

LSU Health Sciences Center – New Orleans

Department of Clinical Rehabilitation and Counseling

2019-2020 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.

Approximately 14 applicants are accepted annually. The program currently has 4 first-year students and 11 continuing students, totaling 15 students. For the following recent years, the Department of Clinical Rehabilitation and Counseling accepted: 5 (2020) 15 students (2019) 15 students (2018), 8 students (2017), the number of students who graduated in those years were: 6 in 2019, and 12 in 2018. 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, psychiatric treatment centers, substance abuse treatment facilities, community mental health centers, private practice settings, and school settings. Students are eligible to sit for certification examination as well as begin to pursue licensure.

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 2020, one (out of eleven) student completed the survey.

With 9% of the class completing the survey, we cannot give an accurate summary of how students felt with the program. The 2020 school year had many students distracted with outside events. The survey was sent to the students via email with their LSIHSC email address and attempts with their personal email address after graduation. We believe that the survey was lost with multiple messages to students at that time and they were not motivated to complete the survey.

Feedback from Advisory Board Members

The advisory board is made up of representatives from both the clinical mental health and clinical rehabilitation track. The 2019 advisory board meet on September 25, 2019 during which the board provided feedback to the department. Each year the advisory board is provided updates on the department including admissions, recruitment, graduation rates, grant applications, Chi Sigma Iota events, clinic activities, practicum and internship site placement, and workshops held in both the department and clinic.

Members are asked each year to respond to each area. Minutes are recorded during the meeting and members are encouraged to provide written feedback after reviewing the departmental documents and attending the meeting. During the 2019 meeting, the advisory board supported the exploration and integration of an online application system and modifications to said process. Members also brainstormed with the faculty on methods to share information regarding careers in the field of counseling in a variety of ways including: *social media, informally, verbally, workshop trainings, and forwarding emails.*

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 approximately 140 alumni whom graduated between the years of 2009 to 2020. Approximately 35 alumni responded from the years of 2009

to 2020. 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 employment in various employment areas ranging from rehabilitation counselor, mental health counselor, or full-time student. The settings alumni reported employment were a wide range, the majority of the responses were private-for profit rehabilitation, for-profit or non-profit agency providing mental health counseling, substance abuse/addictions treatment programs, private practice, and school settings. All respondents have obtained professional credentials, including the Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC), Certified Rehabilitation Counselor (CRC), and National Certified Counselor (NCC).

The alumni were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with how well the program explained the definition of what counseling is and what counseling is not, 48% responded the program did very well, 28% responded the program did well, and 20% alumni were neutral on that question. When asked how well the program prepared alumni to apply working knowledge of theories, models of practice, and frames of reference used in counseling, 42% responded very well, 40% responded well, and 17% responded neutral to the question. Alumni were asked how well did the program prepare alumni to administer appropriate assessment tools for clients and 31% responded very well, 40% responded well, 20% were neutral on the question, 2% responded not well, and 5% responded poorly. On the question of how well the program prepared alumni to collaborate with clients, their families, and other team members to plan an intervention and 40% of the alumni responded very well, 31% responded well, 17% responded neutral, 5% responded not well, and 5% responded poorly. Alumni were asked how well did the program prepare them to implement counseling based intervention plans in rehabilitation or mental health settings and 29% responded very well, 32% well, 23% responded neutral, and 14% responded not well. The question of how well did the program prepare alumni to maintain practice related records, 40% responded very well, 28% responded well, 8% were

neutral, 14% responded not well, and 8% responded poorly. When asked how well did the program prepare alumni to exhibit professional work behaviors 67% responded very well, 23% responded well, 2% responded neutral, 5% responded poorly. Program preparation of alumni to appropriately use professional literature to make practice decisions and incorporate in client care was rated 54% very well, 25% well, 11% neutral, 5% not well, and 2% rated this question poorly. When asked how well did the program prepare students to demonstrate ethical behaviors towards clients and as professional, 68% of the alumni responded very well, 28% of the alumni responded well, and 2% of the alumni responded not well. In the responses part of this questions alumni stated they would have liked more information on how to navigate the job market, apply for licensure, how to run a private practice and more advocacy techniques for reducing barriers.

- Starting in 2018 students enrolled in the professional practicum had classes dedicated to how to run a private practice and navigating the job market.
- Starting in 2017 students enrolled in the career counseling course and in the internship II, course had classes dedicated to counselor advocacy and getting their first job.

