Commission for Counseling and Psychological Services

Home   Newsletter   Membership   Directorate   Convention   Activities   Resources

ACPA Home
About ACPA
Standing Committees
Commissions
State/Int'l Divisions
Membership
Professional Development
Annual Conventions
Publications
Career Advancement
Research
ACPA Foundation
Ethics
Partnerships

What is this?

CCAPS Newsletter

May 2008

- From the Editors
  ~ Jane Bost, Vivian Yamada, Leena Batra, and Eric Klingensmith

- From the Chair
  ~ Chanda Corbett

- CCAPS Committee Announcements

- Publishing with ACPA Books and Media

- Call for CCAPS Awards Nominations

ACPA POST-CONVENTION NEWS

- *2008 CCAPS Awards Recipients*

- *Convention Round Table Summaries*

FEATURED ARTICLES

- Evolutions of Emergency Operations Strategies: Structure and Process of Crisis Response in College Student Affairs
  ~ C. Ryan Akers

- Application of Synergistic Supervision for Counseling Center Professionals
  ~ Jessica Walker and Jocelyn Buhain

Home   Newsletter   Membership   Directorate   Convention   Activities   Resources

ACPA Home
About ACPA
Standing Committees
Commissions
State/Int'l Divisions
Membership
Professional Development
Annual Conventions
Publications
Career Advancement
Research
ACPA Foundation
Ethics
Partnerships

What is this?

From the Editors

Welcome to the spring edition of the CCAPS newsletter. We hope that your spring semesters are coming to a close in peaceful and rewarding ways. The Atlanta convention proved to be a great opportunity for connecting with colleagues after what has proved to be an especially challenging year for counseling centers. This newsletter contains a recap of some convention highlights for those of you who were not able to attend in part or whole, as well as some announcements about future CCAPS involvements.

At the ACPA convention, our commission's leadership changed hands.
Thank you to Jonathan Kandell, past CCAPS chair, for your years of service to the commission. In her introductory Letter from the Chair, Chanda Corbett communicates her intention for a seamless transition and her directional goals for the development of the commission, as well as her desire to be inclusive of all CCAPS members for opportunities of service.

In the theme of inclusivity, please review the Committee Announcements to find member opportunities for involvement in CCAPS through committee work. Another wonderful prospect is represented in Heidi Levine's announcement and invitation, "Publishing with ACPA Books and Media." This entry describes opportunities for book and electronic publications and webinar presentations by CCAPS members. Also, please show your involvement in CCAPS by nominating one of your deserving colleagues for one of the CCAPS awards. See our "Call for CCAPS Awards Nominations" piece for details.

As a follow-up to the ACPA Convention, please see the CCAPS Awards Recipient piece to learn more about the 2008 awards winners. Congratulations to Lifetime Achievement Award recipient, John B. Bishop, and Early Career Achievement Award recipient, Jessica Walker! Also, check out the ACPA Convention Round Table Summaries to get a flavor of the lively discussions that occurred this year.

The authors for this edition's featured articles were invited to summarize informative and engaging presentations at this year's convention. Ryan Akers does an amazing job at reducing his dissertation results and describing the current state of University/College Crisis Response in "Evolution of emergency operations strategies: Structure and process of crisis response in college student affairs." Jessica Walker and Jocelyn Buhain also provide enlightening tips about supervision of Counseling Center clinical staff in ways that improve retention in "Application of Synergistic Supervision for Counseling Center Professionals."

As has been expressed so many times, thank you to David Gilles-Thomas for formatting and updating this newsletter for so many to see! To you all, have a wonderful, rejuvenating summer!

- Jane Bost, Ph.D.
- Vivian Yamada, Psy.D.
- Leena Batra, Ph.D.
- Eric Klingensmith, Psy.D.

ACPA Home

About ACPA

Standing Committees

Commissions

State/Int'l Divisions

Membership

Professional Development

Annual Conventions

Publications

Career Advancement

Research

ACPA Foundation

Ethics

Partnerships

What is this?

