

1999 DIRECTOR'S SURVEY SUMMARY DATA
 Raw data reported outside brackets (frequencies inside)

NOTE ON INTERPRETING THIS SUMMARY: There is missing data for nearly every question in this year's survey, most Directors skip a question or two. The result is that percentages may not add up to 100 for some questions. Please assume that the differences indicate missing data, or "no response" to a question. Numbers correspond to questions on survey, those that have been omitted are highlighted in comments. Thank you!

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Director's Gender		Director's Racial/Ethnic Identification	
Male	166 (54.2%)	African American	15 (4.9%)
Female	140 (45.8%)	Asian American	1 (0.3%)
		Hispanic American	9 (2.9%)
		Native American	1 (0.3%)
		White/Caucasian	278 (90.8%)
		Other	2 (0.7%)
		No response	5 (1.6%)

	<u>Under 2,500</u> n = 61	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> n = 88	<u>SCHOOL SIZE</u> <u>7,500 - 15,000</u> n = 66	<u>Over 15,000</u> n = 95	<u>TOTAL</u> n = 311	<u>COMMENTS</u>
1. Centers that charge fees for the following services:						Annual income generated
a) Personal counseling to students	4 (6.6%)	9 (10.3%)	9 (13.6%)	28 (29.5%)	51 (16.5%)	x= \$ 20,680 Range 3K-70K
b) Career counseling to students	1 (2.6%)	5 (7.9%)	6 (11.1%)	16 (21.1%)	28 (12.1%)	x= \$ 1,000 Range 500-1.5K
c) Career testing to students	3 (8.8%)	15 (24.6%)	15 (29.4%)	38 (50.0%)	71 (32.0%)	x= \$ 2,773 Range 120-19K
d) Personality testing to students	7 (16.7%)	13 (16.9%)	14 (23.3%)	31 (37.3%)	66 (25.1%)	x= \$ 2,442 Range 100-20K
2. Centers that collect third party payments for personal counseling:	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (4.6%)	6 (6.3%)	9 (2.9%)	This was 15% in 1988, 7.2% in 1995, and 4.2% in 1997.
3. Centers that are fully or partially supported by a mandatory fee:	21 (34.4%)	29 (33.7%)	24 (38.7%)	43 (46.7%)	118 (39.2%)	Up 16% since 1994, but leveled off in last 3 years.
4. Centers taking innovative action to earn income:	4 (6.6%)	12 (14.0%)	16 (24.6%)	29 (31.5%)	62 (20.3%)	Most involved service to community clients, testing, grants, & workshops
5. How Center budgets have fared in the past year:						
Salaries:						
a) Decreased	1 (1.7%)	2 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (4.2%)	7 (2.3%)	
b) Stayed the same	16 (26.7%)	21 (24.4%)	12 (18.2%)	10 (10.5%)	59 (19.2%)	
c) Increased 1-3%	30 (50.0%)	56 (65.1%)	40 (60.6%)	50 (52.6%)	177 (57.5%)	
d) Increased 4-6%	9 (15.0%)	7 (8.1%)	14 (21.2%)	26 (27.4%)	56 (18.2%)	
e) Increased 7% or more	4 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (5.3%)	9 (2.9%)	
Other Costs Budget:						
a) Increased	17 (29.3%)	28 (32.9%)	28 (42.4%)	37 (39.4%)	110 (36.2%)	Up 17.9% since 1997
b) Remained the same	37 (63.8%)	50 (58.8%)	35 (53.0%)	48 (51.1%)	171 (56.3%)	
c) Decreased	4 (6.9%)	7 (8.2%)	3 (4.5%)	9 (9.6%)	23 (7.6%)	

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
6. Centers that have been outsourced or privatized:						
a) Yes	4 (6.6%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	6 (1.9%)	
b) No, but under consideration	0 (0.0%)	4 (4.5%)	1 (1.5%)	2 (2.1%)	7 (2.3%)	
7. Director's level of anxiety about the possibility of their Center being outsourced:						
a) Low	52 (86.7%)	71 (80.7%)	55 (83.3%)	87 (91.6%)	266 (85.8%)	
b) Moderate	7 (11.7%)	14 (15.9%)	11 (16.7%)	7 (7.4%)	39 (12.6%)	
c) High	1 (1.7%)	3 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	5 (1.6%)	
8. Directors that think the fears about outsourcing of Counseling Centers are subsiding:	32 (59.3%)	53 (64.6%)	41 (67.2%)	63 (71.6%)	189 (66.3%)	
9. Centers that have gained new staff positions in the past year:						
a) Professional	8 (13.1%)	9 (10.2%)	17 (26.2%)	27 (28.4%)	61 (19.7%)	Centers gaining professional staff is up 7.3% over 1996.
b) Clerical	2 (3.3%)	4 (4.6%)	4 (6.2%)	10 (10.5%)	20 (6.5%)	
c) Graduate Student Assistant or ½ time Intern	4 (6.6%)	5 (5.7%)	4 (6.2%)	11 (11.6%)	24 (7.8%)	
d) Intern (full time)	1 (1.6%)	7 (8.0%)	1 (1.6%)	10 (10.5%)	19 (6.2%)	
10. Centers that have lost staff positions in the past year:						
a) Professional	4 (6.6%)	7 (8.0%)	3 (4.5%)	11 (11.7%)	25 (8.1%)	Centers losing professional staff is down 7.3% since 1996.
b) Clerical	1 (1.6%)	2 (2.3%)	2 (3.0%)	2 (2.1%)	7 (2.3%)	
c) Graduate Student Assistant or ½ time Intern	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.5%)	3 (3.2%)	4 (1.3%)	
d) Intern (full time)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.5%)	2 (2.2%)	4 (1.3%)	
11. Centers that have had records subpoenaed in the past year:	3 (5.0%)	10 (11.5%)	24 (36.9%)	35 (36.8%)	72 (23.4%)	Most involved former clients requesting records (18), custody/divorce cases (11), and suits against the Univ. (7).
13. Subpoenaed records were used:						% based on number of centers that had records subpoenaed.
a) In support of a claim by a Center client	2 (66.7%)	7 (70.0%)	16 (66.7%)	27 (77.1%)	52 (72.2%)	
b) Against a client	1 (33.3%)	1 (10.0%)	6 (25.0%)	11 (31.4%)	19 (26.3%)	
14. Centers where counselors had to appear in court as a result of subpoena:	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (19.0%)	5 (13.5%)	9 (12.9%)	
16. Centers that have had suits brought against them in the past year:	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.5%)	3 (3.2%)	4 (1.3%)	
1998-1999 Suits: Post Doc charged with malpractice, inappropriate counselor behavior, involuntary hospitalization due to dangerousness.						
17. Centers that have experienced other legal or ethical dilemmas in the past year:	23 (39.0%)	33 (40.2%)	29 (45.3%)	35 (38.0%)	120 (40.3%)	See Appendix A for examples of dilemmas.

