

**COUNSELOR EDUCATION PROGRAM**

**ANNUAL REPORT 2024**

The purpose of this annual report is to inform students, the public, and community stakeholders about student enrollment, student success, key findings, decisions, and modifications of the program in line with our program mission statement and objectives. The information below is based upon the year 2024, as required by the Council on Accreditation for Counseling & Related Educational Programs (CACREP).

FIU’s Counselor Education program is comprised of three CACREP accredited tracks:

* Rehabilitation Counseling (Track coordinator: **Dr. Michelle Bradham-Cousar)**
* School Counseling (Track coordinator: **Dr. Zachary Pietrantoni**)
* Clinical Mental Health Counseling (Track coordinator: **Dr. Alena Prikhidko)**

Other administrative/service appointments include:

* Program Director, **Dr. Christina McGrath Fair**
* CACREP Liaison, **Dr. Christina McGrath Fair**
* Chi Sigma Iota (Delta Iota) Chapter Faculty Advisors,

**Dr. Christopher Cheung and Dr. Zachary Pietrantoni**

* Clinical Coordinator, **Dr. Alena Prikhidko**
* SARCA Faculty Advisor, **Dr. Michelle Bradham-Cousar**
* Continuing Education Coordinator, **Dr. Christina McGrath Fair**
* Comprehensive Exam Coordinator, **Dr. Alena Prikhidko**

1. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

**F.1. Professional Counseling Orientation and Ethical Practice**

 Students consistently demonstrated strong performance in understanding the history and philosophy of the counseling profession (F.1.a.) and the ethical standards of professional counseling organizations (F.1.i.). Both standards regularly achieved high average scores, indicating a solid grasp of foundational knowledge and ethics. The strategies for personal and professional self-evaluation (F.1.k.) showed a slight fluctuation, particularly in Fall, suggesting a need for reinforcing reflective practices among students. The area of counseling supervision (F.1.m.) and the role of counselors in emergency response (F.1.c.) also highlighted some variability in understanding, pointing to opportunities for enhanced integration of applied skills and interdisciplinary collaboration in the curriculum. Overall, the data reflect a strong commitment to ethical practice and professional identity, with room for growth in applied and supervisory roles.

**F.2. Social and Cultural Diversity**

 Students consistently excelled in multicultural and pluralistic awareness (F.2.a.) and multicultural counseling competencies (F.2.c.) across all semesters, maintaining strong performance with average scores of 3.0 in most cases. These results indicate a firm grasp of diversity-related concepts and competencies. The impact of heritage, attitudes, and beliefs on individual worldviews (F.2.d.) also showed consistently high scores, reflecting a strong understanding of cultural influences on counseling practice. However, in Spring, a smaller subset of students scored slightly lower in multicultural counseling competencies and the impact of acculturative experiences, suggesting a need for additional reinforcement of these topics in specific courses. The role of help-seeking behaviors (F.2.e., F.2.f.) and the impact of spiritual beliefs on worldviews (F.2.g.) also remained strong, with students demonstrating an awareness of how these factors influence client interactions. One area for improvement lies in identifying and eliminating barriers to oppression and discrimination (F.2.h.), where more emphasis on applied strategies and advocacy skills could enhance student readiness for real-world counseling challenges. Overall, students demonstrate a solid foundation in multicultural and social justice principles, with opportunities to deepen their practical application of anti-oppression strategies.

**F.3. Human Growth and Development**

 Students consistently performed well in understanding biological, neurological, and physiological factors affecting human development (F.3.e.) across all semesters, achieving strong scores that indicate a solid grasp of foundational concepts. Systemic and environmental factors influencing development (F.3.f.) also showed relatively stable performance, though slight fluctuations suggest some students may benefit from additional reinforcement in applying these concepts. Theories of normal and abnormal personality development (F.3.c.) remained a strength, with consistently high scores, reflecting students' ability to differentiate between theoretical models. However, areas such as theories of individual and family development (F.3.a.) and learning theories (F.3.b.) revealed some variability, indicating a need for more applied learning opportunities. The effects of crisis, disasters, and trauma on diverse populations (F.3.g.) showed slight inconsistencies across semesters, suggesting that integrating more trauma-informed approaches could strengthen student comprehension. Additionally, strategies for differentiated interventions (F.3.h.) and ethical strategies for promoting resilience (F.3.i.) exhibited some room for growth, pointing to opportunities to enhance practical application in coursework. Overall, students demonstrate a strong theoretical foundation, with opportunities to improve the application of knowledge in crisis response, resilience-building, and systemic intervention strategies.