The next question alumni were asked was how well the program prepared them in area of professional knowledge, skills and practices based on specific learning domains. The domain of “Professional Identity and Ethical Behavior”, 62% of the alums rated the program very well, 22% rated the program well, 11% rated the program neutral, and 2% rated the program poorly. The domain of “Foundations,” 45% of responders rated the department very well in preparing this concept, 37% responders rated well, 11% of responders were neutral in this domain, 2% responded not well, and 2% responded poorly in this domain. In the learning domain “Medical and Psychosocial Aspects of Disability,” 54% alumni rated the program very well, 40% rated the program well, 2% rated the program neutral in this domain, and 2% rated the program very poorly in this domain. In the area of “Human Growth and Development,” 51% alumni rated the program very well, 42% rated the program well, and 5% rated the

program neutral in this domain. The learning domain “Employment and Career Development” 54% of the responders rated the program very well in teaching this domain. 34% of the responders rated the program as well in teaching this domain, 8% of the responders rated the program as neutral in teaching this domain, and 2% of the responders rated the program as very poorly teaching this learning domain. The Counseling Approaches and Principles learning domain 54% of the alumni rated the program as very well in their preparation, 40% of the alumni rated program preparation as well, 2% rated the program preparation as neutral, and 2% rated the program as preparing them very poorly in this domain. The Group Work and Dynamics learning domain 37% of the responders rated the program as preparing them very well, 40% of the responders rated the program as preparing them well, 14% of the responders were neutral on rating this domain, and 8% rated the program as not well in preparing them in this learning domain. The next learning domain, Counseling, Prevention, and Intervention, 37% of the alumni rated the program as preparing them very well, 40% of the alumni rated the program as doing well in prepping them in this domain, 17% of the alumni rated the program neutral in this domain, and 11% rated the program as not well in preparing them in this domain. The domain area of Diversity, Advocacy, and Accommodation 57% of responders rated the program very well in preparing them. 11% of the responders rated the program as doing well in preparing them in this area, 25% of the responders were neutral in rating their preparation in this domain, 2% of the responders rated the program as not preparing them well, and 2% rated the program as doing very poorly in preparing them in this learning domain. Looking at the learning domain, Assessment and Diagnosis, 31% rated the program as doing very well in preparing them, 40% rated the program as doing well in preparing them, 17% rated this domain as neutral, and 11% rated the program as not doing well in preparing in this learning domain. The Research and Evaluation learning domain, 51% of the alumni rated the program as doing very well in preparing them in this domain. 37% of the alumni rated the program as doing well in preparing them, 5% rated this area neutral, 2% rated the program as not doing well in

preparing them, and 2% rated the program as doing poorly in preparing them in this learning domain. The learning domain Career and Vocational 51% of the responders rated the program as doing very well in preparing them in this domain. 37% responders rated the program as doing well in preparing them, 8% were neutral in their opinion of level of preparation from the program and 2% of the responders felt the program do not do well in preparing them in this domain. In the area of Rehabilitation, Mental Health, Intervention, and Related Services 40% of the alumni felt the program did very well in preparing them in this domain. 45% of the alumni felt the program did well in preparing them in this domain, 11% of the alumni were neutral in assessing the level of preparation in this domain, 2% stated the program did not do well in preparing them in this domain, and 2% felt the program did poorly in aiding them in preparing in this domain. Finally, the learning domain of Clinical Experience 37% of the responders felt the program did very well in preparing them for this domain. 45% of the responders felt they were well prepared in this learning domain, 11% were neutral in rating this area, 2% responders felt they were not well prepared, and 2% felt they were poorly prepared in this learning domain.

The next question asked alumni their level of overall satisfaction of the coursework taken in the program. 37% of the alumni were completely satisfied, 51% of alumni were satisfied, 5% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2% were dissatisfied, and 2% were completely dissatisfied with the coursework taken in the program. When asked to rate their preference based on courses taken. Alumni ranked clarity of course expectations and assignments the highest, overall satisfaction with courses taken next, quality of syllabi next, scope and content of the courses taught was ranked next, quality of the textbook used came next, quality of the feedback on course performance was next, days and times of the courses ranked next, teaching methods used by instructors ranked next, quality of the assignments and readings in the courses was nine, and the elective courses offered ranked the lowest at number 10.

