

LSU Health Sciences Center – New Orleans
Department of Clinical Rehabilitation and Counseling
2017-2018 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 on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) and 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 one of the faculty members holds the CRC credential. 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, are approved, and accept the employment-payback provisions of accepting the scholarship award.

Approximately 14 applicants are accepted annually. The program currently has 9 first-year students and 15 continuing students, totaling 24 students. For the following recent years, the

Department of Clinical Rehabilitation and Counseling accepted: 13 students (2017), 14 students (2016), 15 students (2015). The number of students who graduated in those years were: 12 in 2018, 9 in 2017, and 9 in 2016. 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 association 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 CORE and CACREP standards prior to being accepted into internship II.

Our graduates obtain employment in various settings. These include: 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 also a Licensed Rehabilitation Counselor (LRC) in Louisiana. For the past

three (2) graduating classes, 87% of the responding graduates reported they passed the Certified Rehabilitation Counselor (CRC) examination, and 84% of the responding graduates are employed in a rehabilitation/mental health setting or attending a post graduate school.

Summary of Surveys

Surveys 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 before graduation, students who are completing their Master's degree that semester complete a 15-item program-evaluation questionnaire. These students are divided between the two tracks. In the spring of 2018 67% of respondents were on the rehabilitation tract and 33% were on the mental health tract. The survey is designed to capture their evaluation of how well their education and experience in the program prepared them on a comprehensive list of knowledge items and skills in clinical rehabilitation and counseling. The Likert scale of response options ranges from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). In May of 2018, six (out of twelve) students completed the survey. 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, 67% of students plan to apply to another program upon graduation. 100% plan to seek licensure after graduating. Students had the following comments about the program:

“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”
50% strongly agree 33% agree, 17% neutral.

“I can successfully demonstrate the following counseling skills: attending, questioning, encouraging, paraphrasing, summarizing, and reflecting feelings.” (50% strongly agree, 50% 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).” 50% strongly agree 50% 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.” 50% strongly agree, 50% agree.

Students stated the areas of strength for the program, small class size, variety of knowledge and skills offered research opportunities. The majority of students (67%) would recommend the program to others.

Feedback from Advisory Board Members

The advisory board is made up of representatives from both the clinical mental health and clinical rehabilitation track. The 2018 survey was completed by five advisory board members. The

survey is anonymous and completed online. Members are asked each year to respond to a survey regarding the program. The advisory board 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 student's critical thinking skills, case conceptualization skills, and experience to meet future employer needs. Also, the board felt that students could increase skills by *participating in mock sessions and case studies; interactive, problem-based learning modalities that can more easily be implemented with the small number of students that the department has in each cohort; Set high expectations and use related assessment techniques for the students to engage in practicing and applying critical thinking skills; provide a variety of opportunities to practice and varied placements*. Additionally, the board recommended that instruction include the latest advancements by *sharing articles, utilizing well established resources such as SAMSHA, partnering with local resources, teach psychotropic class, and having guest speakers*.

Stakeholders are an important part of the educational process and the advisory board suggested many ways to use stakeholders to assist graduates in obtaining employment. Some of the suggested ways were: *social media, alumni emails, informational texts, and luncheons*. Board members also felt that student's interdisciplinary skills could be improved by *case studies, demonstrations of assignments, portfolios, and practice*.

Survey of Program Alumni

An electronic survey was designed and sent out electronically to 50 plus alumni whom graduated after May 2018. The survey was sent out twice and we received responses from 7 alumni. The findings revealed clear satisfaction with the components of the Master's degree program and how it prepared the graduates for their current jobs in the settings of rehabilitation,

mental health, or substance abuse. All but one alumnus reported being currently employed, 2 were in substance abuse counseling settings, 1 in private practice setting, 2 in the school setting, of the 7 participants, 1 indicated they were studying for an advanced degree in mental health. Some respondents have obtained professional credentials some dual credentials, including the Certified Rehabilitation Counselor (CRC) (4), National Certified Counselor (NCC) (3) and 3 were obtaining hours for the Licensed Professional Counseling (LPC) as they responded to having PLPC status.