**F.4. Career Development**

 Students demonstrated a strong understanding of career development concepts, particularly in using career, educational, and labor market resources (F.4.c.), where scores remained consistently high across semesters. Their ability to identify and use assessment tools for career planning (F.4.i.) also showed solid performance, reflecting competence in practical applications. However, conceptualizing the interrelationships between work, mental well-being, and life roles (F.4.b.) exhibited slight fluctuations, suggesting some students may need additional support in integrating these factors into career counseling frameworks. Similarly, assessing abilities, interests, and personality factors for career development (F.4.e.) showed minor inconsistencies, indicating an opportunity to reinforce assessment techniques in coursework. While students grasp theoretical and resource-based career development strategies well, they could benefit from further practice in applying these concepts to individualized career planning and decision-making processes. Strengthening experiential learning opportunities, such as case studies or role-play scenarios, could enhance their ability to navigate complex career counseling situations. Overall, students display a strong foundation in career development, with room to refine their practical application of assessment and holistic career counseling strategies.

**F.5. Counseling and Helping Relationships**

 Students consistently demonstrated strong performance in foundational counseling skills, particularly in essential interviewing, case conceptualization (F.5.g.), and developing treatment plans (F.5.h.), where scores remained stable across semesters. They also showed competence in evidence-based counseling strategies (F.5.j.) and developing measurable client outcomes (F.5.i.), indicating a solid grasp of counseling interventions. However, some fluctuations appeared in ethical and culturally relevant strategies for maintaining counseling relationships (F.5.d.), with lower scores in Spring and Summer suggesting a need for reinforced ethical decision-making and technology-assisted counseling techniques. Counselor characteristics and behaviors that influence the process (F.5.f.) exhibited slight inconsistencies, pointing to opportunities for strengthening self-awareness and counselor-client dynamics. Crisis intervention and trauma-informed strategies (F.5.m.) showed mixed results, indicating that students could benefit from additional training in responding to crisis situations. Suicide prevention models (F.5.l.) also presented minor areas for improvement, highlighting the importance of reinforcing risk assessment and intervention techniques. While students possess a strong theoretical foundation, they would benefit from more applied learning experiences, particularly in crisis response, ethical relationship-building, and self-reflective counseling practices.

**F.6. Group Counseling and Group Work**

 Students consistently demonstrated strong proficiency in group counseling concepts across all semesters. They excelled in understanding theoretical foundations (F.6.a.) and group process dynamics (F.6.b.), with consistently high scores indicating a solid grasp of core principles. Similarly, they performed well in identifying different types of groups and considerations for conducting them in various settings (F.6.f.), showing an ability to apply their knowledge across diverse contexts. Ethical and culturally relevant strategies for designing and facilitating groups (F.6.g.) also remained a strength, suggesting that students are well-prepared to manage group counseling with sensitivity to ethical and cultural considerations. However, while overall performance remained strong, there may be opportunities to enhance practical applications through more experiential learning, such as simulated group sessions or case studies. Strengthening hands-on experiences could further refine students’ ability to navigate real-world group counseling challenges. Overall, students demonstrate a strong theoretical foundation in group counseling, with opportunities to deepen their applied skills.

**F.7. Assessment and Testing**

 Students consistently performed well in assessment-related competencies, particularly in understanding diagnostic and intervention planning assessments (F.7.e.) and using assessment results to diagnose developmental, behavioral, and mental disorders (F.7.l.). These strengths indicate a solid foundation in assessment interpretation and application. They also demonstrated strong proficiency in preparing for and conducting initial assessment meetings (F.7.b.) and using environmental assessments and systematic behavioral observations (F.7.j.), where scores remained high across semesters. However, students exhibited some variability in assessing risk factors for aggression, self-harm, and suicide (F.7.c.), suggesting a need for more targeted training in risk assessment and crisis evaluation. Similarly, understanding reliability and validity in assessments (F.7.h.) and using ethical and culturally relevant assessment strategies (F.7.m.) showed minor inconsistencies, indicating that reinforcing these concepts through practical case studies could enhance comprehension. While students display strong knowledge of standardized testing concepts (F.7.f.) and statistical principles (F.7.g.), they would benefit from additional applied practice in selecting, administering, and interpreting diverse assessment tools. Overall, students excel in assessment fundamentals, with opportunities to strengthen their risk evaluation skills and ethical application of assessments in counseling.