18. Paid benefits available for Center staff and interns: (Total data only)	Professional Dues	Licensing Fee	Malpractice Insurance	Conference Expenses	Conference Money available per person
a) Director	121 (41.2%)	68 (23.4%)	107 (36.8%)	271 (93.8%)	x=\$ 1,135 Range 50-8,000
b) Training Director	24 (18.5%)	16 (12.4%)	39 (30.2%)	114 (89.8%)	x=\$ 938 Range 100-5,000
c) Assistant Director	32 (24.8%)	19 (14.7%)	39 (30.2%)	114 (89.8%)	x=\$ 833 Range 150-2,500
d) Professional Staff	69 (26.6%)	50 (19.3%)	85 (32.8%)	237 (92.6%)	x=\$ 647 Range 75-2,500
e) Interns	4 (3.3%)	2 (1.6%)	36 (29.5%)	94 (78.3%)	x=\$ 240 Range 35-1,000

	Under 2,500 n = 61	2,500 - 7,500 n = 88	7,500 - 15,000 n = 66	Over 15,000 n = 95	TOTAL n = 311	COMMENTS
19. Centers that provide supervision for staff who require licensure:	39 (68.4%)	72 (84.7%)	52 (80.0%)	85 (93.4%)	249 (83.3%)	

20. Usage of Center by different student populations relative to their percentage on campus:

	Greater than	Equal to	Less than
a) Men	6 (2.0%)	65 (22.2%)	222 (75.8%)
b) Women	203 (68.6%)	88 (29.7%)	5 (1.7%)
c) International Students	33 (11.8%)	119 (42.5%)	128 (45.7%)
d) Sexual Minorities	47 (20.5%)	88 (38.4%)	94 (41.0%)
e) African American Students	58 (20.3%)	136 (47.6%)	92 (32.2%)
f) Other Minority Students	47 (17.6%)	129 (48.3%)	91 (34.1%)

	Under 2,500 n = 61	2,500 - 7,500 n = 88	7,500 - 15,000 n = 66	Over 15,000 n = 95	TOTAL n = 311	COMMENTS
--	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------

21. Centers with a systematized format for evaluation of professional staff:

a) Institution-wide format	40 (65.6%)	72 (81.8%)	44 (66.7%)	50 (52.6%)	207 (66.6%)	Centers using an institution-wide format is up 11.6% since 1998.
b) Format designed specifically for the Center	13 (21.3%)	17 (19.3%)	19 (28.8%)	41 (43.2%)	90 (28.9%)	
c) No systematized format	13 (21.3%)	7 (8.0%)	5 (7.6%)	11 (11.6%)	36 (11.6%)	

22. For Centers with a systematized evaluation format:

a) Staff formally evaluated on established criteria; evaluation shared with directors supervisor	41 (85.4%)	64 (79.0%)	47 (77.0%)	60 (70.6%)	213 (77.2%)	It is noteworthy that in the majority of cases, evaluations do not affect salary increases.
b) Staff formally evaluated on established criteria; evaluation shared only with staff member	7 (14.6%)	18 (22.2%)	17 (27.9%)	27 (31.8%)	70 (25.4%)	
c) Staff informally evaluated; progress reviewed on regular basis	13 (27.1%)	25 (30.9%)	17 (27.9%)	14 (16.5%)	69 (25.0%)	
d) Team goals reviewed by entire staff; no individual evaluation except if problems arise	1 (2.1%)	3 (3.7%)	3 (4.9%)	5 (5.9%)	12 (4.3%)	
e) Peer evaluations are used	1 (2.1%)	13 (16.0%)	8 (13.1%)	16 (18.8%)	39 (14.1%)	
f) Evaluations directly affect salary increases	13 (27.1%)	26 (32.1%)	23 (37.7%)	40 (47.1%)	103 (37.3%)	

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)		<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)		<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)		<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)		<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)		<u>COMMENTS</u>
23. Previous surveys have indicated that most counselors do, on occasion, find themselves sexually attracted to their clients. Directors indicated that the following statements reflect the current status of this issue:											
a) Sexual attraction toward a client is still a taboo subject in this field	20	(33.3%)	19	(22.9%)	19	(29.7%)	15	(16.1%)	74	(24.6%)	Down 45.2% since 1992!
b) When the topic is discussed, it is almost always in general terms rather than an expression of personal experience	32	(53.3%)	50	(60.2%)	40	(62.5%)	50	(53.8%)	172	(57.1%)	Down 23.8% since 1992.
c) Most counselors who are sexually attracted to a client rarely, if ever, discuss this at a case conference	24	(40.0%)	42	(50.6%)	37	(57.8%)	52	(55.9%)	155	(51.5%)	Down 26% since 1992.
d) Most counselors who are sexually attracted to a client rarely, if ever, discuss this in individual supervision	14	(23.3%)	19	(22.9%)	20	(31.3%)	17	(18.3%)	70	(23.3%)	A major change is occurring in the willingness of center counselors to discuss sexual attraction to clients.
24. Directors that know of students who have come to their Center in the past year because of sexual exploitation or harassment by:											
a) Another therapist	3	(5.6%)	6	(7.6%)	10	(16.1%)	18	(20.5%)	37	(13.0%)	Down 2.4% since 1996.
b) Faculty member or supervisor	30	(55.6%)	49	(62.0%)	42	(67.7%)	79	(89.8%)	201	(70.8%)	Up 9.6% since 1996.
c) Another student	50	(92.6%)	71	(91.0%)	56	(90.3%)	78	(88.6%)	256	(90.5%)	Up 8.3% since 1996.
25. Area where career counseling takes place on campus:											
a) Primarily in the Counseling Center	7	(11.5%)	14	(16.1%)	17	(25.8%)	32	(34.0%)	70	(22.7%)	(a) Down 6.3% since 1996 and down 16.3% since 1991.
b) Primarily in a separate career development or placement office	50	(82.0%)	57	(65.5%)	38	(57.6%)	42	(44.7%)	188	(60.8%)	
c) Shared equally between a and b	1	(1.6%)	13	(14.9%)	8	(12.1%)	19	(20.2%)	41	(13.3%)	
26. Average salaries for professional staff hired in the past year according to gender, minority status, and institutional size is available in Appendix B .											
27. Average salary paid to professional staff according to number of years in the position, according to institutional size, is available in Appendix C .											
28. In 1998, data indicated that 62% of all center professional paid staff are female and that 2 out of every 3 new hires are also female. In view of this, Directors who indicated that they are having more difficulty hiring qualified professional male staff:	13	(38.2%)	24	(35.3%)	15	(30.6%)	27	(36.5%)	79	(35.0%)	
29. Centers using e-mail/Internet for any of the following:											
a) Chat rooms around specific themes for students	1	(2.5%)	6	(8.5%)	5	(9.1%)	5	(6.6%)	17	(7.0%)	Other on-line uses:
b) Psychoeducation	22	(55.0%)	46	(64.8%)	32	(58.2%)	41	(53.9%)	141	(58.3%)	Center Web page, list servs
c) Data base	1	(2.5%)	13	(18.3%)	17	(30.9%)	24	(31.6%)	55	(22.7%)	campus communication,
d) Personal client contact/questions and concerns	21	(52.5%)	32	(45.1%)	18	(32.7%)	23	(30.3%)	94	(38.8%)	scheduling with clients,
e) Providing career information	4	(10.0%)	20	(28.2%)	14	(25.5%)	29	(38.2%)	67	(27.7%)	advertising and announce-
f) Other	16	(40.0%)	18	(25.4%)	22	(40.0%)	26	(34.2%)	82	(33.9%)	ments and research.

