



College	College of Education and Allied Studies
Department	Educational Psychology
Program Unit	Marriage and Family Therapy
Reporting for Academic Year	2013-2014
Department Chair	Dr. Jack Davis
Date Submitted	2/5/2014

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW  
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

**1. SELF-STUDY**

**A. Five-year Review Planning Goals**

The Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT) program follows a two-year cycle of program planning in accordance with the Board of Behavioral Sciences (BBS), our state licensing body for Marriage and Family Therapists. MFT program standards align with BBS program rules and regulations regarding curriculum requirements, which include adherence to classroom and clinical field-placement learning objectives.

We presented three goals in our last CAPR report:

1. Stabilize Student Admissions.
2. Re-evaluate curriculum standards.
3. Stabilize Faculty to maintain program quality.

**B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress**

The MFT program faculty remained steadfast and achieved progress on the three program goals presented in the last CAPR annual report:

1. The first goal was to maintain stable admissions (admitting 24 students within each program yearly). To date we have retained all students who have entered our cohorts. This year we have N=39 for first and second year cohorts combined. We no longer have a Concord cohort which was eliminated during the budget cuts. The 5-year average of the number of degrees awarded annually is 31.

2. The second goal was to ensure the program curriculum continues to meet state standards set forth by the State of California Board of Behavioral Sciences regarding graduate training and preparation of students for state licensing. We had to add two new courses to meet the new changes in the requirements, Community Mental Health Counseling and Career Counseling. Our goal was to ensure the curriculum contained all Marriage and Family Therapy state licensing required classes. We met this goal and while doing so also became eligible to offer the new a Licensed Professional Clinical Counselor (LPCC) license also offered by the BBS.

3. A third goal involved stabilization of faculty. We lost one tenure track faculty position when she went on research leave for 2009-2011 and never returned. We lost another half time position when another member of our faculty entered the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). We are currently running the MFT program with two full-time tenured faculty members. However, we remain a successful program by utilizing highly qualified part-time faculty who continue to have a positive impact on our students. The faculty member in the FERP program finishes his commitment this coming fall and we hope to be able to search for another faculty position next year.

### **C. Program Changes and Needs**

Since we had one departing faculty member and the faculty member in the FERP program will retire this coming fall, we believe it will be essential to search for a new position to maintain the quality training of our MFT and LPCC students.

The MFT program is seeking to advance our program to keep up with national accreditation standards through the Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE). The BBS aligns with these standards and we would be the first public university in the Bay area to offer this prestigious status. We will conduct an intensive self-study in order to see what changes may need to be implemented to achieve this goal. Program accreditation defines a program as having met nationally established standards for training in the field. Students benefit particularly with greater ease in gaining access to licensure across state lines and by recognition of the quality of the program. The program benefits from being defined as having met nationally recognized standards and qualifying for access to greater visibility and resources.

The MFT program will require release time for the program coordinator and one faculty member to write an extensive review of the self-study.

## **2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT**

### **A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

Over the last two years, the MFT program has designed and implemented multiple curriculum changes as we responded to changes in educational training requirements set forth by the BBS. We modeled COAMFTE accreditation standards (seeking accreditation) along with BBS standards for educational and clinical requirements in evaluating student learning outcomes.

Student Learning Outcomes:

ILO	PLO
Thinking and Reasoning	Critical Thinking
Communication	Communication
Diversity	Understanding Diversity
Collaboration	Collaboration
Sustainability	Ethical Practice
Specialized Discipline	Active Engagement in Learning

### **B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

Student Learning Outcomes include:

Critical Thinking  
Communication  
Understanding Diversity  
Collaboration  
Ethical Practice  
Active Engagement in Learning

### C. Summary of Assessment Process

We focus on assessment for learning throughout the program by integrating resilience, resourcefulness, reflectiveness, and reciprocity into what our students do in class, and at their clinical fieldwork placement sites. As evidenced in the following example, we assess resilience by having students review their own program dispositions and clinical aptitudes regularly. We assess resourcefulness by observing how our students get below the surface and capitalize on resources in themselves, their cohort, and in their community. We assess reflectiveness by having students develop a capstone project designed for them to demonstrate their competence professionally and clinically. Reciprocity is assessed by training our students in counseling communication skills throughout the program.