**F.8. Research and Program Evaluation**

 Students demonstrated strong competency in understanding the importance of research in advancing the counseling profession (F.8.a.) and identifying evidence-based counseling practices (F.8.b.), particularly in the summer semester, where scores remained consistently high. They also showed solid proficiency in evaluating counseling interventions and programs (F.8.e.) and understanding research methods (F.8.f.), indicating a firm grasp of both qualitative and quantitative approaches. However, students exhibited some variability in statistical methods used in research (F.8.h.) and data analysis for counseling applications (F.8.i.), suggesting a need for additional reinforcement in applying statistical concepts to real-world counseling scenarios. Ethical and culturally relevant strategies for conducting and interpreting research (F.8.j.) remained a strength, but minor fluctuations suggest that integrating more hands-on research opportunities could improve student confidence in applying ethical principles. While students understand research design (F.8.g.) and program evaluation concepts, they would benefit from more applied learning experiences, such as conducting small-scale research projects or analyzing real data sets. Overall, students show a solid theoretical foundation in research and program evaluation, with opportunities to enhance their applied statistical analysis and research implementation skills.

**C. Clinical Mental Health Counseling**

 Students demonstrated strong proficiency in understanding theories and models related to clinical mental health counseling (C.1.b.) and principles of case conceptualization and treatment planning (C.1.c.), with consistently high scores across semesters. They also performed well in legal and ethical considerations specific to clinical mental health counseling (C.2.l.) and cultural factors relevant to counseling (C.2.j.), indicating a solid grasp of foundational ethical and multicultural competencies. However, students exhibited some variability in their understanding of the etiology, treatment, and prevention of mental and emotional disorders (C.2.b.), suggesting a need for reinforcement in diagnostic reasoning and treatment strategies. Similarly, while students showed competence in the diagnostic process (C.2.d.), fluctuations in scores indicate opportunities to strengthen their ability to apply classification systems such as the DSM and ICD in clinical settings. Techniques and interventions for mental health treatment (C.3.b.) also showed some inconsistencies, highlighting a need for more hands-on experience in intervention strategies. While students grasp core clinical concepts well, they would benefit from additional applied learning opportunities, such as case studies, role-play scenarios, and real-world clinical practice. Overall, students possess a strong theoretical foundation in clinical mental health counseling, with opportunities to refine their diagnostic and intervention skills through practical application.

**D. Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling**

 Students demonstrated a strong understanding of the history and development of rehabilitation counseling (D.1.a.) with high scores in spring 2024. This reflects a solid grasp of the foundational knowledge required in the field. Overall, students show strong theoretical knowledge of history and development in clinical rehabilitation counseling.

**G. School Counseling**

 Students consistently demonstrated a strong understanding of school counseling program development, particularly in creating mission statements and objectives (G.3.a.) and using accountability data to inform decision-making (G.3.n.), reflecting their ability to design and evaluate effective programs. However, performance varied in areas such as assessments specific to P-12 education (G.1.e.) and interventions to promote academic development (G.3.d.), indicating a need for more targeted training in practical application and differentiated instructional strategies. While students excelled in understanding the role of school counselors as leaders and advocates (G.2.a.), minor inconsistencies in legal and ethical considerations (G.2.n.) and the integration of social-emotional learning with academic achievement (G.3.h.) suggest opportunities for further development. Overall, students show strong theoretical knowledge but could benefit from more hands-on experiences and case studies to enhance their practical

**H. Rehabilitation Counseling**

 Students consistently demonstrated a strong understanding of principles related to societal inclusion, participation, and universal design (H.1.e.), as well as advocacy for the full integration of individuals with disabilities (H.3.j.), with high scores across all semesters. This reflects their solid grasp of foundational rehabilitation counseling principles and their ability to engage in social justice and inclusion practices. However, while students performed well in understanding the medical and psychosocial aspects of disability (H.2.b.) and the impact of disability on human sexuality (H.2.h.), there were minor fluctuations in their ability to address individual responses to disability (H.2.c.) and strategies for facilitating successful rehabilitation goals across the lifespan (H.3.g.). These areas suggest that students could benefit from more targeted training in addressing the complexities of co-occurring conditions and applying rehabilitation strategies in diverse contexts. Additionally, while students showed consistent understanding of diagnostic systems like the ICF, ICD, and DSM (H.2.d.), there were slight variations in their ability to utilize resources for evidence-based practices (H.3.d.), indicating room for improvement in integrating research into practical rehabilitation settings. Overall, students exhibit strong theoretical knowledge but could enhance their practical application of psychosocial factors and rehabilitation strategies through more hands-on learning experiences and case study analysis.

