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SECTION A – PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

I. CONTEXT (1 page)

Table One
(S.S. = Second Specialization) (C.C. = Conditionally Classified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students or candidates enrolled</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students graduating or candidates completing the program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a brief description of the program characteristics (e.g., program length, cohorted/non-cohorted, field components, on-line/hybrid components, innovations, themes, etc.) that may affect the experience of students or candidates in the program.

The mission of the Department of Counselor Education at California State University, Sacramento is to prepare highly qualified counseling professionals. The Department is committed to creating and facilitating the ongoing design and implementation of an exemplary teaching/learning community. The counseling program prepares individuals to function as professional counselors in a variety of settings including schools, colleges, business and industry, community agencies, and mental health settings. Currently, the Department offers three areas of specialization: School Counseling, Marriage and Family Counseling, and Career Counseling.

This 60 unit graduate program has previously allowed the flexibility of part-time or full-time course of study in which evening and day time classes are available. The duration of completion ranges from six semesters for full time study to a part time option of seven years completion as allowed by University policy. One of the major hallmarks of the program is the hands on experience provided. As early as the third semester of our program, students receive hands on training in designated service sites. These sites include public schools, a University based Counseling Center, and serving clients in mental health facilities. A 600-hour field study requirement provides real world counseling experience prior to completion of the program. Strengthened by the framework of national standards into the curriculum and training of our students, our program has most recently incorporated the use of the Comprehensive Professional Counselor Examination as an exit exam for our graduates. The Career Specialization within the Department has remained a strong and popular area of study since it’s inception over 20 years ago. Graduates with a Career emphasis have been successful in obtaining employment in community colleges, universities, government, and the private sector.

II. Student/Candidate Performance Assessment and Program Effectiveness Information
   a. Primary Program Learning Outcomes

Our department utilizes two key assessments to make critical decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for program completion, including: Basic Skills Evaluation and the Comprehensive Professional Counselor Examination (CPCE) which
addresses the field related categories of Human Growth and Development (C1), Social & Cultural Foundations (C2), Helping Relationships (C3), Group Work (C4), Career & Lifestyle Development (C5), Appraisal (C6), Research & Program Evaluation (C7), and Professional Orientation and Ethics (C8).

As faculty, we selected assessment instruments that would provide a wide measure of candidates’ performance in a number of counseling domains. Our ultimate goal is to ensure that our candidates develop the necessary counseling skill sets as well as create a productive learning environment for our candidates. Both of the assessment instruments have items that adequately measure candidates’ performance as relates to 1) Skill Assessment and 2) Field Related Knowledge Base.

Our data from the CPCE results reveal that our candidates’ performance is above the national average. The basic counseling skills checklists allows faculty to evaluate candidates twice during the semester which informs us on how well candidates develop and practice the fundamental counseling skills. This provides an opportunity for candidates to receive constructive feedback throughout the semester and program, thus, giving them opportunities to practice and improve in their deficit areas. An additional evaluation, the field site supervisor feedback which takes place half way through the semester and at semester end, provides direct feedback related to the candidates’ performance in the field and their capacity to demonstrate satisfactory application of knowledge related to the counseling domains in real world settings. The CPCE provides us the opportunity to determine how effective our curriculum and instruction meets the standards in the field of counseling. Given that the CPCE is an instrument used nationally in the counseling field, we use our candidates’ results as a way to both measure and inform our curriculum changes. We discuss the test results as a faculty and assist the Curriculum Review Committee develop a plan of action to address any deficit areas. The following table provides key information about the assessments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Type of Assessment</th>
<th>Variable Measured</th>
<th>Data Capture Points</th>
<th>Evaluators</th>
<th>Process of Data Capture</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills Evaluation</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Basic Counseling Skills</td>
<td>EDC 280: Midterm &amp; Final EDC 475: Midterm &amp; Final</td>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>Hard Copies &amp; University URL</td>
<td>CTC CACREP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPCE</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Comprehensive: Theory/Knowledge, Skill &amp; Professional Judgment</td>
<td>EDC 290: Faculty Committees</td>
<td>Hard Copies</td>
<td>CTC, CACREP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What we can surmise from Table One is a relatively stable enrollment for students in the career specialization despite the fact that we were not permitted to accept new students in Spring of 2010. We did have a larger number of Career students graduate in Spring of 2010 than in the Fall of 2009 and hope to replace these numbers with the incoming Class of 2010 in Fall of 2010.
Data related to Table Two for Fall of 2009 and Spring of 2010 in the data capture points of EDC 280 (Midterm & Final), EDC 475 (Midterm & Final) and EDC 290 (CPCE) specifically for Career Specialization Students can be found in Table Three:

Table Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1. Basic Skills Evaluation*</td>
<td>EDC 280 Mid-Term: 3.68</td>
<td>EDC 280 Mid-Term: 2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDC 280 Final: 3.83</td>
<td>EDC 280 Final: 3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDC 475: Mid-Term: 3.36</td>
<td>EDC 475 Mid-Term: 3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDC 475: Final: 4.44</td>
<td>EDC 475 Final: 4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. National CPCE**</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Average national percentile ranking for our students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employer Survey:
Employer Data was collected for the Career Specialization and indicates: with two employers completing the Department’s employer survey. The respondents were Dr. Beth Merritt Miller, Director of the Career Center and the Advising Center at Sacramento State University and Al Striplen, Counselor with the Equal Opportunity Program at Sacramento State University. Their evaluations can be reviewed under Attachment H. The Career Center has hired five of our Career Counseling graduates as full-time Career Counselors during the past four years and the Advising Center has hired eight of our Career Counseling graduates as Advisors during the past two years. The Career Center, Advising Center, and EOPS continue to be designated sites for our students for field study with five to eight students from our program working at those sites each year. In addition, the Career Counseling faculty held a meeting to gain feedback about the specialization this Spring 2009 for employers and field study supervisors. The discussion concerned ideas for improving the curriculum of the Career Counseling specialization and our Department’s efforts with respect to CACREP including ideas such as encouraging Career Counseling students to use their electives to take MFCC courses including Diagnosis and Treatment Planning and Psychopharmacology as electives.

Student Exit Survey Spring 2010
No data was gathered for the Fall 2009 graduating class which consisted of 32 students. For Spring of 2010, however, 40 of the 62 graduates participated in the on-line survey which consists of 16 questions which address topics such as job status as well as program quality. Of these 40 students, 9 were from the Career Specialization, 15 were from School Specialization and 16 were from Marriage, Family & Child Counseling Specialization. This accounts for 63.16% of the Spring of 2010 graduates participating.
The following is a synopsis of responses & ratings to key questions from the Student Exit Survey:

Question 3: Job Status
15.79% (6) of reporting students are employed full time, 52.63% (20) employed part time and 15.79% (6) reported being unemployed.

Question 4: Job Title/Description
There was a wide range of positions that our students hold at this time; from Counseling Intern, Behavior Specialist, High School Counselor, Human Service Specialist, Clinician, Program Manager, Program Director and Sex Educator. This is an indication that a number of our graduates are already working in the counseling field.

**Question 5: Current/Primary Employment**

Of the 34 students who responded to this question the general areas in which people are employed were broken down into the following categories:

- Community Counseling Agency: 15.79% (6)
- Elementary or Secondary School: 21.05% (8)
- College/University Counseling Center: 2.63% (1)
- College/University Faculty: 2.63% (1)
- Community/Junior College: 2.63% (1)
- General Hospital: 2.63% (1)
- Inpatient Facility: 2.63% (1)
- Outpatient Clinic: 5.26% (2)
- Other: 34.21% (13)

**Question 6: Employment, Related to Degree:** If you have obtained employment in a job related to your degree, please indicate how you heard about this position.

- 10.53% (4) of students indicated that they had obtained employment from a Personal Contact, 10.53% (4) indicated that employment was secured through their practicum and 2.63% (1) was through an announcement forwarded by the department. An additional 6 students reported having secured employment related to degree through Edjoin, field study, on line or through self initiated contact.

**Question 7: Present Employment, Not Degree-Related:**

23 students responded with many indicating that they were waiting to complete their program before applying for positions or were already searching for full time employment in the field.

**Question 8: Estimated number of hours per week spent in the following activities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Select if applicable</th>
<th>Select if Not applicable</th>
<th>Responded Count</th>
<th>Skipped Count</th>
<th>Committal Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Counseling</td>
<td>92.11% (35)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>94.74% (36)</td>
<td>5.26% (2)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Counseling</td>
<td>50% (19)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>81.58% (31)</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples/family counseling</td>
<td>28.95% (11)</td>
<td>44.74% (17)</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>71.05% (27)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>84.21% (32)</td>
<td>15.79% (6)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The responses indicate strong use of skill base in the contexts of Individual Counseling, Supervision, Consultation and Report Writing. Other areas in which skill base is in use includes Group Counseling and Research/Scholarly Writing, Diagnosis/Assessment and School-based Meetings.

**Question 9: Memberships**

Of the 38 students who participated in the survey, there were 18 who indicated they were members in a professional organization. These consist of: 5 in American Counseling Association, 2 in American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy, 4 in American School Counselor Association, 6 in California Career Development Association, 6 in California Association for Marriage and Family Therapy.

**Question 11: Achievements, Leadership, Honors, and Service**

10 students indicated that they are members of our student honor society, Chi Sigma Iota, and other students have received scholarships or hold office related to professional organizations mentioned under Question #9.

**Question 12: Scholarly Work**

There were only a handful of students who indicated involvement in conference presentations or publishing. One student had presented at a national conference, 2 at other conferences, 1 had contributed to a refereed publication, 1 to a non-refereed publication and 1 to another publication.