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
30. Centers that inform students that in the future they may be pressured to sign release of information forms if seeking employment in government agencies or admittance to the Bar:	2 (3.4%)	16 (18.4%)	11 (16.7%)	15 (16.1%)	44 (14.4%)	Down 15.2% since 1995.
31. Centers where providing information about pressured release of information has resulted in students deciding not to proceed with therapy:	1 (50.0%)	5 (35.7%)	6 (54.5%)	3 (23.1%)	15 (37.5%)	% based on respondents to # 30.
32. Directors who believe that providing this information would deter students from seeking help:	16 (30.8%)	28 (41.2%)	22 (40.7%)	32 (42.7%)	99 (39.6%)	
33. Approximate ratio of FTE mental health professionals (includes all paid staff and interns at centers and other service units on campus except for services provided by students in departmental clinics) to FTE students:	1 to 763	1 to 1,247	1 to 1,861	1 to 2,165	1 to 1,579	The range varies from 1 - 180 to 1-7,540.
34. On campus psychiatric services are provided:						
a) In Counseling Center only	12 (20.0%)	24 (27.6%)	21 (32.8%)	26 (27.4%)	83 (27.0%)	
b) In Student Health Center only	1 (1.7%)	4 (4.6%)	12 (18.8%)	28 (29.5%)	45 (14.7%)	
c) In both Counseling & Student Health Centers	1 (1.7%)	3 (3.4%)	6 (9.4%)	21 (22.1%)	32 (10.4%)	
d) Contract out for psychiatrists	9 (15.0%)	11 (12.6%)	3 (4.7%)	4 (4.2%)	27 (8.8%)	
e) No access to psychiatrist except as private referral	30 (50.0%)	41 (47.1%)	15 (23.4%)	9 (9.5%)	95 (30.9%)	
f) Other	4 (6.7%)	3 (3.4%)	5 (7.8%)	6 (6.3%)	18 (5.9%)	
35. Number of psychiatric consultation hours available per week:	x= 2.1	x= 8	x= 9.5	x= 37	x= 20	Range 0.5 - 242
36. Number of psychiatric consultation hours per week provided per 1,000 students:	x= 1.3	x= 1.7	x= 1.0	x= 1.9	x= 1.5	Range .001 - 28.5
37. Students receiving medication from an on-campus psychiatrist:						
a) Must be in therapy with a Counseling Center therapist	11 (55.0%)	13 (37.1%)	24 (54.5%)	23 (31.5%)	71 (41.0%)	Up 3.2% since 1997
b) Must be in therapy with either a Center therapist or an external therapist	4 (20.0%)	8 (22.9%)	6 (13.6%)	10 (13.7%)	28 (16.2%)	
c) Can obtain medication without on-going therapy	5 (25.0%)	14 (40.0%)	14 (31.8%)	40 (54.8%)	74 (42.8%)	
38. Center clients receive medication from the following campus sources (Directors checked all that applied):						
a) Psychiatrist	18 (81.8%)	35 (87.5%)	43 (93.5%)	77 (96.3%)	174 (92.1%)	
b) M.D., non-psychiatrist	11 (50.0%)	20 (50.0%)	31 (67.4%)	46 (57.5%)	109 (57.7%)	
c) Nurse practitioner	5 (22.7%)	9 (22.5%)	10 (21.7%)	21 (26.3%)	46 (24.3%)	
40. Number of professional staff for each support staff member:	x= 3.1	x= 3.7	x= 4.1	x= 4.0	x= 3.8	Range 0.20-14
41. Number of clients seen each week to be considered						

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
a full case load for a counselor who does only counseling:	x= 23 Range 15-32	x= 24 Range 12-35	x= 24 Range 15-33	x= 25 Range 13-33	x= 24 Range 12-35	
42. Percentage of counseling caseload at Center which is seen by trainees (interns, practicum students, graduate assistants):	x= 34% Range 2-90	x= 28% Range 1-90	x= 28% Range .18-80	x= 29% Range 5-99	x= 29% Range 0.18-99	
43. The percentage of time a full-time counselor spends on the following areas during Fall and Spring terms:						
a) Direct Service (individual and group counseling, intakes, assessment, crisis intervention, C & O for students)	x= 61% Range 20-92	x= 59% Range 20-94	x= 59% Range 25-80	x= 58% Range 30-95	x= 59% Range 20-95	
b) Indirect Service (supervision, RA/peer/clinical training, consultation, case notes, other outreach)	x= 18% Range 5-40	x= 20% Range 3-50	x= 24% Range 10-60	x= 22% Range 4-40	x= 21% Range 3-60	
c) Administrative Service (staff meetings, committee work, center mgmt., professional development)	x= 13% Range 0-50	x= 15% Range 0-50	x= 12% Range 0-40	x= 15% Range 1-60	x= 14% Range 0-60	
d) Other (research, teaching, etc.)	x= 5% Range 0-26	x= 5% Range 0-30	x= 5% Range 0-20	x= 5.8% Range 0-30	x= 5% Range 0-30	
44. Percentage of students in the following counseling session usage categories:						
a) Students that come for initial session and do not return	x= 21% Range 1-59	x= 23% Range 2-60	x= 27% Range 5-65	x= 27% Range 3-70	x= 25% Range 1-70	
b) Students that come for three sessions or less	x= 27% Range 5-66	x= 33% Range 5-75	x= 28% Range 3-60	x= 33% Range 5-78	x= 31% Range 3-78	
c) Students that come for four to eight sessions	x= 35% Range 2-70	x= 28% Range 3-80	x= 28% Range 9-70	x= 28% Range 5-80	x= 29% Range 2-80	
d) Students that come for nine or more sessions	x= 18% Range 1-80	x= 19% Range 1-75	x= 20% Range 2-57	x= 15% Range 2-60	x= 18% Range 1-80	
45. a) Schools that have had an Academic Success Program established on their campus:	21 (35.6%)	28 (33.7%)	25 (40.3%)	33 (36.7%)	108 (36.6%)	
b) Schools where the involved offices have retained their own identity:	20 (95.2%)	22 (78.6%)	20 (83.3%)	32 (94.1%)	95 (88.0%)	
c) Centers that are involved in their school's Academic Success Program:	15 (71.4%)	12 (44.4%)	12 (52.2%)	26 (74.3%)	65 (60.7%)	% based on respondents to 45a.