**Summary of All Standards**

 Students consistently demonstrated strong theoretical knowledge across all standards, excelling in areas such as ethical practice (F.1.i), multicultural competencies (F.2.c), group counseling principles (F.6.a), and career development resources (F.4.c). However, practical application in areas like crisis intervention (F.5.m), risk assessment (F.7.c), and diagnostic reasoning (C.2.b) showed variability, indicating a need for more hands-on training and case study analysis. While students performed well in foundational skills such as case conceptualization (F.5.g), program development (G.3.a), and inclusion principles (H.1.e), areas like integrating social-emotional learning with academic achievement (G.3.h), rehabilitation strategies (H.3.g), and statistical methods in research (F.8.h) revealed opportunities for improvement. Overall, students exhibit a solid grasp of counseling theories and ethical principles but would benefit from enhanced experiential learning opportunities to strengthen their practical skills in assessment, intervention, and real-world application.

1. Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and Program Learning Objectives (PLOs)
   1. SLOs
      1. Content Knowledge 1.2: Graduates will be able to demonstrate knowledge and application of counseling skills, techniques, and theories and integrate this knowledge into a counseling session and a critical self-assessment of their clinical, counseling skills.

Results: n=10; mean=2.83; 100% of students received scores of 2 and above.

Analysis: With all the students scoring 2 or above, they are receiving passing scores on these measures.

Use of Results for Improvement: With the full range of students analyzed scoring “passing” scores on this assessment, the program’s focus is on assisting students to home in on these skills in additional courses in the program. A change has been made from the use of Tevera to Supervision Assist, which will be required for students beginning in the first semester. The Supervision Assist platform will allow faculty to require students to upload HIPAA compliant videos in additional courses to receive faculty feedback on these skills, techniques, and theories.

* + 1. Critical Thinking 2.5: Graduates will be able to apply and evaluate vocational counseling techniques through inquiry, critical analysis and synthesis, and the integration of technology.

Results: n=10; mean=3; 100% scored 2 and above

Analysis: With all the students scoring 2 or above, they are receiving passing scores on these measures.

Use of Results for Improvement: Students consistently earn “passing” scores. There appears to be some overlap between the MHS5340 Education-Vocational Counseling and the MHS6200 Measurement and Appraisal in Counseling. These courses are currently taken by students within the same semester. The program will make changes to the course schedule so that these courses are taken in different semesters, allowing students to practice these skills across different points in time.

* + 1. Critical Thinking 2.6: Graduates will be able to demonstrate ethical decision-making ability in case analysis.

Results: n=1; mean=3; 100% scored 2 and above.

Analysis: With all the students scoring 2 or above, they are receiving passing scores on these measures.

Use of Results for Improvement: Students consistently earn “passing” scores. Access to an online training utilized in the MHS6700 Ethical, Legal & Professional Issues in Counseling on the topic of child abuse prevention. The course assignment was adapted to cover this content in a “poster presentation” from the perspective of their professional discipline.

* 1. PLOs
     1. Degrees Awarded: Increase the number of students who complete the program.

Results: The number of degrees awarded was 12. The total degrees awarded in the program has decreased by 70.7% from the previous year.

Analysis: In part, the number of degrees awarded decreased due to a change from admitting a MH cohort in both Spring and Fall to Fall only and due to a low enrollment in Fall of 2021 following the pandemic.

Use of Results for Improvement: This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. Since Fall 2022, the Fall cohorts have been relatively large in number and therefore, the program expects larger graduation rates in future cycles. The student organizations have planned to host study and prep sessions for the exit exams since these are often the cause of delayed graduations, particularly in RC. Faculty have added additional course materials and study guides to the practicum (RCS6801) and internship (RCS6821) courses in order to increase first time pass rate on the CRCE. Clinical mental health students have had a first time pass rate of 100% since Fall 2023. The school counseling students have consistently passed the school counseling certification exams on their first administration as well.