The alumni were asked to rate their overall satisfaction of the program on a five-point response scale (1 indicated “completely dissatisfied” and 5 indicated “very satisfied”). 2 alumnus was completely satisfied, 4 were satisfied, and 1 was somewhat satisfied. In response to the question, “What is your level of overall satisfaction related to the coursework taken in the program?”, 7 alumni reported being “satisfied” or “very satisfied”. Using the same satisfaction scale, satisfaction with the clinical experiences during the Practicum and Internship varied, 1 alumni reported being neither satisfied or dissatisfied in the areas of quality of faculty supervision, quality of site supervision, and satisfaction with site placement. 1 participant reported being dissatisfied in the area of quality of faculty supervision and site placement, but being satisfied in the areas of quality of site supervision. 1 participant reported being neither dissatisfied in the areas of quality of faculty supervision, but being satisfied in the areas of quality of site supervision, and satisfaction with site placement. The other 4 participants reported being either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” in the areas of quality of faculty supervision, quality of site supervision, and satisfaction with site placement.

The alumni also reported varied degrees of satisfaction in regards to advising and student support services. In the area of faculty availability for advising 2 respondents reported being

either “satisfied” or “very satisfied”, 4 were neutral, reporting they were “neither satisfied or dissatisfied” in this area and 1 was completely dissatisfied in this area. In the area of quality of faculty advising 1 respondent reported being “dissatisfied”, 2 respondents reported being neutral “neither satisfied or dissatisfied,” and the remaining 4 participants were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” in this area. In the area of career guidance provided by the faculty 4 participants were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied”, while 2 participant was neutral and 1 participant was dissatisfied. In the final area, opportunities for professional involvement as a student, 4 alumni responded being “satisfied” or very satisfied, while 3 alumni remained neutral in this area.

Finally, alumni were asked how well the program prepared students within the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) learning domains. The areas of human growth and development, employment and career development, counseling approaches and principles, career/vocational 6 participants were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their preparation, and one participant did not answer that question. 5 alumni indicated they were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” in regards to their preparation in the domain of professional identity and ethical behavior, 1 responded to being neutral about preparation in this domain and 1 participant did not answer this question. The foundations domain 5 alumni indicated they were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” in regards to their preparation in this domain, while 1 alumnus responded being “dissatisfied” regarding their preparation in this domain and 1 participant did not answer this question. Medical and psychosocial aspects of disability domain 5 respondents reported being “satisfied” with their preparation in this domain, while 1 responder remained neutral in regards to preparation in this area and one responder did not answer this question. In group work dynamics domain 3 alumni indicated they were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” in regards to their preparation in this domain, while 1 alumnus was neutral regarding their preparation in this

domain and 3 responders did not answer this question. In the counseling prevention and intervention and diversity, advocacy, and accommodation domains 4 participants were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with their preparation in this area, while 1 participant was neutral in regards to their preparedness in these areas and 2 participants did not answer this question. The assessment and diagnosis and research and evaluation domains had 3 participants feeling “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their preparation in these domains and 1 responder feeling “dissatisfied” with their preparation in this domain and 3 responders did not answer this question. Finally the domain of rehabilitation services, case management, and related services 3 alumni indicated they were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” in regards to their preparation, while 1 responded to being neutral about their preparation in this domain and 3 participants did not answer this question.

Feedback from Site Supervisors

For the 2017-2018 academic year, site supervisors who oversaw students in Summer 2017, Fall 2017, and Spring 2018 were targeted for feedback. Based on this criteria, 18 site supervisors were sent the evaluation via email twice and had two weeks to respond to the survey in the Summer 2018. The response rate for the survey was 94.4% (17 site supervisors completed). One email address was returned as the site supervisor left the previous place of site employment. Site supervisors rated their level of overall satisfaction with the LSUHSC-New Orleans Practicum and Internship Program as completely satisfied (52.94%) based on a Likert scale from completely dissatisfied (1) to completely satisfied (5). In addition, 100% of site supervisors agreed (52.94%) or completely agreed (47.06%) 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 site supervisor orientation, 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, and quality of professionalism demonstrated by the counseling student*).