46. Centers providing the following services:

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
a) Personal counseling	60 (100.0%)	86 (98.9%)	66 (100.0%)	94 (100.0%)	307 (99.7%)	
b) Career counseling	21 (35.0%)	46 (52.9%)	41 (62.1%)	67 (70.5%)	175 (56.6%)	
c) Learning skills (tutoring, etc.)	12 (20.0%)	14 (16.1%)	12 (18.2%)	27 (28.4%)	65 (21.0%)	
d) Placement	5 (8.3%)	2 (2.3%)	2 (3.0%)	5 (5.3%)	14 (4.5%)	
e) Teaching a credit bearing course	19 (31.7%)	29 (33.3%)	29 (43.9%)	36 (37.9%)	113 (36.6%)	
f) Outreach (workshops, etc.)	59 (98.3%)	84 (96.6%)	66 (100.0%)	93 (97.9%)	303 (98.1%)	
g) Consultations	58 (96.7%)	84 (96.6%)	65 (98.5%)	92 (96.8%)	300 (97.1%)	
h) Supervision of trainees	31 (51.7%)	70 (80.5%)	63 (95.5%)	90 (94.7%)	255 (82.5%)	
i) Academic advising	11 (18.3%)	14 (16.1%)	7 (10.6%)	7 (7.4%)	39 (12.6%)	
j) Freshman orientation	37 (61.7%)	45 (51.7%)	31 (47.0%)	39 (41.1%)	153 (49.5%)	
k) Minority services	15 (25.0%)	20 (23.0%)	13 (19.7%)	38 (40.0%)	86 (27.8%)	
l) Specialized women's services	15 (25.0%)	22 (25.3%)	19 (28.8%)	35 (36.8%)	91 (29.4%)	
m) Specialized services for gay, lesbian, bisexual students	17 (28.3%)	25 (28.7%)	11 (16.7%)	38 (40.0%)	91 (29.4%)	
n) Other	15 (25.0%)	25 (28.7%)	17 (25.8%)	24 (25.3%)	81 (26.2%)	

47. Apart from direct counseling services, Centers are involved in retention efforts through the following services:

a) Committee work	35 (59.3%)	67 (79.8%)	47 (73.4%)	74 (78.7%)	223 (73.8%)	
b) Teach a freshman seminar/adjustment to college course	18 (30.5%)	30 (35.7%)	24 (37.5%)	36 (38.3%)	108 (35.8%)	
c) Workshops on various topics geared toward retention	32 (54.2%)	56 (66.7%)	37 (57.8%)	64 (68.1%)	190 (62.9%)	
d) Contribute to Freshman Orientation	48 (81.4%)	78 (92.9%)	58 (90.6%)	83 (88.3%)	268 (88.7%)	
e) Consultation and Outreach (for Student Affairs Staff, Faculty, etc.)	51 (86.4%)	79 (94.0%)	58 (90.6%)	87 (92.6%)	276 (91.4%)	
f) Coordinate an Academic Support Unit/ Academic Services Program	11 (18.6%)	16 (19.0%)	5 (7.8%)	11 (11.7%)	43 (14.2%)	
g) Coordinate a Learning Skills Unit	8 (13.6%)	7 (8.3%)	8 (12.5%)	17 (18.1%)	40 (13.2%)	
h) Collaborate with Student Affairs Staff	49 (83.1%)	82 (97.6%)	55 (85.9%)	81 (86.2%)	268 (88.7%)	
i) Research/Data collection for university	22 (37.3%)	26 (31.0%)	18 (28.1%)	29 (30.9%)	95 (31.5%)	
j) Provide career education	10 (16.9%)	22 (26.2%)	23 (35.9%)	44 (46.8%)	99 (32.8%)	
k) Organize peer mentoring programs, train peer mentors	20 (33.9%)	33 (39.3%)	15 (23.4%)	29 (30.9%)	97 (32.1%)	
l) Provide interventions for at-risk students	36 (61.0%)	48 (57.1%)	35 (54.7%)	67 (71.3%)	186 (61.6%)	

48. Centers that describe themselves as:

a) Primarily a mental health/psychological services center	32 (53.3%)	36 (40.9%)	29 (43.9%)	40 (42.6%)	138 (44.7%)	Down 11% since 1991.
b) Primarily a personal development center	8 (13.3%)	14 (15.9%)	12 (18.2%)	10 (10.6%)	44 (14.2%)	Down 12% since 1991.
c) Primarily a career development center	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.3%)	
d) A balance of the above	14 (23.3%)	29 (33.0%)	22 (33.3%)	43 (45.7%)	108 (35.0%)	

49. Centers primary theoretical orientation:

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
a) None	9 (15.3%)	9 (10.3%)	7 (10.8%)	10 (11.0%)	35 (11.6%)	Down 52% since 1990.
b) Psychodynamic	7 (11.9%)	5 (5.7%)	5 (7.7%)	9 (9.9%)	26 (8.6%)	
c) Cognitive-behavioral	8 (13.6%)	14 (16.1%)	7 (10.8%)	9 (9.9%)	38 (12.5%)	
d) Developmental	8 (13.6%)	11 (12.6%)	10 (15.4%)	8 (8.8%)	37 (12.2%)	
e) Eclectic/Integrative	22 (37.3%)	40 (46.0%)	31 (47.7%)	47 (51.6%)	141 (46.5%)	
f) Other	5 (8.5%)	8 (9.2%)	5 (7.7%)	8 (8.8%)	26 (8.6%)	
50. Centers that have taken the following actions to effectively manage case loads:						
a) Seeing more students in therapy less than once a week	25 (53.2%)	47 (59.5%)	38 (64.4%)	58 (63.7%)	169 (61.0%)	
b) Reducing the number of students seen more than once a week	17 (36.2%)	27 (34.2%)	18 (30.5%)	23 (25.3%)	85 (30.7%)	
c) No longer having holding appointments for students	14 (29.8%)	22 (27.8%)	25 (42.4%)	25 (27.5%)	87 (31.4%)	
d) Using a waiting list "support" group (students attend group until an individual appt. is available)	1 (2.1%)	2 (2.5%)	2 (3.4%)	7 (7.7%)	12 (4.3%)	
e) Assigning more students to groups directly from intake/assessment	1 (2.1%)	7 (8.9%)	16 (27.1%)	29 (31.9%)	53 (19.1%)	
f) Using a telephone assessment/intake system	5 (10.6%)	4 (5.1%)	1 (1.7%)	3 (3.3%)	13 (4.7%)	
g) Making more external referrals	11 (23.4%)	23 (29.1%)	23 (39.0%)	42 (46.2%)	99 (35.7%)	
h) Using a brief treatment model	32 (68.1%)	53 (67.1%)	43 (72.9%)	75 (82.4%)	204 (73.6%)	
51. Schools which have an alcohol abuse program on their campus:						
	36 (60.0%)	63 (73.3%)	51 (77.3%)	74 (77.9%)	225 (73.1%)	
Centers that are responsible for running this alcohol abuse program:	19 (52.7%)	37 (58.7%)	15 (29.4%)	30 (40.5%)	102 (45.3%)	Up 6.7% since 1993.
52. Centers that provide drug and alcohol assessments:						
	47 (78.3%)	64 (74.4%)	40 (60.6%)	64 (68.1%)	216 (70.4%)	
53. Centers that accept mandated drug and alcohol referrals:						
a) For assessment only	20 (33.9%)	30 (35.3%)	21 (31.8%)	30 (31.6%)	101 (33.0%)	
a) For assessment and counseling	25 (42.4%)	35 (41.2%)	21 (31.8%)	32 (33.7%)	114 (37.3%)	
b) Do not accept mandated referrals	14 (23.7%)	20 (23.5%)	24 (36.4%)	33 (34.7%)	91 (29.7%)	
54. Centers that have noted the following about students coming in for drug and alcohol assessments over the past five years:						
a) Increased	13 (27.7%)	30 (46.9%)	23 (52.3%)	26 (40.6%)	93 (42.3%)	
b) Remained the same	29 (61.7%)	30 (46.9%)	17 (38.6%)	38 (59.4%)	114 (51.8%)	
c) Decreased	5 (10.6%)	4 (6.3%)	4 (9.1%)	0 (0.0%)	13 (5.9%)	
55. Schools participating in the following national alcohol usage surveys:						
a) CORE	30 (54.5%)	53 (64.6%)	41 (69.5%)	36 (40.4%)	161 (56.3%)	