* + 1. Program Enrollment: Increase the number of students enrolled in the program.

Results: Program enrollment was 97. The number of students enrolled increased by 6 from the previous year.

Analysis: Student enrollment increased by 6%.

Use of Results for Improvement: This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. The program has space for continued growth. The plan is to increase our program by hiring two faculty members in 2025. The program is also considering the addition of dual-majors or micro-credentials for current students and alumni.

* + 1. Student Satisfaction: Students will be satisfied with their overall graduate program.

Results: 100% of students (7 out of 7 responses) responded satisfied to the survey item: Summary of responses: - Very Satisfied: 0 - Satisfied: 100% (7) - Dissatisfied: 0 - Very Dissatisfied: 0

Analysis: It seems that all of the student responses fell under “satisfied” leaving room for continued improvement.

Use of Results for Improvement: This is the first year of a two-year cycle of data collection. The program will continue to utilize student feedback to make corrections and improvements to the program. A student survey is planned for Spring 2025, followed by a town hall meeting for students.

1. Student Evaluation
   1. CASES

The Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scales (CASES) were used to measure counselors perceived self-efficacy in performing various counseling activities. The self-efficacy scores are based on an individual's confidence in their ability to successfully carry out specific tasks related to counseling. The average score for the scale was 298, with a standard deviation of 45. FIU Counseling students appear confident that they can perform counseling tasks related to the three subscales of CASES: (1) helping skill self-efficacy, (2) session management self-efficacy, (3) counseling challenges self-efficacy. The highest scores students received for “Interpretations” (M=9) and the lowest for their ability to understand whether clients “demonstrate manipulative behaviors in session” (M=6.1). Faculty will incorporate analysis of nonverbal and verbal behaviors, associated with potential manipulation in Field Experiences classes. The program plans to incorporate into the field experiences courses the requirement to work with first and second semester students in the introduction skills course. The goal is to assist the novice students with honing their skills and the advanced students to engage in feedback with the novice student, enhancing their clinical skills.

* 1. CCS-R

The Counselor Competencies Scale-Revised (CCS-R) assesses counselors' and trainees' skill development and professional competencies. Additionally, the CCS-R provides counselors and trainees with direct feedback regarding their demonstrated ability to apply counseling skills and facilitate therapeutic conditions, and their counseling dispositions (dominant qualities) and behaviors, offering the counselors and trainees practical areas for improvement to support their development as effective and ethical professional counselors. The average score for CCS-R was 103.2, with a standard deviation of 8.9. The maximum possible score for this assessment is 115. Therefore, FIU counseling students show a high level of counselor competencies. The lowest scores were on “advanced reflection of meaning, including values and core beliefs”(M=4) and “counselor challenges clients to recognize and evaluate inconsistencies” (M=4). The highest scores were on “responds non-defensively” (M=4.7). Faculty will pay special attention to discussing ways to support students in challenging and confronting clients and pointing out the necessity to help clients understand their core beliefs and values. The program plans to incorporate into the field experiences courses the requirement to work with first and second semester students in the introduction skills course. The goal is to assist the novice students with honing their skills and the advanced students to engage in feedback with the novice student, enhancing their clinical skills.

* 1. MCKAS

The Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scales (MCAS and MCKAS) are frequently used self-report measures of perceived multicultural counseling knowledge and awareness. The average score for counseling students was 82.3, with a standard deviation of 33.4. The highest possible score for this measure is 224. Therefore, faculty need to pay special attention to addressing multicultural competencies throughout the course of studies. While the standard deviation of this self-report assessment was quite high, the standard deviation of faculty scores of students was next to zero. As a program, there is high value on student self-efficacy in the area of cross-cultural counseling and faculty has been proactive in trying to increase competency. One such change was utilizing a different textbook. The program will incorporate intentional instructional time during the practicum and internship courses facilitated by the faculty supervisor and the on-site supervisor focused on multicultural competencies.