Home   Newsletter   Membership   Directorate   Convention   Activities   Resources

From the Chair

CCAPS Newsletter
May 2008

Greetings CCAPS,

I was humbled and honored to be nominated for Chair-Elect of the Commission for Counseling and Psychological Services (CCAPS) during the 2006 Convention. Thank you for your vote of confidence during the 2007 election. As promised in my election statement, I will continue to serve the Commission with enthusiasm and passion, encourage CCAPS membership to take active leadership roles, and to aid us in continuing to make progress as a Commission. I commit to working with our directorate and committees to address recommendations presented in the CCAPS Strategic Plan Taskforce's report. Recommendations suggested by you, our membership, have been adopted as goals to focus our Commission to address during my tenure. The goals are the following: 1) Provide appropriate programs for our membership at various levels of their career, particularly for mid/senior-level professionals, 2) Value our seasoned professionals by extending specific invitations and opportunities for them to contribute, 3) Contribute to the field through research, 4) Solidify relationships with other organizations addressing college student mental health, and 5) Include a role for every member in CCAPS' goals and vision.

Collaborations with Association of University and College Counseling Center Directors (AUCCCD) and the American College Health Association (ACHA) are developing to strengthen our relationships with these organizations, and provide more opportunities for research and professional development. Partnerships with the American Psychological Association's Division 17 Section on College and University Counseling Centers are also being developed. Building on these relationships, and others in the field of college student mental health, will help us all work more effectively and efficiently with our resources, and strengthen our voice in the field.

I believe we desire CCAPS to provide valuable resources to mental health practitioners serving on university and college campuses and to be recognized as a spokesperson for college student mental health. We are on the frontline and working in many capacities with college students, and we are "the experts" in the field. I encourage you to be open to the upcoming initiatives and to contribute your expertise.

The elected directorate members are the leadership of the Commission for Counseling and Psychological Services. However, it is my desire for every CCAPS member to serve the commission in some capacity. We can all contribute where we can and will all benefit from the diverse skills and expertise of our membership. You will be hearing from me and our directorate members via the listserv and our web-site about ways you can serve. Email me at cccorbett@loyola.edu with your ideas of how you would like to contribute to help us achieve these goals. Again, thank you for your vote of confidence and your support. I look forward to serving and working with you. We have an exciting future ahead of us. Addressing the aforementioned goals will yield very tangible benefits for our Commission and the profession. Our goals are achievable and our vision is clear.

~ Your Chair,
Chanda C. Corbett, PhD (CCAPS Chair, 2008-2010)

ACPA College Student Educators International

Commission for Counseling and Psychological Services

Home   Newsletter   Membership   Directorate   Convention   Activities   Resources

CCAPS Committee Reports

CCAPS Newsletter
May 2008

CCAPS Committee Announcements: "Please come join us!"

CCAPS Committees welcome the participation of all CCAPS members. Committee participation is rewarding when you sense the achievement of your committee's tasks, but it is especially fulfilling in the development of new connections with colleagues across the nation. If you have the time and interest, your assistance on one or more committees would be greatly appreciated.

Please see the list below for brief descriptions of how you could in all committees and the contact information of committee chairs. As you will notice, most committees have some work that occurs throughout the year and some that happens at the ACPA Convention. Participation in committee work does not require convention attendance.

CCAPS Committees are chaired by directorate members, who can provide continuity in their leadership of the committees. Please contact the chairs to learn about specific opportunities for involvement. Also feel free to contact Chanda Corbett, CCAPS Chair, for more information about involvement.

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE
Chair: Melissa Bartsch

First of all, the membership committee requested an opportunity to thank all who helped make the Showcase a success! They also made an explicit invitation for CCAPS members to join the committee – it's a great way to get involved!

Help this committee reach out and bring new members to CCAPS during the ACPA convention and throughout the year. Help organize a fun activity for the ACPA Convention Showcase.

PROGRAM COMMITTEE
Chair: Kelly Simonson

Help review CCAPS sponsored and general programs to get programs of interest to CCAPS members into the ACPA Convention. Provide input into any themed programming that might occur.

CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Chair: Marilia Marien

Help review programs accepted for the ACPA convention to determine which qualify for Continuing Education Credits. Help oversee the Continuing Education registration/recording process at the ACPA Convention.

ELECTIONS COMMITTEE
Chair: Mark Fleming

Help solicit nominations for CCAPS leadership positions including CCAPS Chair and Directorate Members. Help facilitate the election process.

NEWSLETTER COMMITTEE
Co-Chairs: Jane Bost and Vivian Yamada

Help generate ideas for the electronic newsletter that is posted three times a year. Help recruit article writers and gather information about CCAPS activities that would be helpful for CCAPS members to know.

PUBLICITY COMMITTEE
Chair: Matt Torres

Help promote knowledge about CCAPS at the ACPA convention and throughout the year.

AWARDS COMMITTEE
Chair: Jane Bost

Help solicit CCAPS award nominees and organize the awards process.