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
b) The Harvard Survey	2 (3.6%)	11 (13.4%)	13 (22.0%)	25 (28.1%)	51 (17.8%)	
c) Other	3 (5.5%)	9 (11.0%)	4 (6.8%)	10 (11.2%)	26 (9.1%)	
d) Do not participate	24 (43.6%)	19 (23.2%)	13 (22.0%)	31 (34.8%)	87 (30.4%)	
56. The national research data suggest that the average binge drinking rate among college students is about 43%. Among schools who participate in these surveys, Directors indicate the binge drinking rate on their campus is:						
a) Well below the national average (7% points or lower)	10 (20.8%)	10 (13.0%)	7 (12.3%)	10 (13.3%)	38 (14.7%)	
b) Somewhere near the national average	14 (29.2%)	34 (44.2%)	19 (33.3%)	29 (38.7%)	96 (37.2%)	
c) Well above the national average (7% points or higher)	8 (16.7%)	16 (20.8%)	17 (29.8%)	11 (14.7%)	52 (20.2%)	
d) Don't know	16 (33.3%)	17 (22.1%)	14 (24.6%)	25 (33.3%)	72 (27.9%)	
57. In the absence of actual research data, what Directors estimate the binge drinking rate on their campus to be:						
a) Well below the national average (7% points or lower)	7 (18.9%)	8 (18.2%)	3 (11.1%)	7 (14.9%)	26 (16.7%)	
b) Somewhere near the national average	21 (56.8%)	27 (61.4%)	18 (66.7%)	33 (70.2%)	99 (63.5%)	
c) Well above the national average (7% points or higher)	6 (16.2%)	3 (6.8%)	6 (22.2%)	3 (6.4%)	18 (11.5%)	
58. If students on campus binge drink well below the national average Directors account for this difference:						
a) We tend to not attract students with a drinking problem	7 (43.8%)	9 (52.9%)	4 (33.3%)	6 (27.3%)	26 (38.2%)	% based on # of schools where students drink well below the national average. Other ways directors account for this difference include; being religiously affiliated (13), an older student populations (6), and being a commuter school (6).
b) We have a no tolerance alcohol policy	4 (25.0%)	7 (41.2%)	1 (8.3%)	3 (13.6%)	15 (22.1%)	
c) We conduct extensive alcohol education/prevention programming	6 (37.5%)	4 (23.5%)	2 (16.7%)	5 (22.7%)	18 (26.5%)	
d) Other	8 (50.0%)	11 (64.7%)	6 (50.0%)	12 (54.5%)	37 (54.4%)	
59. Director opinions about current alcohol use on their campus now vs. five years ago:						
a) Significant increase in binge drinking	7 (13.0%)	19 (22.4%)	17 (26.6%)	18 (19.8%)	61 (20.7%)	
b) Level of alcohol use about the same	41 (75.9%)	64 (75.3%)	44 (68.8%)	70 (76.9%)	219 (74.2%)	
c) Significant decrease in binge drinking	6 (11.1%)	2 (2.4%)	3 (4.7%)	3 (3.3%)	15 (5.1%)	
60. Institutions that have received a grant to address alcohol problems on campus:						
a) FIPSE grant	22 (39.3%)	42 (48.8%)	35 (56.5%)	64 (70.3%)	164 (55.4%)	
b) State funded grant	10 (17.9%)	9 (10.5%)	15 (24.2%)	16 (17.6%)	50 (16.9%)	
c) Foundation (or other private) grant	11 (19.6%)	13 (15.1%)	7 (11.3%)	15 (16.5%)	47 (15.9%)	
d) Never received an alcohol grant	21 (37.5%)	30 (34.9%)	18 (29.0%)	14 (15.4%)	83 (28.0%)	
61. Institutions where alcohol grant was managed by the Counseling Center:						
	16 (45.7%)	26 (48.1%)	16 (34.8%)	26 (32.9%)	84 (39.1%)	
62. Among institutions who received alcohol grants, the impact it had on student alcohol use at your campus:						

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
a) A significant (8% or more) decline in alcohol abuse	2 (6.5%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (2.5%)	1 (1.4%)	6 (3.1%)	
b) A moderate (4-7%) decline in alcohol use	1 (3.2%)	5 (9.6%)	9 (22.5%)	5 (7.0%)	20 (10.3%)	
c) No noticeable impact	16 (51.6%)	30 (57.7%)	20 (50.0%)	38 (53.5%)	104 (53.3%)	
d) Too early to say	8 (25.8%)	11 (21.2%)	8 (20.0%)	16 (22.5%)	43 (22.1%)	
63. Schools with a committee or office on campus which provides programming to address the problem of alcohol abuse:						
a) Committee	23 (39.0%)	30 (34.9%)	29 (44.6%)	33 (34.7%)	116 (37.9%)	
b) Office or specified program	28 (47.5%)	48 (55.8%)	47 (72.3%)	58 (61.1%)	182 (59.5%)	
c) Do not have	11 (18.6%)	19 (22.1%)	5 (7.7%)	17 (17.9%)	52 (17.0%)	
64. Schools with an educational program for students who break alcohol policies:						
	38 (66.7%)	60 (69.8%)	49 (76.6%)	64 (68.1%)	212 (70.2%)	
65. Directors opinions on effectiveness of these programs:						
a) Highly effective	1 (2.7%)	5 (8.8%)	7 (14.0%)	2 (3.3%)	15 (7.3%)	
b) Moderately effective	27 (73.0%)	34 (59.6%)	35 (70.0%)	48 (78.7%)	145 (70.4%)	
c) Not effective	9 (24.3%)	18 (31.6%)	8 (16.0%)	11 (18.0%)	46 (22.3%)	
66. Centers with successful educational alcohol programs measure effectiveness by:						
a) Drop in overall percentage of alcohol abuse	1 (3.8%)	3 (8.1%)	1 (2.6%)	6 (13.0%)	11 (7.4%)	
b) Attendees tend not to be sanctioned a second time	21 (80.8%)	33 (91.7%)	33 (84.6%)	39 (84.8%)	127 (85.8%)	
c) Other	9 (34.6%)	7 (18.9%)	9 (23.1%)	7 (15.2%)	32 (21.5%)	
67. Directors opinions about the likelihood that any of the interventions currently applied to the alcohol abuse problems on college campuses will significantly reduce this problem in the next 10 years:						
a) Very likely	2 (3.6%)	3 (3.6%)	3 (4.8%)	8 (9.0%)	17 (5.8%)	
b) Somewhat likely	35 (63.6%)	52 (61.9%)	31 (49.2%)	48 (53.9%)	166 (56.8%)	
c) Not likely	18 (32.7%)	29 (34.5%)	29 (46.0%)	33 (37.1%)	109 (37.3%)	
68. Schools which Directors think are already experiencing great success with their alcohol programming and interventions: Northern Illinois (16), University of Arizona (12), University of Delaware (8), Western Washington University (6), Smith and Hobart (4).						
69. Percentage of total clientele seen for eating disorders in the past year: x= 6.5% Range 1-35 x= 4.9% Range 0.5-17 x= 6.5% Range 0-36 x= 5.6% Range .05-20 x= 5.7% Range 0-35.7						
70. Status of eating disorders on campus:						
a) The problem seems to be declining	6 (11.8%)	11 (13.6%)	8 (14.0%)	10 (12.0%)	35 (12.8%)	
b) The problem is still a significant one but leveling off	34 (66.7%)	54 (66.7%)	41 (71.9%)	58 (69.9%)	187 (68.5%)	
c) The problem seems to be increasing	11 (21.6%)	16 (19.8%)	8 (14.0%)	15 (18.1%)	51 (18.7%)	
71. Diagnostic testing for learning disabilities is:						
a) Conducted by the Counseling Center staff	7 (11.7%)	14 (16.1%)	10 (15.2%)	24 (25.3%)	55 (17.8%)	Up 9% since 1992.
b) Conducted by the Learning Skills Center staff	7 (11.7%)	6 (6.9%)	5 (7.6%)	5 (5.3%)	23 (7.4%)	