**Question 13: Financial Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R032</th>
<th>Diagnosis/Assessment</th>
<th>44.74% (17)</th>
<th>31.58% (12)</th>
<th>76.32% (29)</th>
<th>23.68% (9)</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R034</td>
<td>Research/scholarly writing</td>
<td>50% (19)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>76.32% (29)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R036</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>52.63% (20)</td>
<td>71.05% (27)</td>
<td>28.95% (11)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R038</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>34.21% (13)</td>
<td>39.47% (15)</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R040</td>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td>60.53% (23)</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>78.95% (30)</td>
<td>21.05% (8)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R042</td>
<td>School-based Meetings</td>
<td>42.11% (16)</td>
<td>31.58% (12)</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R044</td>
<td>Other (please specify; include # of hours)</td>
<td>28.95% (11)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>55.26% (21)</td>
<td>44.74% (17)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31 students reported receiving some range of financial aid from loans to grants. 50% (19) of the students who responded to the extent to which they felt financially supported by the department indicated that they felt “Completely Unsupported.” 21% (8) indicated that they felt “Somewhat Unsupported.” Another 21% (8) expressed that they felt “Somewhat Supported” while only 2 students (5.13%) felt “Strongly or Very Strongly Supported” in relation to how financially supported they felt by the department.

In light of rising costs of tuition, minimal scholarship availability for graduate students and increased costs for books, parking, juxtaposed with a shrinking job market there is a larger context impacting student capability to keep up with the cost of earning a graduate degree.

**Question 14: Training**

Students were asked to provide a rating on a scale of 1 to 7 with 7 being “Excellent Training” and 1 being “Very Inadequate Training” in relation to 18 areas of training. The Student Exit Survey table is provided below and followed by discussion about student ratings. Highlighted are the ranged scores that reflect the concentration of student ratings:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>5.26% (2)</td>
<td>5.26% (2)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>31.58% (12)</td>
<td>36.84% (14)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>21.05% (8)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>28.95% (11)</td>
<td>15.79% (6)</td>
<td>15.79% (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are clear strengths in the ratings. For example, Counseling diverse populations was rated by 37 out of 38 students in the mid-point (4) to “Excellent Training” (7) provided range. 19 (50%) of the students rated this category as “Excellent.” Other areas receiving strong ratings include Individual counseling which was rated from mid-point (4) to Excellent (7) by 37 out of 38 students with 14 (36.84%) rating as Excellent. Training in Career Counseling also enjoyed strong ratings with 28 students rating at mid point to excellent and 9 rating as excellent. These areas of training were followed by other clusters of perceived strengths such as Group Counseling, Ethical/legal issues, Assessment, Broad theoretical knowledge, Integration of theory, research & practice, Professional Identity, Consultation Skills and Human Development.
Areas receiving ratings more in the mid-range include Marriage counseling, Family Therapy, and Psychopathology. Areas of training that students rated toward the lower range of the scale included Statistics and Research Design with 25 out of 37 students rating their training from mid-point (4) to “Very Inadequate” (1). Also in the lower range was Knowledge of current health care market which was rated by 28 out of 38 students in the mid to lowest range.

Other Areas

Also addressed under the category of “Training”, students were asked to respond to other categories not directly related to skill development of counselors but nonetheless are areas related to the field. In the category of “Participation in service to the profession”, 26 out of 38 students rated their training in our department at mid-point to excellent. In the category of Community Outreach and Education, 24 out of 38 rated their training at mid-point to excellent. In the category of Supervision, our department’s training was rated by 33 out of 36 students in the mid-point to excellent range. The lowest rating related to the category of Learning to teach which was rated by 24 out of 38 students from mid-point to the lowest rating of “Inadequate.”

What is important to note from the 38 student respondents was that 33 of the 38 students rated their “Overall evaluation of the training received at Sacramento State” from mid-point to excellent with the greatest concentration of students rating their training (14 out of 38) at a 2, followed by 11 students rating their experience at a 3, and 5 students rating their experience at a 7. Given the tremendous economic crisis under which our department has attempted to provide optimal program delivery, these final ratings account for an overall positive experience despite the many challenges.

Students were also asked select the three training areas that were of most value to them. The categories receiving the highest responses follow:

- Individual counseling: 34 Responses @ 89.47%
- Counseling Diverse Populations: 19 Responses @ 50%
- Group Counseling: 14 Responses @ 36.84%
- Family Therapy: 13 Responses @ 34.21%
- Career Counseling: 9 Responses @ 23.68%
- Ethical/legal issues: 9 Responses @ 23.68%

Also asked of the students were the three training areas in which they wish they had received more training. The categories receiving the highest responses follow:

- Marriage counseling: 13 Responses @ 34.21%
- Consultation Skills: 13 Responses @ 34.21%
- Integration of theory, research & practice: 12 Responses @ 31.58%
- Family Therapy: 11 Responses @ 28.95%
- Assessment: 9 Responses @ 23.68%
- Psychopathology: 9 Responses @ 23.68%
- Knowledge of Current Health Care Market: 9 Responses @ 23.68%

**Question 15: Student-Faculty Relations**

What follows is the table that reflects the rating scores of students in this particular category & followed by discussion about the ratings:
While there were apparent areas of strength in this set of ratings, there was one particular area that stood out as needing improvement due to the mixed ratings by students across the range. This area was in Advising. While about half of the respondents rated their experience with Advising and mid-point or above, it should also be noted that they other half rated their experience at mid-point or below.

Other areas that were more in the mid-range of ratings pertained to “Assistance in practicum/job placement”, “Availability to Students”, and “Invested in my academic/personal success.” While furloughs have had an impact on availability and there are less tenured faculty available for advising, the mixed experience of so many respondents indicates a need to provide consistent information through multiple avenues and availability & accessibility so that all students receive advising. The perception by some students as faculty not being invested in their academic/personal success also needs to be addressed.