WEB COMMITTEE
Co-Chairs: David Gilles-Thomas and Ben Locke

Help with CCAPS webpage upkeep and design.

JOB SEARCH WORKSHOPS COMMITTEE
Chair: Vivian Yamada

Help promote the Job Search Strategies Workshop that is held at the ACPA convention. Contact graduate student and intern groups to publicize the workshop. Help facilitate the workshop.

Home   Newsletter   Membership   Directorate   Convention   Activities   Resources

ACPA Home

About ACPA

Standing Committees

Commissions

State/Int'l Divisions

Membership

Professional Development

Annual Conventions

Publications

Career Advancement

Research

ACPA Foundation

Ethics

Partnerships

What is this?

Publishing with ACPA Books and Media

CCAPS Newsletter
May 2008

The mission of ACPA Books and Media (BAM) is to "… publish books that will inform and benefit professionals in the student affairs field … designed to appeal to a broad, interdisciplinary audience of researchers, scholars and practitioners." A particular emphasis of BAM is to publish work that is timely in addressing emerging issues. Historically BAM has published short and full-length books and monographs, often written by first-time authors. The editorial board is also very interested in publishing more works that take advantage of electronic media, including the potential to expand ACPA's offerings of "webinars" and similar professional development. While maintaining the strong base ACPA has in offering high-quality publications that incorporate thoughtful scholarship, BAM wants to more fully address the need for ACPA to offer professional development that is timely, useful, and appeals to changes in our profession and professionals.

The BAM editorial board has also identified a list of current, critical topics that it would like to see addressed in upcoming publications. That list includes a number of items on to which CCAPS members can apply their expertise and speak with authority. Those issues include: multicultural competence and identity development, men's issues, the role of counseling in student affairs, and – arguably most important – trends and responses to student mental health issues.

BAM proposal packages must include a manuscript proposal (general description, rationale, abstract, and description of chapters/content), as well as supporting documents (background information for author(s)/editor(s), a draft chapter, and writing samples for each major author/editor). Criteria for editorial consideration include timeliness and importance of the topic, theoretical/knowledge basis for the work, and appropriate incorporation of multicultural dimensions of the issue. The full Books and Media publication handbook can be downloaded from the ACPA website at http://www.myacpa.org/pub/pub_media.cfm.

Member Login | Site Map

| Home | Newsletter | Membership | Directorate | Convention | Activities | Resources |

ACPA Home
About ACPA
Standing Committees
Commissions
State/Int'l Divisions
Membership
Professional Development
Annual Conventions
Publications
Career Advancement
Research
ACPA Foundation
Ethics
Partnerships

What is this?

Call for Award Nominations

Listed here are the the announcements and calls for nominees for the professional awards given by CCAPS. Please take a look at these announcements and consider nominating your center or one of your esteemed colleagues for an award.

Deadlines

Early Career Achievement Award : *August 31, 2010*

Mid-Level Career Achievement Award : *August 31, 2010*

Outstanding Lifetime Achievement Award : *August 31, 2010*

Thomas M. Magoon Innovations Award : *August 31, 2010*

Joan Dallum Graduate Student Research Award : *August 31, 2010*

What is this?

Biographies for CCAPS 2007 Awards

Lifetime Achievement Award: John B. Bishop, Ph.D.

Dr. Bishop has a long and distinguished career as a psychologist and administrator at the University of Delaware since 1969. As Director of the Center for Counseling and Student Development and Associate Vice President for Counseling and Student Development at the University of Delaware until 2006, Dr. Bishop was instrumental in making the center one of the top counseling centers in the country. Under his leadership (for almost 30 years), the counseling center achieved and maintained accreditation by the International Association of Counseling Services and APA accreditation for the pre-doctoral psychology internship program and post doctoral program. Dr. Bishop was instrumental in establishing the Student Services for Athletes program as well as Wellspring, a student wellness center. In 2004, he was awarded the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Association for University and College Counseling Center Directors. In addition, Dr. Bishop created the master's degree program in College Counseling and Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education at the University of Delaware which has graduated many students in its 35 years of existence. He is currently a full professor in the Department of Individual and Family Studies and a prolific author and national presenter.

Early Career Achievement Award: Jessica Walker, Ph.D.