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
c) Conducted by the Disabled Student Services staff	4 (6.7%)	7 (8.0%)	7 (10.6%)	22 (23.2%)	40 (12.9%)	
d) Conducted by an on-campus program other than those listed above	3 (5.0%)	6 (6.9%)	11 (16.7%)	21 (22.1%)	41 (13.3%)	
e) Provided by referral to services off campus	46 (76.7%)	64 (73.6%)	46 (69.7%)	60 (63.2%)	217 (70.2%)	Up 25% since 1992.
72. Source of payment for students referred out for LD diagnosis:						
a) The student	50 (87.7%)	70 (89.7%)	57 (95.0%)	82 (93.2%)	260 (91.5%)	
b) The University	4 (7.0%)	3 (3.8%)	1 (1.7%)	4 (4.5%)	12 (4.2%)	
73. Typical cost for an LD assessment:	x= \$670 Range 0-4	x=\$560 Range 0-1,500	x=\$497 Range 0-1,500	x=\$535 Range 0-1,500		x= \$559 Range \$0-4,000
74. Centers with a procedure in place for dealing with Critical Incidents (e.g., a public suicide, multiple deaths in an accident):	36 (62.1%)	55 (63.2%)	46 (71.9%)	76 (80.9%)	214 (70.4%)	
75. Centers with staff trained in Critical Incident Stress Management/Debriefing:	26 (57.8%)	42 (60.9%)	37 (66.1%)	67 (81.7%)	173 (68.4%)	The majority were suicide-related (73) or student deaths (45).
Training provided by:						
a) International Critical Incident Stress Foundation	3 (10.7%)	5 (12.2%)	8 (21.1%)	11 (16.2%)	28 (15.9%)	
b) Red Cross	7 (25.0%)	7 (17.1%)	9 (23.7%)	9 (13.2%)	32 (18.2%)	
c) Our own staff who have received training elsewhere	11 (39.3%)	23 (56.1%)	16 (42.1%)	35 (51.5%)	85 (48.3%)	
d) Other	7 (25.0%)	6 (14.6%)	5 (13.2%)	13 (19.1%)	31 (17.6%)	
76. Centers that had to intervene in a critical incident in the past year:	15 (25.0%)	33 (37.9%)	33 (50.0%)	63 (67.7%)	144 (46.9%)	
77. Centers that have a written protocol for how a sexual assault case is handled at the Center:	31 (51.7%)	43 (49.4%)	31 (47.0%)	34 (35.8%)	140 (45.3%)	Up 22.8% since 1993.
78. Centers with someone on campus assigned to coordinate services for those who have been sexually assaulted:	34 (57.6%)	42 (49.4%)	43 (65.2%)	53 (55.8%)	173 (56.5%)	
This responsibility has been assigned as:						
a) An add-on responsibility to someone with other duties	33 (97.1%)	36 (85.7%)	36 (83.7%)	28 (58.3%)	133 (79.2%)	
b) A full time responsibility for one or more persons	1 (2.9%)	6 (14.3%)	7 (16.3%)	20 (41.7%)	35 (20.8%)	
79. Institutions that keep statistics on the number of on-campus sexual assaults each year:	57 (95.0%)	73 (88.0%)	62 (98.4%)	83 (92.2%)	276 (92.9%)	
Number of sexual assaults in the past year:	x= 2.7 Range 0-13	x= 2.9 Range 0-15	x= 4.7 Range 0-19	x=10 Range 0-104	x= 5 Range 0-104	
80. Sexual assault statistics are maintained by:						
a) The Campus Police	40 (83.3%)	58 (81.7%)	46 (80.7%)	55 (77.5%)	200 (80.6%)	
b) The Sexual Assault Office	4 (8.3%)	7 (9.9%)	15 (26.3%)	17 (23.9%)	44 (17.7%)	

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
c) The Counseling Center	14 (29.2%)	22 (31.0%)	12 (21.1%)	10 (14.1%)	59 (23.8%)	
c) Other	9 (18.8%)	11 (15.5%)	8 (14.0%)	14 (19.7%)	42 (16.9%)	
81. Centers that provide services to individuals not affiliated with the university (e.g. children of faculty, walk-ins from the community, students from other schools):	6 (10.0%)	14 (16.3%)	14 (21.2%)	27 (28.7%)	61 (19.9%)	A 16.7% decrease since 1990. Note:31.3% of these schools will assume legal responsibility.
83. Center Directors that have noticed an increase in students with the following problems over the past five years:						
a) Severe psychological problems	41 (70.7%)	66 (75.9%)	50 (76.9%)	67 (72.8%)	225 (74.3%)	
b) Sexual assault concerns (on campus)	13 (22.4%)	20 (23.8%)	19 (29.2%)	26 (28.9%)	79 (26.5%)	
c) Problems related to earlier sexual abuse	18 (30.5%)	28 (32.6%)	28 (43.1%)	40 (44.9%)	115 (38.3%)	
d) Alcohol problems	18 (31.6%)	32 (38.6%)	28 (42.4%)	25 (28.1%)	103 (34.8%)	
e) Other illicit drug use	16 (28.6%)	27 (32.9%)	22 (33.8%)	24 (27.0%)	89 (30.4%)	
f) Learning disabilities	40 (70.2%)	62 (72.9%)	46 (71.9%)	68 (76.4%)	217 (73.3%)	
84. Centers with obsessive-pursuit cases in the past year:	16 (27.6%)	28 (32.2%)	31 (48.4%)	43 (47.3%)	118 (39.2%)	A total of 100 cases with 13 persons injured and 2 persons killed.
87. Centers that had to hospitalize a student for psychological reasons in the past year:	41 (68.3%)	75 (87.2%)	55 (84.6%)	84 (88.4%)	256 (83.4%)	A total of 1,081 students, x= 5 Range 1 - 30
88. Campuses that had an enrolled <u>student</u> suicide in the 98-99 school year:	4 (6.8%)	8 (9.2%)	26 (40.6%)	46 (51.7%)	85 (28.3%)	A total of 128 students, x=1.7, Range 1 - 6.
89. Campuses that had a <u>client</u> suicide in the 98-99 school year	3 (5.0%)	3 (3.4%)	6 (9.1%)	14 (15.6%)	27 (8.9%)	A total of 33 students, x=1.2, Range 1 - 2.
90. Centers that have had legal action taken against them following a client or former client suicide:	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (5.3%)	6 (1.9%)	Two were settled out of court, one in favor of the Center, one still in progress.
92. Centers that have had to notify a third party about a potentially suicidal student during the past year:	35 (59.3%)	58 (69.9%)	36 (56.3%)	54 (57.4%)	183 (60.8%)	A total of 480 students, x=3.2, Range 1 - 31.
93. When a student is a suicidal risk but appropriate for treatment in the Center (as opposed to hospitalization), Centers typically:						
a) Provide counseling without informing anyone but take usual precautions (contracting, etc.)	21 (36.2%)	30 (35.3%)	31 (48.4%)	50 (54.3%)	133 (44.3%)	Most directors would do a combination of