The areas of strength appeared to be in “Respect for Diversity”, “Modeling the value of diversity as an important professional goal,” “Encouraging the integration of multicultural perspectives and skills into professional roles,” and “Respect for personal/professional boundaries.”
Question 16: Suggestions: What were the best things about your classes/degree program?

There were 33 respondents and themes that emerged included the quality of experiential classes that provided the opportunity to apply what they are learning in classes, i.e. practicum and field study. Also noted was the personal development that is fostered in courses where student self awareness is emphasized. There was also a theme that there were few, but not all, professors go over and beyond to serve as mentors and advisors.

In response to the changes that respondents suggested, there were a few main themes that emerged from the 34 students and then very specific recommendations related to curriculum within the three specializations. With the program changes that were made to meet accreditation requirements, there was disruption to the course of study that students were given when they first entered. The departments’ capacity to communicate the changes and implement them while students were in the pipeline created angst. The recommendations from students to develop a cohort system, uniform curriculum and unit caps are all being implemented in the Fall of 2010. Other suggestions related to smaller class sizes as the hiring of more faculty so that there can be more advising and greater communication between professors and students. These are areas that the faculty would also like to see improved and are dependent on funding.

While this report is only a synopsis of the Student Survey with brief reflections, the entire report which is being reviewed by the Department faculty on May 12th can be viewed by clicking on the URL:
https://skylight.wsu.edu/Reporting/Public/MultiPoolQuickReport.aspx?SurveyID=72b648cd-4f07-440e-b0d8-a6d80a375f90

Department faculty and staff were also provided with the URL on May 5th and encouraged to review the data and comments for themselves prior to the May 12th meeting.

Case Studies:

While the CPCE provides a standardized quantitative assessment of our graduates, the Case Study is the qualitative assessment that must meet the following criteria: (a) clarity of writing and responsiveness to the prompts; (b) integration of theory to practice; (c) demonstration of willingness to consider alternative perspectives as well as those that differ significantly from their own. This is a summative assessment. Students/candidates are allowed to re-write and re-submit this paper should criteria not meet approval of two of the three evaluators.

The paper is generally from 8 to 10 pages and many students go beyond the minimum. This paper is submitted from mid to final point of the final semester in their field study seminar. The student presents the case study orally to a group of her/his peers and to their faculty instructor. The oral presentation is evaluated by the field study instructor. The quality of the paper is reviewed by their field study seminar instructor, the Culminating Experience Instructor and the Chair of the Department. In Fall of 2009, students were provided with written feedback from the Department Chair on the quality of their Case Study and in several instances, the students were asked to elaborate, in writing, with particular questions related to their theoretical orientation and application of their orientation to the stated case study in addition to questions related to their observation and application of cross cultural understanding. For Spring of 2010, the Department Chair choose to meet with each student in lieu of written communication. These meetings were held weekly with each meeting serving as an exit interview and opportunity to discuss the merits of the case study as well as to discuss the students’ theoretical orientation, application and growth.
For Fall of 2009 and Spring of 2010, all 94 students passed the formal review process with only one student in each semester being instructed by the department chair to rewrite and elaborate on their Case Study before being provided with a final review.

Case Studies reflected sound connection between theory and practice with students clearly demonstrating the use of various counseling techniques and being able to discuss the theoretical orientation from which the technique is derived.

Sites at which students served their field study provide a wide range of clientele and subsequent experiences related to the counseling experience. Of particular strengths that has been noted in the Case Studies for Fall of 2009 & Spring of 2010 include the sections on Cultural Responsiveness in which students are not only able to reflect on the relational construct of themselves with their client but, even more intuitively understanding the perception that the client has of them given similarities and differences. With this documented understanding of the inter relationship of “self and other” students have drawn from identity development models as well as referencing the dynamic of power and privilege as it relates to adultism, racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism.

Career students served clients at the following sites: the Alliance for Excellence Counseling Center in Sacramento which serves a wide range of clientele including students on independent study at El Sereno High School, the Center for Counseling and Diagnostic Services which is located in the College of Education at California State University, Sacramento, and CSUS’s Career Center, University of California, Davis Career and Internship Center, American River College, Sacramento City College, and several One-Stop Career Centers serving unemployed individuals throughout the Sacramento Area. A number of the clients served at the Center for Counseling and Diagnostic Services Career Center were transported from Saint Johns Shelter for Women and Children thereby serving the homeless population. Students from the Career Specialization demonstrated application of theory drawn from: Cognitive Behavioral, Gestalt, Person Centered, Abraham Maslow’s Humanistic Theory, Narrative Therapy, Existential, Adlerian, and drew from a more specialization focused body of theories and assessments such as Social-Cognitive Career Theory, Hansen’s Integrative Life Planning Approach, Frank Parson’s Trait-Factor theory, John Holland’s theory of vocational choice, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Assessment, H.B. Gelatt’s Positive Uncertainty Theory, and John Krumboltz’s and Al Levin’s Happenstance Learning Theory, and Donald Super’s Life Space/ Life-Span theory and Duane Brown’s Values-Based Approach.