Dr. Jessica Walker, psychologist at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington Counseling Center, is already building a reputation as an outstanding educator, clinician, researcher-- and author! Soon after being hired on staff at the counseling center, she assumed the responsibilities of Outreach Coordinator and is known for her highly interactive, creative and successful outreach programming. She developed such an innovative program titled "Sound Body Sound Mind" and presented about this program at the 2007 ACPA/NASPA joint meeting in Orlando, Florida. Jessica is also valued by clients and colleagues alike for her skills in facilitating therapy groups and in providing peer supervision on group counseling. Most recently, she has co-authored the book Practicing counseling and psychotherapy: Insights from trainees, supervisors and clients. This book is unique in that it addresses issues relevant for practicum students and will no doubt be utilized by counselors for years to come.

ACPA Home
About ACPA
Standing Committees
Commissions
State/Int'l Divisions
Membership
Professional Development
Annual Conventions
Publications
Career Advancement
Research
ACPA Foundation
Ethics
Partnerships

What is this?

Home   Newsletter   Membership   Directorate   Convention   Activities   Resources

Convention Round Table Summaries

CCAPS Newsletter
May 2008

New Professionals Round Table
Facilitators: Jessica Walker, PhD (University of North Carolina-Charlotte Counseling Center), & Grace Chen, PhD (California State University-East Bay CAPS)

The New Professionals roundtable was an engaging experience, with contributions from a diverse group of counselors. A major theme that initially emerged was the need for new professionals to connect with a support network. We explored ways that individuals find helpful peers and relevant mentors both on and off campus. Variables such as state licensure requirements and University size came into play as we considered the complexity of establishing and maintaining a support system. The second major theme that developed compared college student presenting problems with grassroots community mental health service delivery. We reflected on what inspired us to join the field, and how to conceptualize and frame our passions within the college setting in an effort to maintain commitment to this field despite relatively low financial rewards. Overall, the participants seemed to gain knowledge and inspiration from one another. We encourage ACPA to continue this roundtable topic next year!

Mid-Level & Senior Professionals Round Table
Facilitators: Ben Locke, PhD (Pennsylvania State University Counseling & Psychological Services), & Vivian Barnett (North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University Counseling Services)

The session started with introductions and how participants defined themselves regarding their levels. Discussion focused on movement from one professional level to the next and about being mentored into various positions in a counseling center. The group also discussed ways to make needed changes in one's administrative role as well as the importance of connecting with the campus at-large. Some of the discussion focused on what keeps professionals in these roles and the positives and negatives about counseling centers. The session ended with participants reflecting on the importance of networking and striving to have a balanced life.

Suicide Issues Round Table
Facilitators: Matt Torres, PhD (Johns Hopkins University Counseling Center), & Tom Berry (Utah State University Counseling Center)

The Suicide Prevention Round-table had an active discussion and exchange of ideas among its 16 participants. Participants included an assistant VP, a dean of students, counseling center staff, representatives from residential life, and graduate students from a variety of institutions. Topics discussed included identifying students at risk, facilitating communication among appropriate university officials and responding to suicidal students.

Self-Care Round Table
Facilitator: Phyllis Weatherly, PhD (Southern Polytechnic State University Career & Counseling Center)

Self-care is not an "emergency response plan" to be activated when stress becomes overwhelming. Instead, healthy self-care is an intentional way of living by which our values, attitudes, and actions are integrated into our day-to-day routines. The need for "emergency care" should be an exception to usual practice.

Approximately 15 individuals attended the session on Self-Care. They represented counselors, graduate students and chief student affairs officers expressing a need to explore ways to better care for themselves.

Conversation began with everyone sharing what they wanted from the session and ways they fail to care for themselves now. Recognizing that counselors often fail to observe the basic guidelines for personal health and wellness, the discussion focused on exploring ways to care for ourselves and obstacles that can get in the way. We revisited the "wellness dimensions" and talked about how often our lives are out of balance. The struggle to set boundaries is always a factor and we talked about the need we have to set healthy boundaries by learning to say "no". **"NO" is a complete sentence**! The roundtable ended with individuals committing to one action to implement in their lives after leaving the session.

Counseling Issues in Small Colleges
Facilitator: briana R. Sevigny (Assumption College Area Coordinator)

The CCAPS Round Table for Counseling Issues in Small Colleges was a small, but successful dialogue. With participants from New York, Massachusetts and Georgia from a variety of functional areas, our conversation addressed several topics. These topics included how people who do not work in Counseling Centers but doing supporting work can connect and align themselves with Counseling departments, how campus offices can communicate about issues that are occurring for students on campus without violating confidentiality, and how to help the silos in student affairs to connect in terms of the counseling that each area provides.