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
b) Seek client's permission to alert someone in the residence hall, or someone with whom the student resides in order to provide another level of safety but work with client even if he/she does not give permission	20 (34.5%)	36 (42.4%)	25 (39.1%)	26 (28.3%)	107 (35.7%)	a, b, and c and evaluate on a case by case basis.
c) Notify someone as indicated above, even without client's permission and encourage client to continue in therapy or to seek hospitalization	2 (3.4%)	8 (9.4%)	5 (7.8%)	6 (6.5%)	21 (7.0%)	
d) Other	15 (25.9%)	11 (12.9%)	3 (4.7%)	10 (10.9%)	39 (13.0%)	
94. Centers that notify the following without student permission when the student is a suicidal risk:						
a) No one	24 (40.7%)	37 (45.1%)	31 (48.4%)	46 (50.0%)	139 (46.6%)	
b) Resident Life staff	17 (28.8%)	30 (36.6%)	17 (27.0%)	24 (26.1%)	88 (29.6%)	
c) Family	19 (32.2%)	25 (30.5%)	18 (28.6%)	33 (35.9%)	95 (32.0%)	
d) Vice President	17 (28.8%)	20 (24.4%)	10 (15.9%)	9 (9.8%)	56 (18.9%)	
e) Other	8 (13.6%)	9 (11.0%)	11 (17.5%)	16 (17.6%)	44 (14.9%)	
95. Centers that have had to give warning during the past year to a third party about a student who posed a danger to another person:	6 (10.0%)	10 (11.6%)	7 (10.8%)	18 (19.8%)	41 (13.5%)	x= 1.3 Range 1 - 4.
96. Centers notified (Percentages based on #95):						
a) Police	3 (50.0%)	6 (50.0%)	6 (85.7%)	10 (58.8%)	25 (59.5%)	
b) Potential victim	4 (66.7%)	8 (66.7%)	5 (71.4%)	12 (70.6%)	29 (69.0%)	
c) Other	3 (50.0%)	2 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (23.5%)	9 (21.4%)	
97. Centers that have seen one or more HIV positive clients within the past year:	7 (11.9%)	14 (16.3%)	21 (35.6%)	40 (44.9%)	83 (28.2%)	A total of 108 HIV positive students seen, x=2 Range 1 - 8.
98. Directors who felt that any of these HIV positive clients posed a risk to any third party:	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.3%)	2 (10.5%)	5 (12.5%)	8 (9.9%)	Only one Director gave warning this year.
99. How Directors would generally handle a situation when an HIV positive client states that he/she has not informed his/her partner of the health situation:						
a) Would take no action	1 (1.9%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.2%)	4 (1.4%)	Directors selecting option (b) is down 5.7% since 1997 and Directors selecting option (c) is up 3.8% since 1997.
b) Would encourage disclosure but otherwise take no action	27 (50.9%)	33 (44.0%)	33 (57.9%)	54 (60.0%)	147 (53.3%)	
c) Would inform the client that if he/she did not inform partner that you would be ethically bound to do so	20 (37.7%)	33 (44.0%)	18 (31.6%)	29 (32.2%)	101 (36.6%)	
d) Other	5 (9.4%)	8 (10.7%)	6 (10.5%)	5 (5.6%)	24 (8.7%)	
100. For a list of recommended professional development videotapes, see Appendix C .						
101. For a list of innovative programs, see Appendix D .						

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
102. Directors that have noted a difference in violent incidents involving students:						
a) Noticed an increase over last five years	19 (31.7%)	35 (40.7%)	27 (43.5%)	42 (44.7%)	124 (40.9%)	
b) Remained the same over last five years	39 (65.0%)	48 (55.8%)	34 (54.8%)	48 (51.1%)	169 (55.8%)	
c) Noticed decrease over last five years	2 (3.3%)	3 (3.5%)	1 (1.6%)	4 (4.3%)	10 (3.3%)	
103. Centers that invited a consultant to their Center:	15 (25.4%)	25 (29.4%)	20 (31.7%)	41 (44.6%)	101 (33.7%)	
104. Reason for the consultant's visit:						
a) Pre-accreditation consult	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.8%)	3 (2.8%)	
b) Assessment of services	3 (20.0%)	3 (11.5%)	1 (4.8%)	5 (11.4%)	12 (11.3%)	
c) To improve staff skills in a particular area	9 (60.0%)	23 (88.5%)	14 (66.7%)	33 (75.0%)	79 (74.5%)	
d) To resolve staff conflict	0 (0.0%)	3 (11.5%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.8%)	6 (5.7%)	
105. Centers that provide half a day or more per week to counselors for private consulting work:	2 (3.8%)	8 (9.5%)	11 (17.2%)	9 (10.0%)	30 (10.3%)	
106. Center policies on limiting the number of sessions per client:						
a) Limit of 5 sessions or less	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)	3 (1.0%)	
b) Limit of 6-10 sessions	10 (16.7%)	19 (22.1%)	12 (18.8%)	22 (23.7%)	63 (20.7%)	
c) Limit of 11-15 sessions	7 (11.7%)	14 (16.3%)	15 (23.4%)	31 (33.3%)	67 (22.0%)	
d) Limit of 16-20 sessions	3 (5.0%)	5 (5.8%)	5 (7.8%)	6 (6.5%)	19 (6.3%)	
e) No limit	40 (66.7%)	46 (53.5%)	32 (50.0%)	33 (35.5%)	152 (50.0%)	
107. Centers make exceptions to their session limit policy:						
a) Frequently	9 (33.3%)	19 (40.4%)	15 (35.7%)	23 (31.5%)	66 (34.9%)	
b) Rarely	11 (40.7%)	19 (40.4%)	19 (45.2%)	40 (54.8%)	89 (47.1%)	
c) No	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.6%)	
d) No session limit	7 (25.9%)	6 (12.8%)	8 (19.0%)	10 (13.7%)	31 (16.4%)	
108. The average number of sessions per client:	x= 5.4 Range 1-12	x= 4.9 Range 2-10	x= 5.5 Range 1.5-14	x=5.3 Range 1-13	x= 5.3 Range 1-14	There was virtually no difference in average # number of sessions between Centers that have a session limit and those that do not.
109. Center policies regarding students who appear, at intake, to need therapy for more than six months:						
a) Commit to as many of these students as possible while staff time is available	31 (53.4%)	47 (55.3%)	30 (46.9%)	26 (27.7%)	134 (44.4%)	
b) Immediately refer most out, keeping a few for training purposes	5 (8.6%)	8 (9.4%)	12 (18.8%)	24 (25.5%)	49 (16.2%)	
c) Immediately refer all such students out	6 (10.3%)	9 (10.6%)	5 (7.8%)	7 (7.4%)	28 (9.3%)	
d) Allow students to be seen for limited number of sessions, then refer out	8 (13.8%)	13 (15.3%)	7 (10.9%)	24 (25.5%)	52 (17.2%)	
e) Other	8 (13.8%)	8 (9.4%)	10 (15.6%)	13 (13.8%)	39 (12.9%)	
110. Centers with a policy that states that the Center reserves the right to decline treatment to any student who seems to have problems that cannot be properly handled in the Center:	32 (56.1%)	47 (54.7%)	48 (76.2%)	56 (60.9%)	184 (61.5%)	