The next question asked alumni about their overall satisfaction with the clinical experiences during the Practicum and Internship. When asked about their overall satisfaction with the quality of faculty supervision 48% of the alumni were completely satisfied, 25% of the alumni were satisfied, 22% were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, and 2% were dissatisfied. When asked about their overall satisfaction about the quality of site supervision 57% of the alumni were completely satisfied, 25% were satisfied, 8% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 2% were dissatisfied, and 5% were completely dissatisfied. When asked about their overall satisfaction with site placement, 60% were completely satisfied, 25% were satisfied, 5% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 8% were dissatisfied.

The final question, alumni were asked about their satisfaction with advising and student support in seven areas. Satisfaction with faculty availability for advising 28% of alumni were completely satisfied, 28% were satisfied, 34% were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied in this area, 5% were dissatisfied, and 2% were completely dissatisfied. Satisfaction with the quality of faculty advising 20% of alumni were completely satisfied, 42% of alumni were satisfied, 25% of alumni were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, and 11% were dissatisfied. Satisfaction with the clarity of requirements for completing the program 42% were completely satisfied, 48% were satisfied, 5% were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, and 2% were dissatisfied. Satisfaction with accessibility of information on practicum and internship requirements and application process 28% of alumni were completely satisfied, 37% were satisfied, 14% were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, 17% were dissatisfied, and 2% were completely dissatisfied. When rating their satisfaction with helpfulness of descriptive materials on the program 22% were completely satisfied, 54% were satisfied, and 22% were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. Satisfaction with post-graduation guidance provided by the faculty 17% were completely satisfied, 25% were satisfied, 25% were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, 22% were dissatisfied, and 8% were completely dissatisfied. Overall rating of opportunities for conference, research, and professional development and involvement as a student 34% were

completely satisfied, 37% were satisfied, 22% were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, 2% were dissatisfied, and 2% were completely dissatisfied. Additional responses included “staff needed better training in cultural competency, especially on how they treated students from different cultural backgrounds”; “I don’t remember hearing about NCC but it’s very popular right now”; “More emphasis should be placed on how to navigate the field after graduation.”

Feedback from Site Supervisors

For the 2019-2020 academic year, site supervisors who oversaw students in the Summer 2019, Fall 2019, and Spring 2020 were requested to provide for feedback. Based on this criterion, 19 site supervisors were sent the evaluation via email twice and had two weeks to respond to the survey in May 2020 after the close of the spring semester. The response rate for the survey was 63.2% (12 site supervisors completed). Site supervisors rated their level of overall satisfaction with the LSUHSC-New Orleans Practicum and Internship Program as completely satisfied (58.33%) and satisfied (33.33%) based on a Likert scale from completely dissatisfied (1) to completely satisfied (5). One supervisor (8.33%) did select that they were dissatisfied with the overall program. In addition, 100% of site supervisors agreed (25.00%) or completely agreed (75.00%) 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*). The majority of

site supervisors who responded selected satisfied (16.67%, 2) or completely satisfied (75%, 9) for “quality of professionalism demonstrated by the counseling student intern(s)” with only 1 supervisor selecting that they felt neither dissatisfied or satisfied with the professionalism of their counseling student intern.

There were a few areas in which a site supervisor selected either dissatisfied or neither dissatisfied nor satisfied which is concerning to the program due to the fact that the previous year, there was only one area in which a site supervisor selected neither dissatisfied nor satisfied for the prompt, “quality of site supervisor orientation.” Areas that received a dissatisfied score (8.33%) include for the following areas “*quality of counseling student interns from LSUHSC—New Orleans,*” “*quality of communication between the site supervisor and the practicum and internship coordinators,*” and “*quality of communication between the site supervisor and the counseling student intern,*” Areas that received a neither satisfied nor dissatisfied score include for the following areas “*quality of site supervisor orientation*” (16.67%, 2) “*quality of practicum and internship coordinator,*” (25%, 3) “*quality of faculty supervisor,*” (8.33%, 1) “*quality of practicum and internship handbook,*” (9.09%, 1) “*quality of practicum and internship evaluations,*” (16.67%, 2) “*quality of communication between the site supervisor and the faculty supervisor,*” (9.09%, 1) and “*quality of professionalism demonstrated by the counseling student intern*” (8.33%, 1).