There were a few areas that received either a completely dissatisfied or dissatisfied score. One (6.25%) site supervisor selected “completely dissatisfied” for the “*Quality of communication between the site supervisor and the faculty supervisor;*” other participant responses were 1 (6.25%) selected neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 5 (31.25%) selected satisfied, and 9 (56.25%) selected completely satisfied on this question. Compared to the previous year (2016-2017) this is an improvement as the completely dissatisfied rating was 12.50% with 75% of site supervisors being satisfied or completely satisfied for this question.

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 one area, 64.71% of site supervisors ranked student performance related to the demonstration of empathy, warmth, and genuine respect for clients as completely satisfied and 35.29% of site supervisors ranked as satisfied totaling 100% of site supervisors who were satisfied or completely satisfied with student preparation in this component. Another high scoring area related to seeking, considering, and accepting professional opinions and constructive criticism which received a 58.82% completely satisfied score and a 29.41% satisfied score. Two additional areas received a 52.94% rating for completely satisfied (*demonstrate ethical behavior and use of an ethical decision making model—41.18% for satisfied; demonstrate appropriate interest and enthusiasm for the counseling field—35.29% for satisfied*).

In all 10 areas highlighted on the survey related to student preparation, the percentage of combined satisfied and completely satisfied was 70.58% or higher (*apply a working knowledge of theories, models of practice, and frames of reference used in counseling practices, administer appropriate assessment tools, collaborate with clients, peers, staff, and supervisors to plan client interventions and gain experience; maintain appropriate paperwork required from the site; 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*).

In 4 of 10 areas, 5.88% of site supervisors ranked student performance as dissatisfied which is a similar finding compared to the previous year (*administer appropriate assessment tools; maintain appropriate paperwork required from the site; exhibit professional work*

behaviors; and appropriate usage of resources and supervision). No site supervisor was completely dissatisfied with the various performance of counseling student interns.

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 4 comments for how the program may continue to improve included:

- “Students should understand that when they are doing their internship, it will affect their reputation as well as reference for a job.”
- “I am so happy to know that the LSUHSC is a counseling program—where the concepts and theories of counseling a client is emphasized in contrast to many social work programs. The mix of counselors and social workers makes for a healthy mix serving our clients. I appreciate the competence of your student/interns and their concerns for our clients.”
- “Evaluations target clinical/hospital and state VR settings. Few questions apply to actual vocational rehab provider settings, such as this one. Please consider developing an alternate Evaluation to include Vocational Provider specific terms and issues; (eg. Student demonstrates a knowledge and/or utilizes resources to develop resume/employment portfolio and/or other employment related documents) ALSO Many of the evaluation statements are redundant -eliminate these and replace with a category: Student Work Ethics (student is on time, student contacts Internship Supervisor to notify of dates of absents or changes in schedule, Student completes assignments, Student can adequately explain all services logs, and so on Over the years, several students have "complained" that direct service (working with people with disabilities to help them obtain and maintain employment is NOT what they plan to do when the finish school;

most express their plans to "counsel" people- these students tend to share the belief that they will have an office and people with disabilities can be counseled into finding work and keeping work. Second only a few students had a well rounded experience of public rehab and private provider serving public rehab and workers comp/private provider.

Those that did seemed to get more out of their internship.”

- “We have enjoyed having the students in previous years and have had no concerns or issues.”

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

- “Knowledgeable staff and faculty for students to rely on. Great communication in a timely manner.”
- “Professors are open to discussion regarding strengths and weaknesses of the students.”
- “I answered this in the last question (#5) We use students from other counseling and Social Work programs. I find that none have been as well prepared as I find your Practicum and intern students. In the area of rehabilitation your interns bring a welcome viewpoint and access to resources which others do not have.”
- “The faculty supervisor I last worked with had very good insight regarding the student. She shared that she had similar experiences with this student needing "extra prompting" to get assignments completed and the faculty supervisor set up a plan with the student to evaluate this weakness. As a result the student improved.”
- “The students that have completed their Practicums and/or Internships with Lifeworks have all been professional. We have truly enjoyed working with them and the LSUHSC faculty.”
- “Intelligent with the ability to communicate effectively.”