Assessment process:

1. Fieldwork (SLO: Critical Thinking, Communication, Diversity, Collaboration, Ethical Practice, and Active Engagement in Learning): Clinical cases are reviewed on an ongoing weekly basis during fieldwork to help students improve their clinical aptitudes and abilities in working with diverse populations.
2. Clinical Dispositions (SLO: Critical Thinking, Communication, Diversity, Collaboration, and Ethical Practice): Students complete quarterly Clinical Disposition Rubrics in order to reflect on their progress.
3. Evaluations (SLO: Communication, Diversity, Collaboration, and Ethical Practice): Clinical Supervisors also rate students in quarterly fieldwork evaluations based on student's clinical skills and abilities, professionalism, legal and ethical standards, and clinical systemic relational work with clients.
4. Advisement (SLO: Critical Thinking, Communication, Diversity, Collaboration, Ethical Practice, and Active Engagement in Learning): Students also meet quarterly with an assigned program advisor to monitor student learning and progress. They look for grades, growth and active engagement in the learning process, cultural humility, challenges, legal and ethical practice, integrating theory and practice, the use of evidenced-based treatments for mental illness, working collaboratively with clients and other mental health professionals and systems of care, course reviews, rubric reviews, current learning, suggestions for program or course improvement, interactions with cohort members, and personal and professional areas of strength.
5. Capstone Project (SLO: Critical Thinking, Communication, Diversity, Collaboration, Ethical Practice, and Active Engagement in Learning): Students complete a Culminating Capstone Project during their second year, highlighting their work over the two years in the program.

#### **D. Summary of Assessment Results**

Program curriculum is based upon a comprehensive and substantive understanding and foundation of human development, family dynamics, systemic thinking, interactional theories, traditional and contemporary marriage and family therapy theories, research, legal and ethical principles, professional practice, clinical skills, and the cultural context in which they are embedded.

Fieldwork: The program provides a rich and varied clinical training experience with excellent supervision. Students gain clinical experience within the program's clinical training guidelines at an approved community mental health based agency, clinic, hospital, school or other mental health based agency. All supervisors are either Approved Supervisor designates or equivalent. All sites must provide opportunities to work with a culturally diverse population of families, couples, and individuals and children, and provide supervision by Approved Supervisors, and be able to provide supervision via audiotape, videotape, or live supervision. Students must complete a minimum of 225 direct client contact hours. Students must additionally have a minimum of one unit of supervision for every five client hours and obtain approximately 45 -50 hours of supervision accordingly. All students get placed and all complete their required hours.

The MFT faculty 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 members continue to invite graduates to come to classes and discuss the translation of graduate school learning to serving clients and working within agencies.

Clinical Dispositions: The Marriage Family Therapy Program has implemented 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.

Evaluations and Advisement: 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. We 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 2013-2014.

Capstone: The Capstone Project is the culminating experience for students in their second year of the MFT program. It includes three sections: 1. Professional Development, 2. Literature Review and Clinical Training Workshop, and 3. Clinical Case Analysis Paper. This is a project highlighting what they have learned throughout their program and shows an active engagement in their learning process, integrating critical thought with their growth as a therapist, theoretical knowledge gained, collaboration, clinical skills, ethical standards and a respect for diversity.

Additional Comments: 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.

Faculty have collaborated with faculty from other institutions and attended trainings to discuss ways to modify program curriculum to respond to continual changing in state licensing standards. The MFT program is currently in the first year of new program requirements and we will be monitoring new courses and licensing requirements in fieldwork closely. In addition faculty replaced the Thesis with culminating project and may introduce other methods better aligned to clinical practice during the 2013-2014 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.