Career Counseling Specialization
III. Analysis of Student/Candidate Assessment Data
Strengths:
  a. Candidate Performance:

All 16 students in the Career Counseling specialization passed the Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE) during the spring 2010 semester. The CPCE is a national exam available to Counselor Education programs nationwide as a means of evaluating students knowledge of eight core areas in the field of Counseling including Human Growth and Development, Helping Relationships, Career Development, Appraisal, Social and Cultural Foundations, Research and Evaluation, Professional Orientation (Ethics), and Group Work. The mean score for Career Counseling students was 89.75 which placed these students at about the national mean for Master’s level students in Counselor Education. There was a wide range of
scores among individual students in the Career specialization on the CPCE with two students scoring 108, two others scoring 107, and another scoring 106; while other students on the low end scored 71, 82, and 84. Because of this wide range of scores within the same specialization, it is difficult to determine a pattern explaining why some students scored significantly higher than other students in this specialization. These results may be due to the fact that some students retained information better than others or may have been more comfortable answering objective/multiple choice questions on the CPCE. There was a similar wide range of scores between students with respect to specific sections within the CPCE and therefore the results cannot be generalized.

In addition to this measurement of knowledge in the eight core areas of the Counseling profession, students also wrote a case study paper and made a presentation in their final semesters in the program. The paper was approved by a three member faculty panel and summarized each student’s experience providing counseling for one long term client (from 5-10 sessions during one semester) in either his or her practicum or field study experience. The paper and presentation (made in each student’s section of Field Study Seminar to the instructor and fellow students) were evaluated for strengths in describing the counseling setting, identifying the client’s presenting issues, discussing cultural responsiveness, identifying client and counselor goals, describing useful theories, applying theory to practice, describing interventions including use of assessments, discussing outcomes, and including an analysis of lessons learned/self-critique. During the Spring 2010 semester, the case study papers showed improvement from past semesters in the areas of cultural responsiveness and applying theory to practice.

b. Program Effectiveness:

Based on the fact that all students successfully passed the CPCE, students in the program are retaining knowledge regarding theories, strategies, concepts, and other data relevant to the counseling profession. The CPCE is based on the eight areas that also correspond with core classes, in contrast to specialization classes, that students complete during their time in the program. In the Student Exit Survey completed by graduating students in Spring 2010, training in Career Counseling was rated highly, in fact, Career Counseling was rated third highest among several factors. Faculty in the Career Counseling specialization were mentioned specifically as being supportive of students during their time in the program.

Areas for Improvement:

a. Candidate Performance:

Two topic areas on the CPCE that students in the Career specialization scored lowest on were 1. Research and Evaluation; and 2. Appraisal. Both of these sections emphasize quantitative rather than qualitative research and statistical terminology that traditionally are not favored by counseling students. With respect to case study papers and presentations, students in the Career Counseling specialization need further skill in applying theory to practice, moving beyond career assessment information to help solve career related issues of their clients, and providing more of a detailed assessment of their own counseling strengths and areas for improvement.

Program Effectiveness:

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Student/Candidate Performance and Program Effectiveness (1-2 pages)
In order to better prepare students for CPCE sections which students seem to be struggling with, namely research and Evaluation and Appraisal, faculty have begun discussing ways to present these topics in various classes throughout the program. These topics were previously covered only in selected courses that some students take early in the program. Both full-time and part-time faculty will continue to be encouraged to include these topics more extensively in other courses as well as the two courses which concentrate on these areas. In this regard, several faculty have indicated that they have added multiple choice exams to their classes as a means of covering this material and preparing students for the CPCE.

In their field study seminars during Spring 2010, Career Counseling students were encouraged to be more thoughtful and detailed in the areas of cultural responsiveness, applying theory to practice, and being more detailed in their self-critiques in their case study papers and presentations.

With respect to using assessment tools, Career Counseling students sometimes rely excessively on using assessment tools as the main component of their interventions in working with their clients. The faculty continues to encourage students to emphasize counseling first and use the assessments as tools to facilitate the counseling process, instead of using assessments to define the counseling process.

During the past semester, a number of Career Counseling program alumni/nae has made guest speaker presentations in various classes. Fortunately, many of the alumni/nae also serve as field study site supervisors each semester. In these presentations, students learn about the realities of the career counseling profession including the different settings employing career counselors, changes in the field including assisting clients during California’s economic downturn, how to maximize your employability, and job search strategies for career counselors themselves.

Given the high unemployment situation in California and elsewhere, career counselors continue to play a significant role in assisting clients in various settings including K-12, community colleges, four-year universities, community One-Stop Career Centers/public career development agencies, and private outplacement firms. The emphasis in the Career Counseling program continues to be a holistic one, recognizing that personal and career problems are intertwined and going beyond simply helping to match individuals with jobs. Given the anxiety and stress that so many individuals are experiencing, this holistic perspective is an important value in today’s unpredictable job market. The new Licensed Professional Clinical Counselor (LPCC) designation in California also recognizes the importance of a holistic approach to Career Counseling. In this regard, the Career Counseling program of courses has been adjusted this past semester in order to enable continuing and new students the opportunity to take three of the four courses required for this licensure including Diagnosis and Treatment Planning, Substance Abuse, Psychopharmacology, and in Spring 2011 Crisis and Trauma Counseling.
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SECTION A –PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

I. CONTEXT (1 page)

Table One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students or candidates enrolled</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students graduating or candidates completing the program</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a brief description of the program characteristics (e.g., program length, cohorted/non-cohorted, field components, on-line/hybrid components, innovations, themes, etc.) that may affect the experience of students or candidates in the program.

