the faculty hold the CRC credential at a minimum. The cost of the Clinical Rehabilitation and Counseling program per semester is \$7,468.22, including tuition, fees, health insurance, and books. The department was awarded a long-term training grant funded by the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) which pays tuition, and, if available, a stipend for students who apply and accept the employment-payback provisions of accepting the scholarship award.

Approximately 14 applicants are accepted annually. The program currently has 12 first- year students and 14 continuing students, totaling 26 students. For the following recent years, the Department of Clinical Rehabilitation and Counseling accepted: 15 students (2019) 15 students (2018), 8 students (2017), the number of students who graduated in those years were: 6 in 2019, 12 in 2018, and 9 in 2017. Most students complete the program by attending full-time for five semesters, including one summer semester. Students are expected to participate in and reflect upon extra-curricular, professional-development activities each year. These include conferences, topical seminars, advocacy and support group meetings, informational site visits, community service work, and interdisciplinary workshops. Students can choose to do a research practicum or supervised

independent project as one of their two elective courses. This involves working with a faculty member in designing, conducting, evaluating, and disseminating the results of a research or resource-development project. Upon completion, most students who choose this elective collaboratively create and participate with the faculty member in a platform or poster presentation of the project at a regional, state, or national professional conference. All qualified students are required to pass a comprehensive examination, which assesses student learning across all knowledge domains covered in the CACREP standards prior to being accepted into Internship II.

Our graduates obtain employment in various settings. These include, but are not limited to: federal and state health and rehabilitation agencies, supported employment programs, hospital-based rehabilitation units, psychiatric treatment centers, substance abuse treatment facilities, private rehabilitation agencies, community mental health centers, and university and school settings. Students are eligible to sit for the Certified Rehabilitation Counselor (CRC) and/or National Certified Counselor (NCC) examinations as early as their final semester in the program.

Students are also eligible, with additional post-graduate supervision, to apply to become a Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC) and/or a Licensed Rehabilitation Counselor (LRC) in Louisiana. 90% of the responding graduates are employed in a rehabilitation/mental health setting or attending a post graduate school.

Summary of Surveys

Surveys and/or feedback were obtained from five groups of stakeholders: students at the completion of the program, advisory board members, alumni, practicum/internship site supervisors, and employers. Respondents were asked to complete a short survey about their levels of satisfaction with the program areas being evaluated. The surveys also included a section to provide free-response comments about aspects of the program not assessed in the main structure of the survey.

Exit Survey of Graduating Students

Each year right before graduation, students who are completing their Master's degree that semester are encouraged to complete a 15-item program-evaluation questionnaire. It is designed to capture their evaluation of how well their education and experiences in the program prepared them on a comprehensive list of

knowledge items and skills in the Clinical Rehabilitation and Counseling program. The likert scale of response options ranges from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). In May of 2019, four (out of six) students completed the survey, with 25% of respondents being on the rehabilitation tract and 75% were on the clinical mental health.

Overall, the results indicated that the students felt well prepared by the program. Utilizing the descriptors across the nine anchor ratings, ratings from 1 to 2 will be regarded as below average or below expectations; 3 is neutral and 4 to 5 will be regarded as average or above expectations. At the top end of the evaluations, students indicated 100% plan to seek licensure after graduating. The results of the exit survey questions were:

“I have gained knowledge in the following areas of counseling: career development, research, assessment, ethics, group work, human growth and development, helping relationships, and social and cultural foundations” 75% strongly agree 25% agree. “I can successfully demonstrate the following counseling skills: attending, questioning, encouraging, paraphrasing, summarizing, and reflecting feelings.” 100% strongly agree “I can successfully plan appropriate counseling interventions for individuals and/or for use in small or large group settings (e.g., case study and/or small group counseling).” 75% strongly agree 25% agree “I have successfully demonstrated counseling knowledge and skills through my field work in rehabilitation, agency, private, and college settings.” 50% strongly agree, 50% agree.

“I possess qualities from the following dispositions: professional collaboration, reflective practitioner, ethical professional, student/client centered, professional leader, and professional competence.” 100% strongly agree.