The program's commitment to social justice and diversity has produced a dynamic and multicultural infused curriculum. In addition to specialized courses with multicultural content in MFT, faculty works to incorporate cultural considerations into all coursework. Learning processes are highly interactive, including emphases on both personal growth and professional knowledge and skills. The program has a long tradition of serving the community through its clinical traineeship placements serving agencies throughout the Bay area serving diverse client populations. Graduates of the MFT program at have been highly successful in securing employment in community agencies, private practices, hospitals, and school-affiliated programs.

Graduates are regarded very highly by local employers and are recognized for the strength of their clinical training and cultural competency.

### **3. STATISTICAL DATA**

#### Student Demographics for Graduate Candidates in Marriage and Family Therapy Program

# of Graduates Year 2009	# of Graduates 2010	# of Graduates 2011	# of Graduates 2012	# of Graduates 2013
46	22	44	24	19

#### Number of Majors

Major	Option	5-year Average
Counseling MS	Marriage and Family Therapy	31

#### Number of Degrees Awarded

Major	Option	5-year Average
Counseling MS	Marriage and Family Therapy	31

CAPR Table 1

California State University, East Bay

Counseling		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		Fall 2009		Fall 2010		Fall 2011	
		Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL
		Master		Master		Master		Master		Master	
Female	Black, non-Hispanic	3	3	5	5	11	11	8	8	3	3
	American Indian or Alaska Native	1	1	1	1			1	1		
	Asian	13	13	14	14	16	16	17	17	13	13
	Pacific Islander	1	1	1	1						
	Hispanic	10	10	13	13	10	10	16	16	14	14
	White	44	44	45	45	53	53	57	57	45	45
	Multiple ethnicity							4	4	2	2
	Race/ethnicity unknown	18	18	15	15	18	18	7	7	8	8
	Nonresident aliens	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Male	Black, non-Hispanic	2	2	2	2	1	1	3	3	2	2
	American Indian or Alaska Native										
	Asian	2	2	3	3	6	6	4	4	3	3
	Pacific Islander										
	Hispanic	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	2	2
	White	10	10	7	7	8	8	11	11	9	9
	Multiple ethnicity									1	1
	Race/ethnicity unknown	6	6	4	4	2	2	1	1	2	2
	Nonresident aliens										
Total	Black, non-Hispanic	5	5	7	7	12	12	11	11	5	5
	American Indian or Alaska Native	1	1	1	1			1	1		
	Asian	15	15	17	17	22	22	21	21	16	16
	Pacific Islander	1	1	1	1						
	Hispanic	13	13	16	16	14	14	19	19	16	16
	White	54	54	52	52	61	61	68	68	54	54
	Multiple ethnicity							4	4	3	3
	Race/ethnicity	24	24	19	19	20	20	8	8	10	10





### The SAS System

Counseling		CY07-08				CY08-09				CY09-10				CY10-11				CY11-12YTD			
		Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total
		Bccalaureate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaureate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaureate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaureate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalaureate	Mast er	Ed Doct or	
Female	Black, non-Hispanic		1		1		2		2		5		5		7		7		2		2
	American Indian or Alaska Native						1		1						1		1				
	Asian		6		6		7		7		5		5		7		7		9		9
	Pacific Islander						1		1												
	Hispanic		2		2		10		10		4		4		5		5		9		9
	White		21		21		25		25		15		15		30		30		20		20
	Multiple ethnicity														2		2		2		2
	Race/ethnicity unknown		9		9		5		5		11		11		3		3		2		2
	Nonresident aliens														1		1				
Male	Black, non-Hispanic		1		1						2		2						3		3
	American Indian or Alaska Native																				
	Asian		2		2						3		3		2		2		2		2