The MFCC program is a 60 unit M.S. degree with a substantial portion of experiential activities, including a Practicum in which students are observed live while counseling community clients in our Community Counseling Center, plus an additional 600 clock hours of Field Study in other non-profit agencies in the community. The university has contracts with placement sites, and one requirement is a high level of diversity, providing our students supervised experience in working with the poor and disenfranchised, as well as those of diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

The city of Sacramento, according to the last census, was the most diverse city in the United States. Both the faculty and the students enrolled in our program reflect this diversity. Four of nine faculty members are from other than Euro-American backgrounds. In a number of classes, Euro-American students are the minority. Diversity is a strong theme, and the self-knowledge and self-awareness essential to working effectively with diverse populations is emphasized, and ethnic and cultural differences in marriage and family relationships are explored.

Fall Semester, 2010, the entire department will begin our first cohorts, which should be very helpful in scheduling classes.

II. STUDENT/CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS INFORMATION

a. PRIMARY PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

Our department utilizes two key assessments to make critical decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for program completion, including: Basic Skills Evaluation and the Comprehensive Professional Counselor Examination (CPCE) which addresses the field related categories of Human Growth and Development (C1), Social & Cultural Foundations (C2), Helping Relationships (C3) Group Work (C4), Career & Lifestyle Development (C5), Appraisal (C6), Research & Program Evaluation (C7) and Professional Orientation and Ethics (C8).

As faculty, we selected assessment instruments that would provide a wide measure of candidates’ performance in a number of counseling domains. Our ultimate goal is to ensure that our candidates develop the necessary counseling skill sets as well as create a productive learning
environment for our candidates. Both of the assessment instruments have items that adequately measure candidates’ performance as related to 1) Skill Assessment and 2) Field Related Knowledge Base.

Our data from the CPCE results reveal that our candidates’ performance is above the national average. The basic counseling skills checklists allows faculty to evaluate candidates twice during the semester which informs us on how well candidates’ develop and practice the fundamental counseling skills. This provides an opportunity for candidates to receive constructive feedback throughout the semester and program, thus, giving them opportunities to practice and improve in their deficit areas. An additional evaluation, the field site supervisor feedback which takes place half way through the semester and at semester end, provides direct feedback related to the candidates performance in the field and their capacity to demonstrate satisfactory application of knowledge related to the counseling domains in real world settings.

The CPCE provides us the opportunity to determine how effective our curriculum and instruction meets the standards in the field of counseling. Given that the CPCE is an instrument used nationally in the counseling field, we use our candidates’ results as a way to both measure and inform our curriculum changes. We discuss the test results as a faculty and assist the Curriculum Review Committee develop a plan of action to address any program deficit areas.

b. **Primary Student/Candidate Assessments**

**Table Two**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Type of Assessment</th>
<th>Variable Measured</th>
<th>Data Capture Points</th>
<th>Evaluators</th>
<th>Process of Data Capture</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills Evaluation</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Basic Counseling Skills Students rated on a 1 (low) to 5 (high) point scale</td>
<td>EDC 280: Midterm &amp; Final EDC 475: Midterm &amp; Final</td>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>Hard Copies &amp; University URL</td>
<td>CTC, CACREP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPCE</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Comprehensive: Theory/Knowledge, Skill &amp; Professional Judgment</td>
<td>EDC 290</td>
<td>Faculty Committees</td>
<td>Hard Copies</td>
<td>CTC, CACREP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table One confirms that the MFT Specialization continues to hold a large number of students. While we did graduate a larger number in Spring of 2010, preliminary figures for incoming students (Fall of 2010) already shows our capacity to replace graduated students while enjoying high selectivity.

Data related to Table Two for Fall of 2009 and Spring of 2010 in the data capture points of EDC 280 (Midterm & Final), EDC 475 (Midterm & Final) and EDC 290 (CPCE) specifically for MFT Specialization Students can be found in Table Three:
### Table Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Basic Skills Evaluation*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDC 280 Mid: 3.78 Final: 3.61</td>
<td>Mid: 2.63 Final: 3.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDC 476 Mid: 3.95 Final: 4.73</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDC 475 Mid: 4.0 Final: 4.48</td>
<td>Mid: 3.61 Final: 3.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDC 480 In Progress</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 National CPCE** (Average national score for our students)</td>
<td>97.65</td>
<td>100.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employer survey**: Data not available at time of report.

**Student Exit Survey Spring 2010**

No data was gathered for the Fall 2009 graduating class which consisted of 32 students. For Spring of 2010, however, 40 of the 62 graduates participated in the on-line survey which consists of 16 questions which address topics such as job status as well as program quality. Of these 40 students, 9 were from the Career Specialization, 15 were from School Specialization and 16 were from Marriage, Family & Child Counseling Specialization. This accounts for 63.16% of the Spring of 2010 graduates participating.