* 1. Practicum & Internship Midterm and Final Evaluations

During Practicum and Internship, students are evaluated by their faculty and site supervisors in the middle and end of the semester based on their abilities and knowledge related to professional counseling according to CACREP standards. Recent evaluations showed that students, on average, enhanced their counseling practice by 25 points. However, there is a range in the improvement scores, which shows that students' progress in the program at different levels, which might be due to differences in their counseling abilities and the assessment approaches of their faculty and site supervisors. In several cases, evaluations of faculty and site supervisors were different, which might be a sign of the faculty supervisor's lack of contact with the site supervisor. Faculty and site supervisors might consider discussing students' performance more closely in the future. Additionally, we will ask students to calculate the difference between their midterm and final evaluations given by faculty and site supervisors and explain the results.

1. Site and Site Supervisory Evaluation & Summary

While performing evaluations of sites and site supervisors, students reflected on their learning outcomes while undergoing field experiences in counseling. Students explored their goals, objectives, and challenges along the way. Individuals had multiple learning objectives, including understanding and incorporating counseling theories, improving communication skills, and managing time effectively. Some of the students shared that "initially, they had little motivation" but rediscovered their passion for counseling. They had expectations about therapeutic relationships, crisis management, cultural competence, client assessments, and treatment planning.

Though the experience was not as hands-on as anticipated in certain areas (e.g., group therapy and treatment plans), students gained insights on various counseling aspects. They observed and participated in intake assessments, worked on client rapport, coordinated with other professionals, and learned about cultural diversity. Key learning included practicing less directive approaches (like Cognitive Behavioral Therapy), improving active listening, and understanding personal triggers to prevent transference.

Students progressed from uncertainty to gaining practical experience. They shared that they gained valuable experience not only through direct client contact but also through observation and supervision. The program's learning objectives align with students' professional growth, as they focus on skills such as communication, assessment, case management, and cultural competence, all foundational to counseling practice.

There are clear signs of improvement in core counseling competencies, such as building rapport, active listening, and applying interventions like CBT. However, some goals, such as facilitating group therapy or preparing clients for termination, were not fully realized due to practical limitations. Students' acknowledgment of personal triggers and transference shows the development of self-awareness, a crucial component for effective counseling. Overall, students gained practical skills while working on their personal and professional identities, ultimately achieving their goals.

The program has moved from Tevera field experience platform to Supervision Assist. The move was made due to ease of use following feedback from students and site supervisors’ dissatisfaction with navigation and usage. In addition, Tevera did not offer HIPAA compliant recording and storage of recordings. Field experience sites are required to offer students both group and individual counseling opportunities – with ongoing collaboration between sites and the program, this requirement will be emphasized. Consistent meetings between clinical coordinator and site supervisors will reinforce the initial training covering the requirements of all sites.

1. Faculty Evaluation

The Florida International University Student Perceptions of Teaching Survey (SPOTS) is an assessment measure completed by the students of FIU. At the end of each semester, students receive an email from the OPIR and a notification in their student portal on their evaluation start date. Students will evaluate several aspects of instructor’s performance during that semester and course. The purpose of SPOT is to collect students’ opinions on various aspects of teaching and course delivery. This feedback will help instructors, and the program improve the course delivery and course content. The survey consists of 19 questions, including both standardized questions and those specifically designed by the university. The overall Average SPOT Score is a composite of three categories for instructor evaluation: Course Structure, Learning Support, and Student-Instructor Interaction. An average score will be calculated to summarize the overall performance of the instructor.

Scoring:

The categories are scored on a five-point scale. Excellent = 5; Very good = 4; Good = 3; Fair = 2; Poor = 1.

The current report is a summary of the performances of FIU’s Counselor Education Program faculty members, including adjunct faculty during 2024 Spring Semester, 2024 Summer Semester, and 2024 Fall Semester.

Spring Semester 2024

For the Spring semesters the following courses were offered and taught by the full time (FT) Faculty of the Counselor Education program

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course ID** | **Course name** |
| MHS 6630 | Program Evaluation in Counseling & School Psych |
| SDS 5460 (RVC) | Crisis Counseling and Intervention |
| RCS 6031 | Rehabilitation Counseling: Principles and Practices |
| SDS 6700 | Organization and Administration of School Counseling |
| MHS 6630 | Program Evaluation in Counseling & School Psych |
| MHS 6020 Sections 1 & 2 | Foundations of Mental Health Counseling |
| MHS 6470 | Human Sexuality Counseling |

For the Spring semesters the following courses were offered and taught by the non-full time (NFT) Faculty of the Counselor Education program

