

**College of Education and Allied Studies
Department of Educational Psychology**

M.S. in Counseling Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT) Option

**Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) Annual Report
May 2012**

1.0 Program Status:

Over the last year the MFT program has faced multiple curriculum challenges for 2011-2012 and beyond as it has responded to decreased resources imposed on the university and all programs as a result of the California budget crisis. The results have included a combination of cancelled classes and combined classes and closure of the Concord Campus MFT program. Each of the three MFT program cohorts had been impacted but our department and faculty have been instrumental in keeping our Hayward program running smoothly. After the closure of the Concord program, faculty had to readjust their schedules and develop new preps for classes. We now have combined mega classes within our department to make sure all state pre-licensure requirements are met. Our second year cohort (n = 24) is graduating in June and our first year cohort (n=19) will advance to second year status in the fall. We have an incoming first year cohort of 22.

These changes represented the tip of the iceberg and more substantive changes are planned for 2012-2013 to respond to budget constraints and required curriculum changes by the state licensing board. For example, the program has not maintained a M.S. Thesis requirement for a culminating experience thus eliminating multiple sections. However, we were able to design a three-part culminating project where students present a professional disposition, a workshop, and a clinical case. We have also made the required state licensing board's curriculum changes for 2012, adding a class in community mental health counseling and infusing our program with the new standards for recovery orientated care. With the addition of one course in career counseling, our program now meets the curriculum requirements students need to meet before becoming Licensed Professional Clinical Counselors. We were recently granted program status by the state licensing board that also oversees MFT's. In addition to curricular changes, changes in the department structure of support will mean faculty will assume more routine functions of program management usually addressed by support staff.

These changes have impacted faculty morale and vision of quality graduate education, upset students so that weekly complaints and concerns about the quality of their education have been voiced, and resulted in an environment of uncertainty about the future of programs and services filled with new stressors almost weekly as additional changes and cuts are announced.

Regardless of the hostile environment to quality education, the MFT program faculty remained steadfast and achieved progress on the three program goals presented in the last CAPR annual report. The first goal was to maintain stable admissions and a program (24 students within each program). To date we have retained 64 students. Missing targets was primarily due to planned adjustments and resignations from students who faced financial difficulties in continuing in school. The second goal was to ensure the program curriculum meets state standards set forth by the State of California Board of Behavioral Sciences regarding graduate training and preparation of students for state licensing. Our goal was to ensure the curriculum contained all MFT state

licensing required classes. We met this goal. A third goal involved stabilization of faculty. We lost one full-time faculty member who was on research leave for 2009-2011 and never returned and that meant additional advising loads for existing faculty. We are down to two full-time faculty. However, we were highly successful in utilizing part-time faculty that have had positive impact on our students and maintaining program quality. In summary MFT faculty feel the program is on task and target in fulfilling its mission to prepare counselors to respond to mental health needs for Californians.

2.0 Summary of Assessment Results:

Key Assessment processes and procedures: MFT students Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

The Marriage Family Therapy Program has implemented of a Professional Dispositions and Clinical Aptitudes rubric. The rubric is an important tool that assists MFT faculty in assessing and monitoring student progress in the program. The rubric allows for a quantitative method of measuring each student's performance in specific areas. These professional dispositions and clinical aptitudes are widely accepted as important in the field of counseling. The rubric allows faculty to screen out students who might master the academic knowledge and technical skills of counseling but are performing poorly in clinical application of learning so that it impacts their ability to perform in the counseling profession. The tool provides a concrete guide for students' growth and development as they progress through the program. Based on responding to needs for more comprehensive student assessment and evaluation, the rubric assessment has become a critical addition to evaluate less concrete aptitudes and dispositions that are also important to be an effective counselor.

The self-assessment element of the process is also extremely helpful in guiding the students' progress. Each student becomes more aware of her/his progress and can create and monitor an individual plan for self-improvement. During the year each MFT student met with their faculty advisor each quarter to assess student growth and development as measured within the rubric. The advisor reviews the rubric and provides additional feedback and input from various faculty, instructors and fieldwork supervisors regarding student development of clinical aptitudes and professional dispositions. Faculty believe a major outcome of use of the assessment instrument will be more detailed performance feedback for each individual student. No rubric modifications plans were initiated in the system for 2011-2012.