“I would recommend this program to other people seeking a counseling degree?” 75% agree.

Students stated the areas of strength for the program include small class size, variety of knowledge and skills offered research opportunities, guest lectures, and the experience and knowledge of the professors.

Feedback from Advisory Board Members

The advisory board is made up of representatives from both the clinical mental health and clinical rehabilitation tracks. The 2018-2019 advisory board meetings were held in the fall and spring semesters

wherein advisory board members were provided an overview with supporting documents to outline the progress of the department. Advisory board members were provided information on: admissions, recruitment, graduation rates, advertisement, grants, the honor society, the counseling clinic housed in the department,, professional seminars, practicum and internship experiences, and annual reports. Members were asked to review said documents and comment regarding the program.

The advisory board members reported that they shared information regarding careers in the field of counseling in a variety of ways including: *social media, informally, verbally, workshop trainings, and forwarding emails*. The board members felt that the department could improve advertising by the following: explore connections to Greek life at LSU main campus, Partner with alternative teacher training programs (Inspire NOLA, Teach for America, etc.), connect with alums, review the online social media of Tulane and incorporate what applicable advertising methods used by local universities.

Lastly, the board felt that the department could improve professional seminar series outreach by additional advertisement, such as: NOLA Counselors, North Shore Counselors, NOLA Social Workers; “Add a link with the pictures sent out for the entire list of seminar series and registration page”; research in-house LSU marketing to assist with social media messages; review emails sent to mailing lists; Video record the CEU events making them available online; Add an informational section to the website with licensure and certification requirements; and offering an online, hybrid, or podcast for the workshops.

Survey of Program Alumni

An electronic survey was e-mailed to 125 alumni whom graduated between the years of 2011 to 2019. Responses were received from 8 alumni that graduated between the years of 2011 to 2015. The findings revealed clear satisfaction with the components of the Master’s degree program and how it prepared the graduates for their current jobs as a rehabilitation counselor, mental health counselor, or substance abuse counselor. Respondents reported being currently employed as either a rehabilitation counselors (5) or mental health counselor (3). The settings alumni were employed were in federal/government (2), private practice setting (2), clinic setting (2), vocational rehabilitation (1), and school setting (1). All respondents have obtained professional credentials, including the Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC), Certified Rehabilitation

Counselor (CRC), and National Certified Counselor (NCC). All but one respondent held at least two professional credentials, while one respondent held all three professional credentials of LPC, CRC, and NCC.

The alumni were asked to rate their overall satisfaction of the program one respondent indicated being dissatisfied and seven respondents indicated they were either satisfied or completely satisfied with the program overall. When alumni were asked about their satisfaction with the clinical experiences during the Practicum and Internship results varied. Seven alumni indicated they were either satisfied or completely satisfied with their faculty supervision in the program. One alumnus indicated they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with faculty supervision while in the program. The question regarding quality of site supervision five alumni reported being completely satisfied, one reported being satisfied, one alumnus reported being completely dissatisfied, and one alumnus reported being neither satisfied or dissatisfied. The question focused on site placement all alumni reported being either completely satisfied or satisfied with their site placement. The alumni also reported varying degrees of satisfaction in regards to advising and student support services. In the area of faculty availability for advising four respondents reported being either satisfied or very satisfied. The remaining four alumni were neutral, reporting they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied in the area of faculty availability for advising. In the area of quality of faculty advising four alumni reported being either satisfied or completely satisfied. Two respondents reported being neutral neither satisfied nor dissatisfied,” and the remaining two participants were dissatisfied in the area of quality of faculty advising. In the area of career guidance provided by the faculty five participants were satisfied, while two participants were dissatisfied, and one participant was completely dissatisfied. In the area of clarity of program requirements all eight participants reported being either satisfied or completely satisfied in this area. In the final area, opportunities for professional involvement as a student, six alumni responded being either satisfied or completely satisfied, while one alumni remained neutral in this area and one alumni reported being completely dissatisfied in this area.