Two comments were noted by site supervisors regarding general thoughts or feedback relevant to the program:

- “Our last intern was such a good fit that he volunteered another semester of work at our site as well as his designated next assignment. We are still in contact with him, now working in Houston.”
- “I have a great appreciation for training and gaining knowledge; however, can you please consider that some of us have been Supervisors previously and if we are in good standing with your program waive the requirement that we attend an "orientation" in order to accept students. Perhaps develop an on-line handbook and we need to read it and verify this to you or maybe a face to face meeting with the internship supervisor (at our office) to review any new handbook requirements would be suffice.”

Employer Surveys

The employer survey responses represent 7 employers from private not for profit, Community agencies, state agencies, federal agencies and hospitals. Employers were asked to rate their perception of students’ preparedness on a variety of areas. Rankings included: not at all prepared, minimally prepared, moderately prepared, highly prepared, and very highly prepared. The low response rate is regrettable, however, mirrored last year’s response rate. Despite this, the responses from the employers were positive. Employers were asked to comment on the preparation in the following areas: the organizational structure and services of the public vocational rehabilitation; gender and multicultural counseling issues; the ethical standards and decision making for rehabilitation counselors; behavior and personality theory; computer applications and technology in rehabilitation counseling; computer applications and technology in rehabilitation counseling; the history and philosophy of rehabilitation; terminology and

concepts of medical and vocational rehabilitation; terminology and concepts of medical and vocational rehabilitation; society issues, trends, and developments as they related to rehabilitation; group counseling theories and practices; individual counseling theories and practices; attitudinal and environmental barriers for individuals with disabilities; vocational implications of various disabling conditions; medical implications and resources for various disabling conditions; the psycho-social and cultural impact of disabilities on the individual and family; rehabilitation techniques for individuals with psychological disabilities; techniques for working effectively across disciplines; the legislation affecting individuals with disabilities; human growth and development; theories of career development and work adjustment; theories of career development and work adjustment and substance abuse and treatment.

Additionally, average rating from the respondents rated the graduates of our program as very highly prepared, or highly prepared on the following items: The history and philosophy of rehabilitation, The legislation affecting individuals with disabilities, Terminology and concepts of medical and vocational rehabilitation, The organizational structure and services of the public vocational rehabilitation, The organizational structure and services for not-for-profit service delivery system, The ethical standards and decision making for rehabilitation counselors, Society issues, trends, and developments as they related to rehabilitation, Group counseling theories and practices, Individual counseling theories and practices. Behavior and personality theory. Human growth and development. Gender and multicultural counseling issues. Attitudinal and environmental barriers for individuals with disabilities. Planning for the vocational rehabilitation series with clients, Theories of career development and work adjustment, and vocational implications of various disabling conditions, Medical implications and resources for various disabling conditions the psycho-social and cultural impact of disabilities on the individual and

family. Administration and interpretation techniques for assessing clients' needs and resources. Job analysis, modification, and accommodation techniques. The respondents rated our students as moderately prepared in the legislation affecting individuals with disabilities. The Organizational Structure and services of private for profit rehabilitation, The organizational structure and services for not-for-profit service delivery, system, Family Counseling theories and practices, Workers' compensation practices, expert testimony, and life care planning, Social Security benefits and techniques for evaluating earning capacity and loss, The case management process, including case finding, service coordination, referral and utilization of other disciplines, Marketing Techniques for rehabilitation services, and Computer applications and technology in rehabilitation counseling. No items averaged minimally or not at all 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. Student course evaluations (n=228) for AY 2017-2018 were reported across 44 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 (3.46); (2) assignments added to student's mastery of the course content (3.51); (3) course materials were well prepared and clear (3.51); (4) evaluation methods were fair/appropriate (3.50); (5) goals and requirements for practicum were clear (3.55); (6) evaluation of practicum skills were fair (3.58); (7) the workload of the course was appropriate to the number of credit hours (3.42); (8) the

workload of the practicum was manageable (3.72) and that (9) the practicum was well organized (3.45).