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
111. Centers utilizing the following types of outcomes assessment (Director's checked all that applied):						
a) General student evaluation forms	41 (77.4%)	72 (92.3%)	53 (85.5%)	79 (86.8%)	246 (86.3%)	
b) Pre and Post testing	3 (5.7%)	16 (20.5%)	11 (17.7%)	18 (19.8%)	48 (16.8%)	
c) Post therapy assessment of goal attainment	9 (17.0%)	19 (24.4%)	17 (27.4%)	12 (13.2%)	57 (20.0%)	
d) Other	7 (13.2%)	3 (3.8%)	7 (11.3%)	10 (11.0%)	27 (9.5%)	
112. Approximate percentage of positive ratings Centers receive for counseling staff:						
a) Above 90%	34 (70.8%)	59 (76.6%)	39 (62.9%)	69 (76.7%)	201 (72.3%)	
b) 85-89%	9 (18.8%)	17 (22.1%)	20 (32.3%)	17 (18.9%)	64 (23.0%)	
c) 80-84%	2 (4.2%)	1 (1.3%)	2 (3.2%)	4 (4.4%)	9 (3.2%)	
d) 79% and below	3 (6.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.5%)	
113. Center methods for obtaining student evaluations of therapy:						
a) Send evaluation forms to a sample (say 10%) and follow up until you get a high percentage return	1 (2.0%)	2 (2.6%)	2 (3.3%)	9 (9.9%)	14 (5.0%)	
b) Send evaluation forms to all clients and accept whatever response rate you get	22 (44.9%)	28 (35.9%)	18 (29.5%)	24 (26.4%)	92 (32.9%)	
c) Evaluation forms distributed by secretary at end of therapy	5 (10.2%)	16 (20.5%)	11 (18.0%)	13 (14.3%)	45 (16.1%)	
d) Evaluation forms distributed by counselor at end of therapy	9 (18.4%)	20 (25.6%)	13 (21.3%)	20 (22.0%)	62 (22.1%)	
e) Evaluation forms distributed for a specified period of time each semester	13 (26.5%)	35 (44.9%)	31 (50.8%)	45 (49.5%)	125 (44.6%)	
f) Other	9 (18.4%)	4 (5.1%)	4 (6.6%)	10 (11.0%)	27 (9.6%)	
114. Directors that have received a copy of past results of this Survey:	46 (83.6%)	71 (89.9%)	61 (100.0%)	86 (96.6%)	265 (93.0%)	
115. Directors have used past copies of this Survey:						
a) For their own information	40 (80.0%)	68 (93.2%)	54 (87.1%)	78 (89.7%)	241 (88.3%)	
b) Distributed to staff	26 (52.0%)	49 (67.1%)	44 (71.0%)	46 (52.9%)	166 (60.8%)	
c) Shared data at a staff meeting	26 (52.0%)	56 (76.7%)	45 (72.6%)	63 (72.4%)	191 (70.0%)	
d) Shared with others on campus	23 (46.0%)	32 (43.8%)	32 (51.6%)	30 (34.5%)	117 (42.9%)	

	<u>Under 2,500</u> (n = 61)	<u>2,500 - 7,500</u> (n = 88)	<u>7,500 - 15,000</u> (n = 66)	<u>Over 15,000</u> (n = 95)	<u>TOTAL</u> (n = 311)	<u>COMMENTS</u>
e) Shared data with their boss	34 (68.0%)	50 (68.5%)	46 (74.2%)	67 (77.0%)	198 (72.5%)	
f) Quoted data in professional writing	8 (16.0%)	13 (17.8%)	9 (14.5%)	14 (16.1%)	44 (16.1%)	
g) Quoted data for in-house or institutional reports	25 (50.0%)	35 (47.9%)	40 (64.5%)	42 (48.3%)	143 (52.4%)	
h) Used directory to contact other directors	17 (34.0%)	16 (21.9%)	16 (25.8%)	31 (35.6%)	80 (29.3%)	
i) Used data to support a request for new resources	18 (36.0%)	27 (37.0%)	31 (50.0%)	39 (44.8%)	115 (42.1%)	
j) Followed-up with another director who shared information in the survey	10 (20.0%)	8 (11.0%)	6 (9.7%)	12 (13.8%)	36 (13.2%)	
k) Generated a new program in their Center which was stimulated by ideas shared in the survey	4 (8.0%)	12 (16.4%)	9 (14.5%)	10 (11.5%)	35 (12.8%)	
l) Followed-up on leads for videotapes, books, etc. that were recommended by other directors in the survey	9 (18.0%)	9 (12.3%)	11 (17.7%)	8 (9.2%)	37 (13.6%)	
m) Other	1 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.6%)	3 (3.4%)	5 (1.8%)	
116. Centers that are IACS accredited:	3 (5.0%)	17 (19.8%)	26 (40.0%)	51 (54.8%)	97 (31.8%)	
117. Benefits of IACS accreditation:						
a) Increases status and credibility of Center on campus	1 (100.0%)	13 (81.3%)	24 (92.3%)	43 (84.3%)	81 (86.2%)	Directors listed the following disadvantages to IACS accreditation: cost (42), time (7), poor feedback (3), no benefit (2).
b) Supports requests for new resources	1 (100.0%)	7 (43.8%)	17 (65.4%)	27 (52.9%)	52 (55.3%)	
c) Supports requests for new staff positions and salary increases	1 (100.0%)	3 (18.8%)	16 (61.5%)	19 (37.3%)	39 (41.5%)	
d) The valuable feedback generated by an outside review and evaluation	1 (100.0%)	12 (75.0%)	20 (76.9%)	42 (82.4%)	75 (79.8%)	
e) Helps us to maintain professional standards	1 (100.0%)	16 (100.0%)	24 (92.3%)	43 (84.3%)	84 (89.4%)	
f) Accreditation is respected by administrators	1 (100.0%)	13 (81.3%)	22 (84.6%)	36 (70.6%)	72 (76.6%)	
g) Generates new ideas	1 (100.0%)	7 (43.8%)	10 (40.0%)	28 (54.9%)	46 (49.5%)	
h) Other	1 (100.0%)	1 (6.3%)	1 (4.2%)	1 (2.0%)	3 (3.3%)	