Reflection on assessment -- student course evaluations and assessing program effectiveness

Faculty continue to monitor all classes and respond to student feedback from formal student course evaluations, use of mid-quarter class evaluations to make within quarter adjustments, and formal and informal contact with students regarding course content and structure. Faculty review student comments and suggestions and discuss innovative ways to modify teaching techniques and classroom delivery style. Review with students has become more important to monitor performance by additional part time faculty.

In terms of program effectiveness, the MFT faculty has increased contact with student clinical placement field site supervisors to better monitor student performance. Contact with site supervisors has assisted faculty in making a stronger connection of the theory learned in the classroom with clinical practice involved in working with individual clients and within mental health agencies. In addition to contact with site supervisors, faculty continue to invite graduates to come to classes and discuss the translation of graduate school learning to serving clients and working within agencies.

Program effectiveness is under review as faculty examine existing curriculum to respond to new state standards for graduate education that are being created by the Board of Behavioral Sciences for 2011-12. Faculty have collaborated with faculty from other institutions and attended trainings to discuss ways to

modify program curriculum to respond to changing state licensing standards. In addition faculty replaced the Thesis with culminating project and may introduce other methods better aligned to clinical practice during the 2012-2013 academic year. Faculty anticipate the next review for CAPR will include more information about state legislation and curriculum modification, as well as updates on the program movement for professional accreditation.

California State University, East Bay

APR Summary Data

Fall 2006 - 2010

Educational Psychology					
Item	Fall Quarter				
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
A. Students Headcount					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	184	167	156	168	191
4. Total Number of Majors	184	167	156	168	191
College Years					
B. Degrees Awarded					
	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	52	63	59	72	64
3. Total	52	63	59	72	64
Fall Quarter					
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	12	12	12	12	11
2. Part-Time	3	2	0	0	1
3a. Total Tenure Track	15	14	12	12	12
3b. % Tenure Track	46.9%	50.0%	41.4%	41.4%	50.0%
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	0	0	0	0	0
5. Part-Time	17	14	17	17	12
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	17	14	17	17	12
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	53.1%	50.0%	58.6%	58.6%	50.0%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	32	28	29	29	24
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	14.0	12.5	12.7	9.2	10.2
9. Lecturer FTEF	4.7	5.2	4.1	5.5	3.8
10. Total Instructional FTEF	18.6	17.7	16.8	14.7	14.0
Lecturer Teaching					

11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	158.3	155.6	159.5	128.3	226.0
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	72.1%	76.0%	73.6%	60.4%	80.7%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	61.1	49.3	57.2	83.9	54.2
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	27.9%	24.0%	26.4%	39.6%	19.3%
13. Total FTES taught	219.4	204.9	216.7	212.2	280.2
14. Total SCU taught	3291.0	3073.0	3251.0	3183.0	4203.0
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
1. Tenured/Track	11.3	12.5	12.6	13.9	22.1
2. Lecturer	13.1	9.5	13.8	15.4	14.2
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	11.8	11.6	12.9	14.5	20.0
4. Lower Division	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Upper Division	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. Graduate	11.8	11.6	12.9	14.5	20.0
E. Section Size					
1. Number of Sections Offered	72.0	74.0	74.0	70.0	93.0
2. Average Section Size	16.8	14.8	15.3	16.0	23.2
3. Average Section Size for LD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Average Section Size for UD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Average Section Size for GD	16.8	14.8	15.3	16.0	23.2
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	48	53	50	41	58
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	25	22	24	29	35

Source and definitions available at:

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/apr/summary/definitions.pdf>

Headcount Enrollment	Fall Quarter				
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Counseling	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	115	114	114	130	133
4. Total Number of Majors	115	114	114	130	133
Special Education					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0

3. Graduate	69	53	42	38	58
4. Total Number of Majors	69	53	42	38	58
College Years					
Degrees Awarded	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10
<i>Counseling</i>					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	47	53	54	63	47
3. Total Number of Majors	47	53	54	63	47
<i>Special Education</i>					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	5	10	5	9	17
3. Total Number of Majors	5	10	5	9	17