While the group was small and the meeting time was early, the think tank atmosphere promoted an open discussion that produced ideas for everyone to bring back to their campuses. I would like to thank my co-planner Cindy Stroschein, who couldn't be with us in Atlanta, and the participants who braved the first session of the last day to contribute to their colleagues and the field. I hope to see you next year in Metro D.C.!

ACPA Home
About ACPA
Standing Committees
Commissions
State/Int'l Divisions
Membership
Professional Development
Annual Conventions
Publications
Career Advancement
Research
ACPA Foundation
Ethics
Partnerships

What is this?

Home   Newsletter   Membership   Directorate   Convention   Activities   Resources

EVOLUTION OF EMERGENCY OPERATIONS STRATEGIES: STRUCTURE AND PROCESS OF CRISIS RESPONSE IN COLLEGE STUDENT AFFAIRS

A Dissertation Study by *C. Ryan Akers, Ph.D.*

> ***Editor's Note:***
>
> *The following is a brief summary of a mixed methods dissertation that analyzed crisis response strategies at 51 institutions of higher education across the U.S. Seven dichotomies of institutional type were utilized as was an analysis of institutional size based on student enrollment classification and an analysis of geographic location. Due to limited space in this newsletter, I invite your questions and comments by email.*

Introduction and Statement of the Problem

Due to the rising number of campus crises today, it is easy to assume that during the course of a lengthy career in higher education, student affairs practitioners and other administrators will be faced with not just a single crisis, but many crises, whether they relate to student death, violence, or natural disasters (Duncan & Misner, 2000).   Crisis response is a function of university administration that is often overlooked within student affairs divisions across the country. However, due to several recent events on campuses and the post-9/11 world in which we live, university officials are constantly reviewing and placing a strong emphasis on how to develop and implement their crisis response procedures and protocols. Incidents such as the recent Virginia Tech tragedy, the institutions directly affected by Hurricane Katrina damage, the Texas A&M bonfire in November of 1999, the public suicide of a highly visible campus protester at the University of Pennsylvania, the 1999 floods at East Carolina University, the residence hall fire at Seton Hall University in January of 2000, the 1996 fraternity house fire at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, the 2004 fire at the Alpha Tau Omega fraternity house fire at the University of Mississippi, and the student suicides at Harvard University in 1997, 1998, and 2001, are recent examples of campus tragedies that provide the context for this study.

Further instances of traumatic events on campus and in the adjacent community are the 2002 shooting at Clark University in Atlanta, Georgia, or the two separate instances of student deaths in 2002 at small Catawba College in Salisbury, North Carolina where three students were killed prior to another student death in a residence hall fire. From the aftermath of the 1998 Mathew Sheppard case in the University of Wyoming community to the faculty/student murder suicide at the University of Arkansas in August of 2000, and from faculty murders at Dartmouth to institutions of higher education in the shadows of the 2001 terrorist attacks, the effects of traumatic events can manifest themselves in even the best students and practitioners, possibly rendering them helpless to continue their education or careers in a formidable manner.

According to Barr and Desler (2000), "Crisis situations occur far too often on college campuses and student affairs staff members are often the first responders when a crisis occurs. The death of a student, a serious injury, fire, flood, or tornado all require sensitive responses on behalf of the institution and for those affected by the tragedy" (p. 637). Instances of trauma can take a toll on the residential areas on campus where the majority of the institution's students live and a high percentage of student affairs

professionals are employed. When the residence hall environment is disrupted, the academic and student development missions of the institutions and the emotional livelihood of all involved are compromised. These critical incidents can also affect other areas of campus and areas in the surrounding community, specifically in smaller cities and towns and with those institutions that have a strong town/gown relationship. University administrators should concern themselves with the physical, mental, and emotional well being of their entire university populations as they progress through times of crisis related to student death and assault, weather-related emergencies, and terrorism and its threats to safety.

Data Collection Methods

The 114-item *Crisis Response Survey* was developed by the primary investigator and analyzed the definition of a crisis, the structure (the plan itself, or "the plan on paper" of the respective crisis response protocols (organization; education, preparation, training; assessment/evaluation; memorials), the process of crisis response ("the actual plan in action"; response to needs), and the overlap between the structure and the process and its components crisis communication and collaboration. A Likert scale was implemented with each quantitative item on the survey and a return rate of 94.44% was achieved. Quantitative data were then entered into an SPSS program and series of T-tests of independent means and ANOVAs were run. Fifty-one qualitative interviews were conducted via telephone over the span of 18 days and analyzed the same elements in the *Crisis Response Survey*. The initial point of contact with each participating institution was the Chief Student Affairs Officer. However, the task of study requirement completion could have been delegated to the appropriate staff member. The average interview lasted approximately 37 minutes. Qualitative data were then transcribed, coded, and analyzed. To eliminate potential researcher bias, member checks and peer reviews were implemented.