Finally, alumni were asked how well the program prepared alumni in several domains. The domain of professional identity and ethical behavior, three alumni did not answer the question, four alumni felt they were very well prepared, and one alumnus felt they were poorly prepared in this area. In the foundations domain four alumni indicated they were very well prepared, three responded the question was not applicable, and one

alumnus felt they were poorly prepared in this domain. The medical and psychosocial aspects of disability domain only five respondents reported being very satisfied with their preparation in this domain, while three respondents reported this question was not applicable. The human growth and development domain only four alumni felt they were very well prepared while four other alumni felt this domain was not applicable to them. The counseling approaches and principles domain only four respondents felt very well prepared, three respondents felt the domain was not applicable to them, and one respondent felt they were prepared poorly in this domain. In group work and family dynamics domain three alumni indicated they were very well prepared in this domain, while five alumni felt this domain was not applicable. In the counseling prevention and intervention domain, three alumni felt they were very well prepared in this domain, while five alumni felt this domain was not applicable in their preparation. The diversity, advocacy, and accommodation domain, six of the participants felt they were very well prepared in this area, while two participants felt that domain was not applicable. The assessment and diagnosis domain had two alumni report they felt very well prepared in this domain, while six alumni felt this domain was not applicable. In the research and evaluation domain, three participants felt they were very well prepared in this domain, while one participant felt they were poorly prepared in this domain, and four felt this domain was not applicable. In the domain of career/vocational five alumni felt this domain was not applicable while three alumni felt they were very well prepared in this domain. The domain of rehabilitation services, case management, and related services five alumni felt this domain was not applicable, while three alumni felt they were prepared very well in this domain. Finally in the domain of clinical experience, six alumni felt this domain was not applicable, one alumnus felt very well prepared in this domain, and one alumnus felt they were prepared poorly in this domain.

Feedback from Site Supervisors

For the 2018-2019 academic year, site supervisors who oversaw students in the Summer 2018, Fall 2018, and Spring 2019 were requested to provide for feedback. Based on this criterion, 12 site supervisors were sent the evaluation via email twice and had two weeks to respond to the survey in May 2019 after the close of the spring semester. The response rate for the survey was 41.66% (5 site supervisors completed). Site supervisors rated their level of overall satisfaction with the LSUHSC-New Orleans Practicum and Internship

Program as completely satisfied (80.00%) based on a Likert scale from completely dissatisfied (1) to completely satisfied (5). In addition, 100% of site supervisors agreed (60.00%) or completely agreed (40.00%) to feeling prepared and comfortable performing their duties as a site supervisor for the LSUHSC—New Orleans Practicum and Internship Program.

Next site supervisors were asked to rate the level of satisfaction with various components of the LSUHSC-New Orleans Practicum and Internship Program. In all questioned areas, the majority of site supervisors responded favorably with satisfied to completely satisfied (i.e. *quality of practicum and internship coordinators, quality of faculty supervisors, quality of counseling student interns from LSUHSC—New Orleans, quality of practicum and internship handbook, quality of practicum and internship evaluations, quality of communication between the site supervisor and the practicum and internship coordinators, quality of communication between the site supervisor and the faculty supervisor, quality of communication between the site supervisor and the counseling student intern*). All 5 site supervisors who responded selected completely satisfied for “quality of professionalism demonstrated by the counseling student intern(s).”

There was only one area in which a site supervisor selected neither dissatisfied nor satisfied for the prompt, “quality of site supervisor orientation.” Compared to the previous year (2017-2018) this is an improvement as no site supervisor selected completely dissatisfied or dissatisfied in this section. Whereas, last year there were 6 areas that received 5.88% as dissatisfied scores for the following areas “*quality of practicum and internship coordinator,*” “*quality of counseling student interns from LSUHSC—New Orleans,*” “*quality of practicum and internship evaluations,*” “*quality of communication between the site supervisor and the practicum and internship coordinators,*” “*quality of communication between the site supervisor and the counseling student intern,*” and “*quality of professionalism demonstrated by the counseling student intern.*”