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course ID** | **Course Name** |
| MHS 6511 Section 1&2 | Group Counseling |
| MHS 6470 | Human Sexuality in Counseling |
| SDS 5460 | Crisis Counseling and Intervention |
| MHS 6802 (RVD) | Personality Theories |

**Statistics:**

* Mean Overall Average = **4.19** (5.00 score highest; 2.70 score lowest)
* Mean Overall Average for FT Faculty = **4.22** (5.00 highest score; 2.70 score lowest)
* Mean Overall Average for NFT faculty = **3.99** (5.00 highest score; 4.10 lowest score)
* Mean Response Rate = **48.50%** (85.7% highest response rate ;19.2% lowest response rate)
* Mean Response Rate FT faculty = 47.14%
* Mean Response Rate NFT faculty = 48.15%

**Summary**

For the academic year of 2024 Spring Semester, the SPOT scores indicated that students, on average, rated the courses as ‘very good’ (mean Average SPOT score of **4.19**). The courses receiving high SPOT scores included MHS 6630, MHS 6020, and MHS 6511. The courses receiving the lowest SPOT scores included MHS 6802 (RVC), SDS5460 (RVC), and MHS 6802 (RVD)**.**

Concerning the response rate for the academic year of 2024 Spring Semester, the response rate of students completing SPOTS was generally low at around 48.50%. There were six courses that did not have SPOT data and were excluded from the calculation. The SPOT scores are slightly higher for FT faculty when compared to NFT faculty, while the response rates are similar. A total of **128** student responses were collected out of a possible **273**

***Summer Semester 2024***

For the Summer semesters the following courses were offered and taught by the full time Faculty of the Counselor Education program

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course ID** | **Course Name** |
| MHS 6450 | Substance Abuse Counseling |
| MHS 6800 | Adv. Practicum in Counseling |
| MHS 5340 | Educational-Vocational Counseling |

For the Summer semesters the following courses were offered and taught by the NFT Faculty of the Counselor Education program

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course ID** | **Course Name** |
| MHS 6411 Sections 1&2 | Counseling and Consultation in Community Settings |
| SDS 6411 | Counseling Children and Adolescents |
| MHS 5340 | Educational-Vocational Counseling |
| MHS 6200 Sections 1&2 | Measurement and Appraisal in Counseling |
| MHS 5400 | Counseling Skills and Techniques |
| MHS 6800 | Adv. Practicum in Counseling |
| EDF 6211 | Psychological Foundations of Education |
| SDS 5460 | Crisis Counseling and Intervention |
| RCS 6245 | Psychological/Sociological Aspects of Disability |

**Statistics:**

* Mean Overall Average = **4.38** (5.00 score highest; 2.32 score lowest)
* Mean Overall Average for FT Faculty = **3.89** (5.00 highest score; 2.32 score lowest)
* Mean Overall Average for NFT faculty = **4.61** (5.00 highest score; 3.88 lowest score)
* Mean Response Rate = **40.12%** (63.6% highest response rate; 16.7% lowest response rate)
* Mean Response Rate FT faculty = 36.15%
* Mean Response Rate NFT faculty = 41.96%

**Summary:**

For the academic year of 2024 Summer Semester, the SPOT scores indicated that students, on average, rated the courses as ‘very good’ (mean Average SPOT score of **4.38**). The courses receiving high SPOT scores included MHS 6800 and MHS 6411. The courses receiving the lowest SPOT scores were MHS 5340 (RVC), RCS 6801, and MHS 6802 (RVC).

Concerning the response rate for the academic year of 2024 Summer Semester, the response rate of students completing SPOTS was generally low at around 40.12%. There were two courses that did not have SPOT data and were excluded from the calculation. The SPOT scores are slightly higher for NFT faculty when compared to FT faculty, while the response rates are similar. A total of **112** responses were collected out of a possible **291**

***Fall Semester 2024***

For the Fall semesters the following courses were offered and taught by the full time Faculty of the Counselor Education program

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course ID** | **Course Name** |
| MHS 6427 | Adult Psychopathology |
| MHS 6700 | Ethical, Legal and Professional Issues in Counseling |
| MHS 6428 (RVD) | Cross Cultural Counseling |
| EDP 6277 | Human Development: Across the Life Span |
| MHS 6427 | Adult Psychopathology |
| MHS 5400 | Counseling Skills and Technique |
| EDP 6277 | Human Development: Across the Life Span |
| SDS 5420 | Counseling Students with Exceptionalities |
| RCS 6821 | Supervised Field Experience in Counseling and Consultation |
| RCS 6080 | Medical Aspects of Disability |