The following is a synopsis of responses & ratings to key questions from the Student Exit Survey:

**Question 3: Job Status**
15.79% (6) of reporting students are employed full time, 52.63% (20) employed part time and 15.79% (6) reported being unemployed.

**Question 4: Job Title/Description**
There was a wide range of positions that our students hold at this time; from Counseling Intern, Behavior Specialist, High School Counselor, Human Service Specialist, Clinician, Program Manager, Program Director and Sex Educator. This is an indication that a number of our graduates are already working in the counseling field.

**Question 5: Current/Primary Employment**

Of the 34 students who responded to this question the general areas in which people are employed were broken down into the following categories:
- Community Counseling Agency: 15.79% (6)
- Elementary or Secondary School: 21.05% (8)
- College/University Counseling Center: 2.63% (1)
- College/University Faculty: 2.63% (1)
- Community/Junior College: 2.63% (1)
- General Hospital: 2.63% (1)
- Inpatient Facility: 2.63% (1)
- Outpatient Clinic: 5.26% (2)
- Other: 34.21% (13)

**Question 6: Employment, Related to Degree**: if you have obtained employment in a job related to your degree, please indicate how you heard about this position.
10.53% (4) of students indicated that they had obtained employment from a Personal Contact, 10.53% (4) indicated that employment was secured through their practicum and 2.63% (1) was through an announcement forwarded by the department. An additional 6 students reported having secured employment related to degree through Edjoin, field study, on line or through self initiated contact.

**Question 7: Present Employment, Not Degree-Related:**

23 students responded with many indicating that they were waiting to complete their program before applying for positions or were already searching for full time employment in the field.

**Question 8: Estimated number of hours per week spent in the following activities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>R022</th>
<th>R024</th>
<th>R026</th>
<th>R028</th>
<th>R030</th>
<th>R032</th>
<th>R034</th>
<th>R036</th>
<th>R038</th>
<th>R040</th>
<th>R042</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Select if applicable</td>
<td>Select if Not applicable</td>
<td>Responded Count</td>
<td>Skipped Count</td>
<td>Committed Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R022</td>
<td>Individual Counseling</td>
<td><strong>92.11%</strong> (35)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>94.74% (36)</td>
<td>5.26% (2)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R024</td>
<td>Group Counseling</td>
<td><strong>50%</strong> (19)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R026</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td><strong>73.68%</strong> (28)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>81.58% (31)</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R028</td>
<td>Couples/family counseling</td>
<td>28.95% (11)</td>
<td><strong>44.74%</strong> (17)</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R030</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td><strong>71.05%</strong> (27)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>84.21% (32)</td>
<td>15.79% (6)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R032</td>
<td>Diagnosis/Assessment</td>
<td><strong>44.74%</strong> (17)</td>
<td>31.58% (12)</td>
<td>76.32% (29)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R034</td>
<td>Research/scholarly writing</td>
<td><strong>50%</strong> (19)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>76.32% (29)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R036</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td><strong>52.63%</strong> (20)</td>
<td>71.05% (27)</td>
<td>28.95% (11)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R038</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>34.21% (13)</td>
<td><strong>39.47%</strong> (15)</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R040</td>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td><strong>60.53%</strong> (23)</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>78.95% (30)</td>
<td>21.05% (8)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R042</td>
<td>School-based Meetings</td>
<td><strong>42.11%</strong> (16)</td>
<td>31.58% (12)</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses indicate strong use of skill base in the contexts of Individual Counseling, Supervision, Consultation and Report Writing. Other areas in which skill base is in use includes Group Counseling and Research/Scholarly Writing, Diagnosis/Assessment and School-based Meetings.

**Question 9: Memberships**
Of the 38 students who participated in the survey, there were 18 who indicated they were members in a professional organization. These consist of: 5 in American Counseling Association, 2 in American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy, 4 in American School Counselor Association, 6 in California Career Development Association, 6 in California Association for Marriage and Family Therapy.

**Question 11: Achievements, Leadership, Honors, and Service**
10 students indicated that they are members of our student honor society, Chi Sigma Iota, and other students have received scholarships or hold office related to professional organizations mentioned under Question #9.

**Question 12: Scholarly Work**
There were only a handful of students who indicated involvement in conference presentations or publishing. One student had presented at a national conference, 2 at other conferences, 1 had contributed to a refereed publication, 1 to a non-refereed publication and 1 to another publication.

**Question 13: Financial Support**
31 students reported receiving some range of financial aid from loans to grants. 50% (19) of the students who responded to the extent to which they felt financially supported by the department indicated that they felt “Completely Unsupported.” 21% (8) indicated that they felt “Somewhat Unsupported.” Another 21% (8) expressed that they felt “Somewhat Supported” while only 2 students (5.13%) felt “Strongly or Very Strongly Supported” in relation to how financially supported they felt by the department.

In light of rising costs of tuition, minimal scholarship availability for graduate students and increased costs for books, parking, juxtaposed with a shrinking job market there is a larger context impacting student capability to keep up with the cost of earning a graduate degree.