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. One hundred percent (100%) of site supervisors were satisfied or completely satisfied in 2 areas including interns' ability to “*administer appropriate assessment tools*” and “*exhibit professional work behaviors.*” 2 areas received a score of dissatisfied by 1 site supervisor (8.33%) in “*collaborate with clients, peers, staff and supervisors to plan client interventions and gain experience*” and “*demonstrate appropriate interest and enthusiasm for counseling field.*” All other areas received strong scores in the satisfied or completely satisfied

with 1 score in the neither satisfied nor dissatisfied category: “*applying a working knowledge of theories, models of practice, and frames of reference used in counseling practices,*” “*maintain appropriate paperwork required by the site,*” “*demonstrate ethical behavior and used of an ethical decision making model,*” “*seek, consider, and accept professional opinions and constructive criticism,*” “*demonstrate empathy, warmth, and genuine respect for clients,*” and “*appropriate usage of resources and supervision.*” This is a slight decline from last year when we received dissatisfaction scores in no areas and only 2 scores in neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (“*applying a working knowledge of theories, models of practice, and frames of reference used in counseling practices,*” and “*administer appropriate assessment tools*”) Although it should be noted that over the past year, the program made improvement related to the area of administer appropriate assessment tools.

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 were 9 comments related to improvement:

- *I greatly appreciate how well prepared the Interns are for work in the Counseling field. Preparation for the field of school counseling is most important before they enter a school setting for their training.*
- *Some questions asked about communication between parties I am not a part of as a site supervisor (faculty and coordinator, etc.).*
- *Keep up the good work.*
- *N/A*
- *I wouldn't allow a student to do a practicum at a site that only allows for group counseling. It leaves the student unprepared and behind a semester. We spent the last two semesters playing catch up with how to work with individual clients.*
- *Thank you for your work in preparing our intern. Outside of site supervisor orientation, there was not any communication with the LSUHSC supervisors mentioned, therefore, I put a neutral response.*
- *n/a*

- *improvement could be on assessment for suicidal and homicidal ideation. Help the students feel comfortable in doing them & walk them through the steps of contacting the crisis hotline & having to face the client/patient after their discharge from the hospital.*
- *n/a*

Seven comments were noted by site supervisors regarding the strengths of the program:

- *The students were most professional, had excellent contact and supervision from the LSU faculty, and were well trained. Dr. Frazier was excellent as a faculty supervisor and very easy to converse and work with for me in supervising the students.*
- *Great communication and you clearly care about the well-being of the interns.*
- *Great communication between sites and faculty.*
- *LSUHSC has demonstrated a strong desire to improve and further develop the program through various feedback modalities. I am confident the program will continuously improve and only get stronger over time.*
- *Students have a Strong understanding of their theory and are ready to apply it to their caseload.*
- *I feel this is an excellent program and the student that I had was extremely professional and really thought outside the box when it came to counseling clients.*
- *The students are well prepared and have access to their professors*

Finally, there was 1 additional comment reported:

- *This year was a challenge for the Interns with virtual learning. I greatly appreciate Dr Frazier and Dr. Dugan working closely with me to plan for the continuation of the student Internship program in March - May. We have greatly enjoyed having LSU Interns and hope to continue serving as a site in the future for training.*

Employer Surveys

Employers are identified through a variety of ways, exit surveys of graduating students, alumni surveys, and professional networking opportunities. While a number of individuals were asked to complete the employer survey, only 4 employers responded. Of the four respondents, two worked in

private for-profit agencies, one in a school, and 1 in a hospital. The respondents agreed that graduates were highly to very highly prepared in the following areas: Professional Counseling Orientation and Ethical Practice, Social and Cultural Diversity, Human Growth and Development, Career Development, Counseling and Helping Relationships, Assessment and Testing, and Research and Program Evaluation. However, overall respondents reported moderately prepared to highly prepared in the area of Group Counseling. While these results show that our students are overall leaving the program prepared for the field of counseling, the low response rate makes such a generalized statement cautionary.

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=96) for AY 2019-2020 were reported across 21 different course listings for the department. Each course was rated on two separated broad domains: course quality and instruction quality. The average response rate across the course listings was 47%, ranging from 8% to 100%. The course quality domain indicated (1) improvement of clinical skills (3.4); (2) assignments added to student's mastery of the course content (3.4); (3) course materials were well prepared and clear (3.6); (4) evaluation methods were fair/appropriate (3.4); (5) goals and requirements for practicum were clear (3.6); (6) evaluation of practicum skills were fair (3.7); (7) the workload of the course was appropriate to the number of credit hours (3.5); (8) the workload of the practicum was manageable (3.6) and that (9) the practicum was well organized (3.5).