Counseling		CY07-08				CY08-09				CY09-10				CY10-11				CY11-12YTD			
		Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total	Degree Level			Total				
		Bccalau ate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalau ate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalau ate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalau ate	Mast er	Ed Doct or		Bccalau ate	Mast er	Ed Doct or	
	Pacific Islander																				
	Hispanic					2	2		1	1		3	3			1	1				
	White		9	9		6	6		1	1		8	8			1	1				
	Multiple ethnicity																				
	Race/ethni city unknown		3	3		4	4					1	1								
	Nonreside nt aliens																				
Total	Black, non- Hispanic		2	2		2	2		7	7		7	7			5	5				
	American Indian or Alaska Native					1	1					1	1								
	Asian		8	8		7	7		8	8		9	9			11	11				
	Pacific Islander					1	1														
	Hispanic		2	2		12	12		5	5		8	8			10	10				
	White		30	30		31	31		16	16		38	38			21	21				
	Multiple ethnicity											2	2			2	2				
	Race/ethni city unknown		12	12		9	9		11	11		4	4			2	2				
	Nonreside												1	1							



Academic Program Review SFR Table - Subject

California State University, East Bay

SFR BY COURSE LEVEL: TERM FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENTS / ALL FACULTY AND LECTURERS

Fall 2008 through Fall 2012

		Total SCU					term_ftes					term_ftef					term_sfr					
		Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	
EPSY	Tenured & Tenure Track	2393	1924	3390	3074	2702	159.5	128.3	226	204.9	180.1	12.69	9.22	10.22	10.59	9.93	12.58	13.91	22.12	19.34	18.15	
	Lecturer	858	1259	813	964	1065	57.2	83.93	54.2	64.27	71	4.14	5.47	3.81	5.67	3.24	13.81	15.36	14.21	11.34	21.93	
	Lower Division	.	.	.	156	192	.	.	.	10.4	12.8	.	.	.	0.27	0.4	.	.	.	38.95	32	
	Upper Division	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Graduate	3251	3183	4203	3882	3575	216.7	212.2	280.2	258.8	238.3	16.83	14.69	14.03	16	12.76	12.88	14.45	19.97	16.18	18.67	
	Total	3251	3183	4203	4038	3767	216.7	212.2	280.2	269.2	251.1	16.83	14.69	14.03	16.26	13.16	12.88	14.45	19.97	16.55	19.08	

Source: CSU Academic Planning Data Base (APDB); Section Master File (BKPD SMF) and Faculty Master File(BKPD FMF)

TOTAL FTES will differ slightly between ERSS and APDB. ERSS FTES is the official figure for CSU System reporting.

TERM FTES: Student Credit Units/15; FTEF: Instructional Faculty FTE only. Administrative and Other support fractions excluded.

Student Faculty Ratio(SFR) = TERM FTES / TERM FTEF

FTES generated is assigned to the department of record for the course subject area.

Document: Cal State East Bay Fact Book

Planning and Institutional Research

**Course History Table 10.1c**  
**California State University, East Bay COURSE HISTORY**  
**By Quarter from Summer 2007 through Spring 2012**

EPSY

		Summer					Fall					Winter					Spring				
		Sumr 2007	Sumr 2008	Sumr 2009	Sumr 2010	Sumr 2011	Fall 2007	Fall 2008	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2011	Wntr 2008	Wntr 2009	Wntr 2010	Wntr 2011	Wntr 2012	Sprg 2008	Sprg 2009	Sprg 2010	Sprg 2011	Sprg 2012
<b>Lower</b>	<b>Number Sections</b>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1.0	.	.	.	.	1.0	.	.	.	.	2.0
	<b>Total Enrollment</b>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	39	.	.	.	.	30	.	.	.	.	61
	<b>Avg Section Size</b>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	39.0	.	.	.	.	30.0	.	.	.	.	30.5
<b>Graduate</b>	<b>Number Sections</b>	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	74.0	74.0	70.0	93.0	80.0	73.0	71.0	66.0	79.0	69.0	81.0	81.0	65.0	80.0	63.0
	<b>Total Enrollment</b>	72	118	113	90	82	888	953	1,011	1,411	1,144	919	913	978	1,303	1,170	954	1,010	986	1,258	1,035
	<b>Avg Section Size</b>	36.0	59.0	28.3	45.0	41.0	14.8	15.3	16.0	23.2	17.2	17.6	16.7	20.1	23.0	22.0	17.3	17.5	22.1	24.2	21.0
<b>DISCIPLINE TOTAL</b>	<b>Number Sections</b>	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	74.0	74.0	70.0	93.0	81.0	73.0	71.0	66.0	79.0	70.0	81.0	81.0	65.0	80.0	65.0
	<b>Total Enrollment</b>	72	118	113	90	82	888	953	1,011	1,411	1,183	919	913	978	1,303	1,200	954	1,010	986	1,258	1,096
	<b>Avg Section Size</b>	36.0	59.0	28.3	45.0	41.0	14.8	15.3	16.0	23.2	17.5	17.6	16.7	20.1	23.0	22.1	17.3	17.5	22.1	24.2	21.4