Research Questions (RQs) and Summary of Study Findings

Editor's Note: (Qualitative data illustrations are not possible here due to space limitations. If interested, please contact Ryan Akers at cakers@humansci.msstate.edu.)

RQ1: What constitutes a crisis from the perspective of the institution and from the division of student affairs?
The definitions of crises at the institutional level and the division of student affairs level can best be illustrated through a series of four levels. Incidents at higher levels have an increased degree of campus impact and response effort. The first two levels are student emergencies and student crises, respectively. These incidents require a division response and are normally defined by the person affected and/or the division. These incidents normally affect only individuals and have a localized impact and require an individualized response. The third and fourth levels are termed campus crises and campus disasters, with the latter level being the most serious of the four categories. In contrast to the first two levels, campus crises and campus disasters require and an institution-wide and external response. These incidents are defined by the institution and external agencies. Incidents in these two levels normally affect both individuals and property and have a widespread impact that requires a systemic response. It should be noted that very small/small institutions are an exception to this rule presumably due to the smaller institutions having much more inclusive social environments. Additionally, student emergencies can escalate to higher level incidents without efficient recognition and response.

RQ2: Who is involved in the development of crisis response protocols and how do institutions prepare themselves for crisis?

Protocol development and response team membership was composed of five categories or levels. Primary membership was evident at the executive level (Presidents, Vice Presidents, Police Chiefs, and Legal Counsel) and at the division and departmental levels (Deans, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans, Directors, Assistant Directors). Secondary membership was sporadic among the 51 institutions and featured two categories or levels: community (external health and support agencies, neighborhood coalitions, alumni) and academic (professors, instructors). Institutions prepared for crises and critical events through five common methods: training (via simulated exercises, decentralized departmental training, and routine campus response team training); education (via campus education and prevention programs, professional development opportunities, and professional certification opportunities); collaboration/communication (specific to crisis response team, within internal departments, with external

agencies, and with other institutions) resource application (via new technology, new human resources, and physical and logistical resources); and organization/early preparation (via observation exercise, predetermining roles and responsibilities, establishing relationships prior to events, and establishing clear communication channels early). Of special note, the majority of participants suggested that preparation was an aspect of the crisis response plan that needed much improvement, advocating for more frequent training exercises with all stakeholders, opportunities and rewards for continuing education and enhanced collaboration, additional innovative technological advances, and early preparation and organization.

RQ3: Whose needs are being addressed in times of crisis and what are these needs? How are these needs being addressed?

There are five primary stakeholder groups represented in student affairs work with crises. The most relevant group to student affairs work is the student group, followed by parents, faculty/staff, the local community, and alumni/media in that descending order. Each group has its own needs and student affairs and the institution address those needs in a variety of ways. For example, students have the need for information dissemination or need to know what is going on. We meet that need through various communication mediums. Students also have needs for safety and security reassurance. We meet that need by detailing our plans and protocols at orientations, floor meetings, emails, etc. Students also have physical, psychological, spiritual, and academic needs. We meet those needs by providing food and shelter, immediate and sustained counseling, campus ministries, and liaisons with academic affairs. Parents also have the need for information dissemination, safety and security reassurance, and psychological and bereavement needs. We institute similar processes as found in our work with students and we also provide counseling services, attend funerals and memorials, provide physical assistance in moving belongings, and limiting irrelevant communications. We meet faculty/staff needs of information dissemination and safety and security reassurance in the same way as we do with other groups. We also assist faculty/staff in student behavior education and awareness by providing workshops, seminars, and training. We also provide them opportunities for rest and support by having backup teams, recognizing exemplary efforts in response, and via counseling programs. We respond to the information dissemination needs of the local community and alumni/media through various communication mediums. We also strive to meet the physical and psychological needs of the local community by providing shelter and occasional counseling. In the future, needs identification and assessment will grow in importance due to media awareness and societal expectations increasing in the face of increase threats to safety and security. The need for student affairs first responders who understand these processes is crucial.

RQ4: How are crisis response protocols evaluated and improved?