The instruction quality domain indicated (10) the instructor communicated effectively and presented materials clearly in class (3.5); (11) the instructor encouraged or was receptive to student participation (3.6); (12) the instructor was available to individual students during stated

office hours and/or by e-mail (3.4); (13) the instructor was enthusiastic about teaching (3.5); and (14) the instructor was well-prepared for class (3.5).

Finally, in utilizing a grand mean across all courses, instructors, and factors, the department received an overall score of 3.5 for the teaching year of 2019-20. Similarly, only one course received an overall rating below 3.0.

Mid Semester Department Head Survey

A department head survey was sent to the students in the program for the fall 2019 (14 responses), Spring 2020 (2 responses) and Summer (5 responses). 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 "Accessibility of information on practicum/internship requirements and application process". They have also commented on the amazing faculty, classes set up well, projects coordinate small class sizes. Students reported a strength of the program as "*Professors are up to date with new advances. Professors are approachable, they do a great job of providing guest speakers and being competent, themselves.*" 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, most respondents (77%) reported overall satisfaction as it related to coursework taken in the program. With clinical experiences the majority of students were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied (54.55%) with the quality of faculty supervision, the site supervision and their site placement.

Response to Recommendations for Program Improvement for the 2019-2020

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).

Response to Recommendation 1: The practicum and internship coordinator sent out a Zoom link as an additional option to the in-person site supervisor orientation in which site supervisors could attend the meeting in-person at LSUHSC or could attend site supervisor orientation virtually through Zoom. Site supervisor orientation has also been listed as the Monday before the semester start date at 9:00-10:00 am for consistency and future planning by site supervisors. Finally, the site supervisor orientation was recorded, and a link was provided to site supervisors should they need to refer to the orientation.

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

Response to Recommendation 2: Department continued to send email blasts to advisory board members, undergraduate universities, programs, faculty, and career offices at local universities; increased social media postings; and continued attendance at state career/recruitment fairs.

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.

Response to Recommendation 3: The alumni survey was sent out earlier and the earlier distribution led to an increased response to 35 alumni. For the next distribution of the survey, alumni will be sent the survey throughout the spring semester beginning in April.

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.

Response to Recommendation 4: The alumni questions were modified to be more reflective of the two tracks CRC and CMHC, as well as questions were modified to include the CMHC track.

Recommendation 5: Offer more P/I info meetings.

Response to Recommendation 5: Students were offered more meetings time to prepare for Practicum and Internship with the Practicum and Internship Coordinator. Additionally, the Practicum and Internship Coordinator discussed Practicum and Internship Placement with students in the REHAB 5601 Foundations in Counseling course and brought in site supervisors as guest speakers so that students had networking opportunities.

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

Response to Recommendation 6: An exit survey was established to gather contact information for graduating students, this was used to follow up and discover where individuals gained employment. Unfortunately, this did not increase employer responses. Tiger's and Stripes continuing education was not held due to the pandemic. The recommendation will be followed up on for the following employer survey.

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.

Response to Recommendation 7: While Counseling Research Practicum was not taught during this last reporting cycle, Professional Practicum in Counseling showed a mean rating increase of .03 with all of the sections across the year rated at 3.0 and higher.

Recommendations for Program Improvement for the 2020-21 Academic Year:

Recommendation 1: To transition the fieldwork application and fieldwork documents, such as time sheets and evaluations, to an electronic platform.

Recommendation 2: For the Practicum and Internship Coordinator, as well as the Faculty Supervisors, to increase number of interactions with Site Supervisors by developing better working relationships with Site Supervisors through Site Visits, Zoom Conferences, and other forms of communication.

Recommendation 3: Nine courses had response rates below 50%. Faculty members are being asked to remind students to complete these course ratings during the next academic year to best inform the department.

Recommendation 4: It is recommended that the primary faculty member charged to teach the respective sections of Introduction to School Counseling, Vocational Counseling/Career Development, and Research Design and Methodology carefully examine the rating components from this last reporting cycle and to consult with other faculty members to ascertain how the course might be improved as indicated in the ratings for the next reporting cycle so that the grand mean ratings rise above 3.0.