The next set of questions asked site supervisors to rate satisfaction on how well LSUHSC-New Orleans counseling student interns are prepared to provide counseling services in the field. In 6 of the 10 areas, site supervisors selected satisfied (40.00%) or completely satisfied (60.00%) with their intern’s services (*exhibit professional work behaviors, demonstrate ethical behavior and use of an ethical decision making model, demonstrate appropriate interest and enthusiasm for the counseling field, seek, consider, and accept*

professional opinions and constructive criticism, demonstrate empathy, warmth, and genuine respect for clients, and appropriate usage of resources and supervision). One hundred percent (100%) of site supervisors were also satisfied (60.00%) or completely satisfied (40.00%) in 2 additional areas including interns abilities to collaborate with clients, peers, staff, and supervisors to plan client interventions and gain experience and maintain appropriate paperwork required from the site.

There were only two areas were site supervisors selected neither dissatisfied nor satisfied with no areas receiving dissatisfied or completely dissatisfied. The neutral areas included apply a working knowledge of theories, models of practice, and frames of reference used in counseling practices (20.00%) and administer appropriate assessment tools (40.00%). This is an improvement from last year when we received dissatisfaction scores in 4 of 10 areas, 5.88% of site supervisors ranked student performance as dissatisfied (*administer appropriate assessment tools; maintain appropriate paperwork required from the site; exhibit professional work behaviors; and appropriate usage of resources and supervision*).

Site supervisors were also given the opportunity to add comments based on how the program may improve, the strengths of the program, and any other thoughts or comments. There was 1 comment for how the program may continue to improve included: “It is hard to go to required supervisor meeting at beginning.”

Six comments were noted by site supervisors regarding the strengths of the program included: “I have been happy with both the program and the interns.”; “Excellent job on student preparation for internship.”; “A strong background and knowledge that prepares the students to work at sites.”; “Organized, professional, prepared.”; “Great job!!!”; and “I was very well pleased with how the program prepared my intern for her internship.”

Employer Surveys

The employer survey responses represent 5 employers from private for profit, state agencies, and schools. Employers were asked to rate their perception of students’ preparedness on a variety of areas. Rankings included: not at all prepared (1), minimally prepared (2), moderately prepared (3), highly prepared (4), and very highly prepared (5). The low response rate is regrettable, however, mirrored last year’s response rate. Despite this, the responses from the employers were mostly positive.

Employers were asked to comment on the preparation in the following areas: The organizational structure and services of private for-profit rehabilitation (3.00), Occupational and labor market information (3.40), Transferable skills analysis (3.80), Marketing techniques for rehabilitation services (3.60), The history and philosophy of rehabilitation (4.20), The legislation affecting individuals with disabilities (4.00), Terminology and concepts of medical and vocational rehabilitation (4.40), The organizational structure and services of the public vocational rehabilitation (4.40), The organizational structure and services for not-for-profit service delivery system (3.75), The ethical standards and decision making for rehabilitation counselors (4.50), Society issues, trends, and developments as they related to rehabilitation (3.75), Group counseling theories and practices (4.50), Family counseling theories and practices (3.75), Individual counseling theories and practices (4.60), Behavior and personality theory (4.20), Human growth and development (4.20), Gender and multicultural counseling issues (4.40), Attitudinal and environmental barriers for individuals with disabilities (4.40), The case management process, including case finding, service coordination, referral and utilization of other disciplines, and client advocacy (4.00), Planning for the provisions of independent living services with clients (4.00), Planning for vocational rehabilitation services with clients (4.40), Financial resources and community services for rehabilitation planning (3.80), Computer applications and technology in rehabilitation counseling (3.75), Theories of career development and work adjustment (4.00), Vocational implications of various disabling conditions (4.40), Medical implications and resources for various disabling conditions (3.60), The psycho-social and cultural impact of disabilities on the individual and family (4.20), Administration and interpretation techniques for assessing clients' needs and resources (3.80), Procedures for assessing the effectiveness of rehabilitation services and outcomes (3.80), Job analysis, modification, and accommodation techniques (3.60), Strategies for job placement, supported employment and employer development (3.80), Employer practices and services for hiring and retention of individuals with disabilities (3.80), Client job seeking and job retention skills development (3.80), Workers' compensation practices, expert testimony, and life care planning (3.50), Employer-based disability prevention and management strategies (3.25), Substance abuse and treatment (4.00), Social security benefits and techniques for evaluating earnings capacity and loss (3.80), Rehabilitation techniques for individuals with psychological disabilities (4.40), School

to work transition for students with disabilities (4.00), The workplace culture and environment (3.80), Techniques for working effectively across disciplines and (4.00) Employers stated “The students from the program are very well prepared and integrate well within the state VR program.”