For the Fall semesters the following courses were offered and taught by the NFT Faculty of the Counselor Education program

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Course ID** | **Course Name** |
| MHS 6450 Sections 1&2 | Substance Abuse Counseling |
| SDS 6428 RVC | Cross Cultural Counseling |
| SDS 6800 | Adv. Practicum in Counseling and Consultation |
| EDF 6211 Sections 1&2 | Psychological Foundations of Education |

**Statistics:**

* Mean Overall Average = **4.43** (5.00 score highest; 3.34 score lowest)
* Mean Overall Average for FT Faculty = **4.35** (5.00 highest score; 3.34 score lowest)
* Mean Overall Average for NFT faculty = **4.62** (5.00 highest score; 4.22 lowest score)
* Mean Response Rate = **50.0%** (100% highest response rate; 16.0% lowest response rate;)
* Mean Response Rate FT faculty = 58.28%
* Mean Response Rate NFT faculty = 31.74%

**Summary**

For the academic year of 2024 Fall Semester, the SPOT scores indicated that students, on average, rated the courses as ‘very good’ (mean Average SPOT score of **4.43**).

The courses receiving high SPOT scores included MHS 6820 and MHS 6450C. The courses receiving the lowest SPOT scores were RCS6080, RCS 6821, and MHS 6427 (RVC)**.** Concerning the response rate for the academic year of 2024 Fall Semester, the response rate of students completing SPOTS was generally on average at 50.0%. There was one course that did not have SPOT data and was excluded from the calculation. The SPOT scores are slightly higher for NFT faculty when compared to FT faculty, while the response rates are similar. A total of **117** responses were collected out of a possible **262.**

SWOT Analysis

*STRENGTHS:*

Through SPOT data, from the Spring, Summer, and Fall semesters in 2024, we identified several instructors that received high overall averages, indicating strong teaching performances and student satisfaction (Mean Overall Scores for all three semesters **4.33**). Courses taught by these instructors receive high ratings across different terms, thus demonstrating reliability in teaching quality. Students generally rate the courses at FIU’s Counseling Education Program as “very good”. The satisfaction level was positive and comparable to FT instructors and NFT instructors.  The data does suggest that FT instructors were slightly more favorable than NFT instructors

*WEAKNESSES:*

Through SPOT data, from the Spring, Summer, and Fall semesters of 2024, we identified courses that were consistently rated below a score of 4 across terms. Courses like MHS 6802 (RVC) and SDS 5460 (RVC) had low averages (below a 3). This suggests areas where teaching methods or course content might need evaluation and improvement. We observed that online courses generally receive lower ratings compared to face-to-face (F2F) courses. This may warrant further evaluation of the teaching method of online courses.

A second weakness we identified is the low response rate. Fewer than half the students who took the courses responded to the SPOT surveys. This may cause inconsistencies in our data, and it will be difficult for us to take proper action for improvement.

*OPPORTUNITIES:*

By understanding the areas of strengths and weaknesses, we can make improvements to the program overall. First, we identified strong instructors, both FT and NFT. We can learn from high-performing instructors’ teaching methods and strategies and use it as a model for new hires of both FT and NFT instructors. Second, our data helps us facilitate the process of matching instructors to specific courses. This can maximize our ability to plan out future semesters and prepare for adjunct hires. Third, for our courses and instructors that have low ratings we can provide additional support, and we can dedicate resources to enhance teaching performance and student learning. We need to investigate further to determine what specific actions can be taken to improve our online classroom and curriculum.

*THREATS:*

Failure to address the courses with lower SPOT scores can lead to ongoing dissatisfaction and negatively impact the program’s reputation. Moreover, the low response rate poses a threat to the accuracy and representativeness of students’ feedback, which could hinder effective decision-making for instructors and course improvement. Next, our program relied on adjunct faculty to teach a significant number of courses. These faculty members may become desirable to other programs or become unavailable at any moment. This can lead to potential disruption of the continuity and quality of course delivery. Finally, issues with online course delivery platforms or technological support can negatively impact the student’s learning. Further investigation is warranted to ensure what aspects of online course delivery need improvement.
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