The instruction quality domain indicated (10) the instructor communicated effectively and presented materials clearly in class (3.57); (11) the instructor encouraged or was receptive to student participation (3.63), the instructor was available to individual students during stated office hours and/or by e-mail (3.57), the instructor was enthusiastic about teaching (3.65), and the instructor was well-prepared for class (3.55).

Mid Semester Department Head Survey

A department head survey was sent to the students in the program for the fall 2017, spring 2018 and summer 2018 semesters. We received 11 students responses, while this is a low response rate, students are given the opportunity to provide feedback.

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 program is flexible to accommodate those wanting to become rehab counseling"*. Students also reported a strength of the program as *"All of the professors encourage an interactive experience and challenges the students professionally"*.

The department still has challenges and areas for growth students reported *"The program needs to offer some new electives for students in the program"* and *"The demand for advisory, supervision and other meetings with the faculty is understandable, but most of the faculty have limited time. This conflicts with students' schedules. Although participating in school is an important responsibility, some students have to make a living or have other obligations. The faculty seems to view this as the students not being committed or professional, but that is not*

accurate.” 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 satisfied (50%) or completely satisfied (50%) with the quality of faculty supervision, the site supervision and their site placement.

Follow -up from 2016-2017 Program Improvements

Recommendation 1: Ensure the working relationship between the Practicum and Internship Coordinators and Site Supervisors by ensuring continual communication and contact throughout a counseling student intern’s practicum and/or internship experience.

Follow Up: The program coordinators have increased the communication between themselves and the site supervisors, as well as increased communication between the site supervisors and the faculty supervisors. Site supervisor orientation ensures that the program coordinators meet each site supervisor and address any concerns or questions they may have related to practicum and internship. A standardized site feedback form for faculty supervisors was also added to the Practicum and Internship Handbook for faculty supervisors to utilize when they visit each student’s site throughout the semester.

Recommendation 2: Emphasize the importance of professionalism by the counselor student intern at various points in their academic journey so that they are more prepared to exhibit professional work behaviors (time management, respect, follow policies, prepared for meetings, etc.) in fieldwork settings.

Follow Up: Course content was embedded into the professional practicum course to address professionalism.

Recommendation 3: Revise the professional practicum series and implement the IPE Health Sciences Center's course.

Follow Up: During the 2017-2018 academic year, students participated in the IPE Health Science course which was imbedded into the professional practicum course. For each IPE class, students were given credit for one hour of course time in the professional practicum class. This allows students the opportunity to consult with other health professionals and provide knowledge regarding the counseling field.

Recommendation 4: Increase Recruitment and the department's visibility.

Follow Up: Recruitment was increased for fall 2018. This was due to social media, guest lectures provided at local universities by departmental faculty. Faculty members also attended local career fairs increasing the community's knowledge of our program.

Recommendation 5: Increase students' professional visibility.

Follow Up: Students presented at local, state, national and international conferences during 2017-2018. This allowed students opportunities to network professionally.

Recommendation 6: Revamp the continuing education series in the department to increase community outreach.

Follow Up: During the 2017-2018 academic year, the department hosted an all day event "Tigers and Stripes" which offered several one hour sessions and a keynote speaker.

Recommendation 7: Revise the remediation and promotion policies and procedures.

Follow Up: Faculty have prepared a rough draft of remediation and promotion policies and procedures and continue to improve said documents.

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

- 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.
- 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 7 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.
- 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.
- In the area of “faculty supervision” 1 alumni reported being dissatisfied with the supervision they received. 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.
- The area of “site placement” 1 alumni reported being dissatisfied with site placement in the program. 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.
- 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.

- 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.
- 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.