**California State University, East Bay**  
**APR Summary Data**  
**Fall 2009 - 2013**

<b>Educational Psychology</b>					
<b>Item</b>	<b>Fall Quarter</b>				
	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
<b>A. Students Headcount</b>					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	168	191	159	145	140
4. Total Number of Majors	168	191	159	145	140
<b>College Years</b>					
<b>B. Degrees Awarded</b>					
	<b>08-09</b>	<b>09-10</b>	<b>10-11</b>	<b>11-12</b>	<b>12-13</b>
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	72	64	81	67	51
3. Total	72	64	81	67	51
<b>Fall Quarter</b>					
	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
<b>C. Faculty</b>					
<b>Tenured/Track Headcount</b>					
1. Full-Time	12	11	11	10	10
2. Part-Time	0	1	0	1	0
3a. Total Tenure Track	12	12	11	11	10
3b. % Tenure Track	41.4%	50.0%	42.3%	42.3%	35.7%
<b>Lecturer Headcount</b>					
4. Full-Time	0	0	0	0	0
5. Part-Time	17	12	15	15	18
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	17	12	15	15	18
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	58.6%	50.0%	57.7%	57.7%	64.3%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	29	24	26	26	28
<b>Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)</b>					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	9.2	10.2	10.6	9.9	9.2
9. Lecturer FTEF	5.5	3.8	5.7	3.2	4.1
10. Total Instructional FTEF	14.7	14.0	16.3	13.2	13.3
<b>Lecturer Teaching</b>					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	128.3	226.0	204.9	180.1	140.2
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	60.4%	80.7%	76.1%	71.7%	62.4%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	83.9	54.2	64.3	71.0	84.3
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	39.6%	19.3%	23.9%	28.3%	37.6%
13. Total FTES taught	212.2	280.2	269.2	251.1	224.5
14. Total SCU taught	3183.0	4203.0	4038.0	3767.0	3368.0
<b>D. Student Faculty Ratios</b>					
1. Tenured/Track	13.9	22.1	19.3	18.2	15.2
2. Lecturer	15.4	14.2	11.3	21.9	20.6
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	14.5	20.0	16.6	19.1	16.9
4. Lower Division	0.0	0.0	39.0	32.0	29.1

5. Upper Division	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. Graduate	14.5	20.0	16.2	18.7	16.5
<b>E. Section Size</b>					
1. Number of Sections Offered	70.0	93.0	81.0	68.0	68.0
2. Average Section Size	16.0	23.2	17.5	21.2	21.3
3. Average Section Size for LD	0.0	0.0	39.0	28.0	28.0
4. Average Section Size for UD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Average Section Size for GD	16.0	23.2	17.2	20.9	21.0
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	41	58	51	49	46
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	1	2	2
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	29	35	29	17	20

Source and definitions available at:

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

Headcount Enrollment	Fall Quarter				
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
<b>Counseling</b>					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	130	133	104	107	105
4. Total Number of Majors	130	133	104	107	105
<b>Special Education</b>					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	38	58	55	38	35
4. Total Number of Majors	38	58	55	38	35
Degrees Awarded	College Years				
	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13
<b>Counseling</b>					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	63	47	70	51	40
3. Total Number of Majors	63	47	70	51	40
<b>Special Education</b>					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	9	17	11	16	11
3. Total Number of Majors	9	17	11	16	11