Suggestions for content included :

“Laws & Reg's re: Secondary Transition and preparing students with disabilities ages 14+ for employment, post-secondary education/training, and independent living.”

“More information on Private forensic rehab as well as transferable skills analysis, job placement and vocational assessments.”

The average rate of response was highly prepared, no areas were averaged as not prepared at all or minimally prepared.

Student Course Evaluations

In accordance with the policy of the Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center (LSUHSC), students are asked to complete course evaluation forms at the end of each semester, rating the quality of the course and the instructor on a 4-point rating scale. These results are based on the available responses from the students enrolled in our department during this reporting year.

Student course evaluations (n=134) for AY 2018-2019 were reported across 28 different course listings for the department. Each course was rated on two separated broad domains: course quality and instruction quality.

The course quality domain indicated (1) improvement of clinical skills (3.50); (2) assignments added to student's mastery of the course content (3.52); (3) course materials were well prepared and clear (3.55); (4) evaluation methods were fair/appropriate (3.53); (5) goals and requirements for practicum were clear (3.43); (6) evaluation of practicum skills were fair (3.43); (7) the workload of the course was appropriate to the number of credit hours (3.60); (8) the workload of the practicum was manageable (3.21) and that (9) the practicum was well organized (3.28).

The instruction quality domain indicated (10) the instructor communicated effectively and presented materials clearly in class (3.72); (11) the instructor encouraged or was receptive to student participation (3.83);

(12) the instructor was available to individual students during stated office hours and/or by e-mail (3.72); (13) the instructor was enthusiastic about teaching (3.75); and (14) the instructor was well-prepared for class (3.74).

Mid Semester Department Head Survey

A department head survey was sent to the students in the program for the fall 2018, 11 students responded, while this is a low response rate, students were given the opportunity to provide feedback and encouraged to do so. As per the survey results, students believe the program's overall strength to be the small class size. They have also commented on the great involved, diverse professors, course discussions, individualized program and the sense of support and structure these strengths provide. The students felt the program was "The curriculum appears to cover a broad area of counseling topics". Students also reported a strength of the program as "*The faculty makes time for the students. If they do not know something, they will do everything they can to get the information.*" The department still has challenges and areas for growth students reported "*More assistance/advice in choosing best site placements*" and "*More time with professors.*" Despite these challenges all respondents (100%) reported overall satisfaction as it related to coursework taken in the program. With clinical experiences the majority of students were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied (50%) or completely satisfied (40%) with the quality of faculty supervision, the site supervision and their site placement.

Response to Recommendations for Program Improvement for the 2018-2019 Academic Year:

Recommendation #1: Clarify the evaluation process through a description in the practicum and internship handbook, as well as to review the current evaluations to ensure that the forms capture the necessary information for student assessment.

Follow Up: The practicum and internship program coordinator revised the evaluation process so that students are required to meet with their site supervisor at mid-term and final to obtain supervisor evaluations, feedback, and signatures. The evaluations are based on CACREP specialty areas for clinical rehabilitation and clinical mental health counseling. The practicum and internship handbook was reviewed and a section was created specifically on the evaluation process.

Recommendation #2: The previous year the alumni survey received 5 responses, this year to get more alumni participation the survey was sent out to alumni with a message and a link to get to the survey

twice. Sending the survey out twice 8 responders this year, next year the survey will be sent out 4 times beginning in May to see if we can get even more participation.

Follow Up: The alumni survey was sent out multiple times via email with a link to the survey to garner higher numbers in the response rate.