Institutions assess and evaluate their crisis response protocols through four common methods: simulated exercises (via campus wide drills, division and specific committee tabletops, and case studies); actual live crisis experiences (via debriefing, institutional benchmarking, and best practices research and review); internal discourse (via student, faculty/staff, parent feedback solicitation, appointed focus groups, and dedicated professional/committee review); and external discourse (via hired consultants, established external law enforcement/emergency management partnerships, and special task forces). The area of assessment and evaluation of crisis response plans was another area that participants indicated that much attention and improvement was needed. Just as evaluation and assessment is a top priority in our daily work, so too should it be in the area of crisis response. The potential consequences of no assessment are unacceptable.

RQ5: Does type of institutional influence campus crisis response?

Primary influences on crisis response are based on the commuter/residential and public/private dichotomies. Secondary influences on crisis response are based on the liberal arts/non-liberal arts, land grant/non-land grant, and faith based/non faith-based dichotomies. Finally, there were tertiary influences, or factors associated with institutional type, that influenced crisis response including being a largely decentralized institution, having a high percentage of out of state and international students, and having the state "flagship" reputation. Quantitative data indicated the highest number of significant items at the .o5 level being found within the Structure analysis (organization; education, preparation, and training; assessment; memorials). Education, preparation, and training produced the most significant survey items across all dichotomies. Each type dichotomy produced further interesting findings. Publics scored higher on familiarity of symptoms and stages of Acute Traumatic Stress, while Privates scored

higher when addressing concerns of students and families. Commuters scored lower than residential participants on all significant items. Interestingly enough, the quantitative data yielded many significant survey items in the HBCU/PWI dichotomy and Two-Year/Four-Year dichotomies. However, no themes were found in the qualitative data that would suggest these type dichotomies had an influence on crisis protocols. HBCUs did respond less favorably to communication efforts with stakeholders and collaboration with internal units. Liberal arts institutions have crisis response plans that focus on and address the entire campus community and are more likely to lead campus-wide memorial services and to utilize dedications in the recovery process, than their non-liberal arts counterparts. Land grants scored consistently higher in each of the significant survey items in this dichotomy. Faith-based institutions scored consistently lower on each of the significant survey items with respect to the faith based/non-faith based dichotomy.

RQ6: Does institutional size classification influence campus crisis response?

Institutional size based on student enrollment classification positively and negatively influences campus crisis response. Positive influences of smaller institutions included having simplified tasks, increased partnership and support, and fewer incidents. Negative influences of smaller institutions included fewer resources, increased expectations, and complacency issues. Positive influences of larger institutions included increased staffing, increased experience and expertise of staff and administration, and increased services and programs offered for community. Negative influences of larger institutions included difficulties in community notification, responder role confusion, and difficulty in outreach services. Quantitative data yielded 16 significant items at the .05 level with 14 from the Structure analysis (education, preparation, and training; memorials). Very large institutions scored higher than medium sized institutions in educating first responders to assist in emotional, natural, and facility crises, and in assisting victims of sexual assault, drug/alcohol abuse, and secondary victims. Smaller institutions scored higher than medium sized institutions in addressing faculty/staff and neighboring community needs.

RQ7: Does the geographic location of an institution influence campus crisis response?

Geographic location does influence crisis management protocols on campus. The influence is two-fold with respect proximity to areas with a high potential for natural crises (coastal and "tornado alley" institutions) and proximity to major metropolitan areas due to crime and threats of terrorism). Rurally located institutions indicated an increased ability to contain their crises in part because of the concept of total campus involvement in the response effort. However, rural campuses indicated increased expectations from the surrounding community. In contrast, urban institutions suggested their location afforded increased resources and partnership. However, being an urban institution resulted in increased frequency and range in crises, immediacy of media engagement, and hyperawareness of constant threats to safety and security. The survey data yielded five items of significance at the .05 level with four being from the analysis of structure (organization; education, preparation, and training). Large mean disparities found only between urban and rural institutions suggest comfortable resources and efficient protocols for suburban institutions. Additionally, proximity to federal buildings and prominent landmarks influence crisis response. Institutions located in urban areas and in areas at-risk for inclement weather are doubly influenced by their location.

Areas of Future Research

After completing this dissertation and other projects related to the effects of crisis and critical incidents on campus populations and the learning environment, I am pleased with the vast array of research opportunities that exist in this area of our field. Unfortunately, there is no policy that administrators can enact that will prevent crises and critical incidents from occurring. Areas ripe for future research include: real-time crisis communication and technology strategies; certification of practitioners in emergency management and the use of ICS and NIMS; functions of behavioral and threat assessment teams; gun ownership and information disclosure; increased college application scrutiny; development of cultures of reporting; faculty education and workshops; campus-wide physical safety features, and much more.

Application of Synergistic Supervision for Counseling Center Professionals

Jessica Walker
University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Jocelyn Buhain
University of North Carolina, Wilmington

Psychologists/counselors at University/College Counseling Centers are certainly not at a loss for relevant and applicable supervision research. Over the past few decades, the psychotherapy supervision literature has expanded dramatically, with clinical supervisors learning to consider multiple supervision process and outcome variables (e.g., parallel process factors, critical incidents, response modes, working alliance components, satisfaction assessments, identity stages, etc.). However, little, if any, research considers counseling trainees in the context of a greater culture of Student Affairs. For instance, outcome measures related to psychotherapy supervision rarely consider satisfaction with overall work environment or retention issues. Also, although there is a growing amount of supervision literature specifically addressing early career Student Affairs professionals, these data rarely, address the unique identity of counseling center psychologists and counselors. Our objectives for this article are two-fold. First, we sought to present a model of supervision that has been shown to be effective for early career student affairs professionals. Second, we considered the relevance and applicability of this model for early career counseling center counselors. Parts of this article were presented at the 2008 ACPA conference.

Synergistic supervision is defined as a supervision style that incorporates discussion of exemplary performance, discussion of long-term career goals, discussion of inadequate performance, frequency of informal performance appraisals, and discussion of personal attitudes. Tull's (2006) research demonstrated a positive significant correlation between perceived levels of synergistic supervision received and job satisfaction for new professionals in Student Affairs. In other words, the more one perceived he or she was getting synergistic supervision, the more satisfied he or she was with his or her student affairs position. Further, a significant negative correlation was shown between perceived level of synergistic supervision received and intention to turnover. Thus, the more one perceived he or she was getting synergistic supervision, the less likely he or she was to look for a new job or consider leaving his or her current position.

During the predoctoral internship and the postdoctoral year, the supervision provided to early career counseling center professionals focuses on further development of clinical skills. In preparing individuals for careers in student affairs, it would be helpful for directors and associate/assistant directors to incorporate tenets of synergistic supervision into their repertoire of administrative skills in order to promote the retention and job satisfaction of early career counseling center professionals in higher education. Discussions involving exemplary and inadequate performances could focus on functional areas of individual/ couples/ group counseling, outreach and consultation, training and crisis management. In addition, performance evaluation can be extended to cover areas including administrative tasks and interpersonal skills. The opportunity for informal performance appraisals could occur during weekly staff meetings when colleagues can provide spontaneous acknowledgement, recognition, or feedback to each other, thus improving the overall morale of the center. Winston and

Creamer (1998) suggest that informal feedback could transpire in private between a supervisor and supervisee immediately after a performance since "praise and correction are most effective when given immediately after the activity's occurrence" (p. 33). This type of dialogue could also be effective between staff members, especially when the counseling center maintains an open-door policy. Conversations about long-term career goals would be a natural addition to a planning retreat held at the beginning, middle, and/or end of an academic term to ensure that early career professionals are allotted the time and space to reflect upon their occupational values and aspirations as well as to shape their future work experiences. For example, early career counseling center professionals often entertain/juggle interests in engaging in research, teaching courses, and/or pursuing a private practice. Finally, discussions of personal attitudes with early career professionals may invite an open and authentic dialogue about the congruency between their expectations and the reality of developing an identity and fit as a counseling center staff member. Because of the collaborative relationships that counseling center professionals strive to have with members across the division of student affairs, synergistic supervision could occur within informal relationships with mentors and colleagues from other offices, such as the Office of the Dean of Students and the Health Center.

In conclusion, supervisors may benefit from seeing their early career counseling center psychologists and counselors more holistically in terms of their professional development. It is important not only to consider specifically honed clinical skills but also to appreciate the broad big picture of one's identity development into the field of Counseling Center work.

Tull, A. (2006). Synergistic supervision, job satisfaction, and intention to turnover of new professionals in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, *47 (4)*, 465-480.

Winston, R. B., & Creamer, D. G. (1998). Staff supervision and professional development: An integrated approach. In W. A. Bryan & R. A. Schwartz (Eds.), *Strategies for staff development: Personal and professional education in the 21st century* (New Directions for Student Services No. 84, pp. 29-42).