Recommendation #3: When reviewing the results of the alumni survey, it is important to recall these respondents reflect combined cohorts. Most of the alumni that responded the cohort that had instructors who are now retired. Additionally, 3 responders of the survey are a cohort that came in prior to the two approved tracks and later in their educational experience choose either CRC or CMHC.

Follow Up: Annual reports and supporting documentation were submitted to the report at least one week prior to the meeting said that advisory board members could review said documentation and come to the meeting prepared with questions for clarification. Advisory board members commented that this made the meetings more productive.

Recommendation #4: In the area of “faculty supervision” 1 alumni reported being dissatisfied with the supervision they received.

Follow Up: Currently the program has an evaluation form that students fill out for the faculty supervisor, the department will continue to monitor this evaluation as students fill it out during practicum and internship courses.

Recommendation #5: The area of “site placement” 1 alumni reported being dissatisfied with site placement in the program.

Follow Up: The department has revamped the process of site placement, allowing the students to go out and select 3 sites and rank the site in the order they would like to be placed. The department will continue to monitor the new process and make changes as needed.

Recommendation #6: The areas of “faculty advising,” “faculty availability,” and “faculty career guidance” at least one participant responded to being dissatisfied or being completely dissatisfied. The department has incorporated career guidance and professionalism into a one hour class that all students must take. In regards to faculty availability and advising, faculty discuss office hours, seeking advising every

semester, and faculty availability during the department's New Student Orientation for all incoming students in the fall and spring semesters. Additionally, faculty do semester check-ins with each of their advisees to ensure that they are getting their needed advising, career needs, and additional availability.

Follow Up: Faculty continue to hold office hours outside of students' class times as well as recommend scheduling advising sessions with faculty as needed. The department head continues to hold mid semester department surveys and meetings with the students and provides feedback to faculty and implement necessary and appropriate changes as needed.

Recommendation #7: It is recommended that the primary faculty member charged to teach Counseling Theories and Practice, Vocational Counseling and Career Development, and Counseling Research Practicum carefully examine the rating components from this last reporting cycle to ascertain how might the quality ratings improve for the next reporting cycle.

Follow Up: Courses that showed a rating below 3.0 reflected improvements in grand mean ratings of .32 and .30 were demonstrated for the Counseling Theories and Practice class; and the Vocational Counseling and Career Development classes, respectively, bringing both above 3.0. However, the grand mean ratings for Counseling Research Practicum remained below 3.0 with a decrease of .01 for available ratings.

Recommendation #8: Ensure the working relationship between the Faculty Supervisor(s) and Site Supervisors by ensuring continual communication and contact throughout a counseling student intern's practicum and/or internship experience.

Follow Up: Faculty supervisors in the 2018-19 academic year increased communication via email, phone, and site visit with individual site supervisors for each practicum and internship student. The practicum and internship coordinator also followed up with site supervisors to inquire on the communication between the faculty supervisors and the site supervisors throughout the semester.

Recommendations for Program Improvement for the 2019-20 Academic Year:

Recommendation #1: Offer a video conferencing option for site supervisor orientation and an alternative site supervisor orientation option, as well as providing site supervisors with orientation dates at time students identify their site(s) and site supervisor(s).

Recommendation #2: Advisory board members make recommendations for advertisement and outreach. The CRC department head will investigate recommendations.

Recommendation #3: For the 2018-2019 year the alumni survey was sent out three times and eight responses were garnered this year, up by 3 responses from last year. The survey will continue to be sent out multiple times a year to see if the increase in responses can remain constant. This may also allow responses from more recent graduates that have graduated from the program once the two tracks were established.

Recommendation #4: The alumni survey questions will be revised to be more reflective of the programs two tracks, CRC and CMHC, adding questions that are more clinical mental health counseling focused and pairing down the questions that are only rehabilitation counseling focused.

Recommendation #5: Offer more P/I info meetings.

Recommendation #6: Get a complete listing of all employers annually, email them, possibly offer free T & S CEH to them.

Recommendation #7: It is recommended that the primary faculty member charged to teach their respective section of Counseling Research Practicum and Professional Practicum in Counseling carefully examine the rating components from this last reporting cycle to ascertain how might the quality ratings improve for the next reporting cycle.