**Question 14: Training**
Students were asked to provide a rating on a scale of 1 to 7 with 7 being “Excellent Training” and 1 being “Very Inadequate Training” in relation to 18 areas of training. The Student Exit Survey table is provided below and followed by discussion about student ratings.

Highlighted are the ranged scores that reflect the concentration of student ratings:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>5.26% (1)</td>
<td>5.26% (1)</td>
<td>23.68% (2)</td>
<td>31.58% (3)</td>
<td>36.84% (4)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>50% (19)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>15.79% (6)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>26.95% (11)</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63% (2)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>5.26% (1)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>26.95% (11)</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>100% (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are clear strengths in the ratings. For example, Counseling diverse populations was rated by 37 out of 38 students in the mid-point (4) to “Excellent Training” (7) provided range. 19 (50%) of the students rated this category as “Excellent.” Other areas receiving strong ratings include Individual counseling which was rated from mid-point (4) to Excellent (7) by 37 out of 38 students with 14 (36.84%) rating as Excellent. Training in Career Counseling also enjoyed strong ratings with 28 students rating at mid point to excellent and 9 rating as excellent. These areas of training were followed by other clusters of perceived strengths such as Group Counseling, Ethical/legal issues, Assessment, Broad theoretical knowledge, Integration of theory, research & practice, Professional Identity, Consultation Skills and Human Development.
Areas receiving ratings more in the mid-range include Marriage counseling, Family Therapy, and Psychopathology. Areas of training that students rated toward the lower range of the scale included Statistics and Research Design with 25 out of 37 students rating their training from mid-point (4) to “Very Inadequate” (1). Also in the lower range was Knowledge of current health care market which was rated by 28 out of 38 students in the mid to lowest range.

**Other Areas**

Also addressed under the category of “Training”, students were asked to respond to other categories not directly related to skill development of counselors but nonetheless are areas related to the field. In the category of “Participation in service to the profession”, 26 out of 38 students rated their training in our department at mid-point to excellent. In the category of Community Outreach and Education, 24 out of 38 rated their training at mid-point to excellent. In the category of Supervision, our department’s training was rated by 33 out of 36 students in the mid-point to excellent range. The lowest rating related to the category of Learning to teach which was rated by 24 out of 38 students from mid-point to the lowest rating of “Inadequate.”

What is important to note from the 38 student respondents was that 33 of the 38 students rated their “Overall evaluation of the training received at Sacramento State” from mid-point to excellent with the greatest concentration of students rating their training (14 out of 38) at a 2, followed by 11 students rating their experience at a 3, and 5 students rating their experience at a 7. Given the tremendous economic crisis under which our department has attempted to provide optimal program delivery, these final ratings account for an overall positive experience despite the many challenges.

Students were also asked to select the three training areas that were of most value to them. The categories receiving the highest responses follow:

- Individual Counseling: 34 Responses @ 89.47%
- Counseling Diverse Populations: 19 Responses @ 50%
- Group Counseling: 14 Responses @ 36.84%
- Family Therapy: 13 Responses @ 34.21%
- Career Counseling: 9 Responses @ 23.68%
- Ethical/legal issues: 9 Responses @ 23.68%

Also asked of the students were the three training areas in which they wish they had received more training. The categories receiving the highest responses follow:

- Marriage Counseling: 13 Responses @ 34.21%
- Consultation Skills: 13 Responses @ 34.21%
- Integration of theory, research & practice: 12 Responses @ 31.58%
- Family Therapy: 11 Responses @ 28.95%
- Assessment: 9 Responses @ 23.68%
- Psychopathology: 9 Responses @ 23.68%
- Knowledge of Current Health Care Market: 9 Responses @ 23.68%

**Question 15: Student-Faculty Relations**

What follows is the table that reflects the rating scores of students in this particular category & followed by discussion about the ratings:
While there were apparent areas of strength in this set of ratings, there was one particular area that stood out as needing improvement due to the mixed ratings by students across the range. This area was in Advising. While about half of the respondents rated their experience with Advising and mid-point or above, it should also be noted that they other half rated their experience at mid-point or below.

Other areas that were more in the mid-range of ratings pertained to “Assistance in practicum/job placement”, “Availability to Students”, and “Invested in my academic/personal success.” While furloughs have had an impact on availability and there are less tenured faculty available for advising, the mixed experience of so many respondents indicates a need to provide consistent information through multiple avenues and availability & accessibility so that all students receive advising. The perception by some students as faculty not being invested in their academic/personal success also needs to be addressed.

The areas of strength appeared to be in “Respect for Diversity”, “Modeling the value of diversity as an important professional goal,” “Encouraging the integration of multicultural perspectives and skills into professional roles,” and “Respect for personal/professional boundaries.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R149 Advising</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Skipped Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.42%</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>18.42%</td>
<td>13.16%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R150 Respect for diversity</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>18.42%</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>44.74%</td>
<td>97.37%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R151 Modeling the value of diversity as an important professional goal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
<td>44.74%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R152 Encouraging the integration of multicultural perspectives and skills into professional roles</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R153 Respect for personal/professional boundaries</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>23.68%</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>23.68%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R154 Assistance in practicum/job placement</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>18.42%</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R155 Availability to students</td>
<td>13.16%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>23.68%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>13.16%</td>
<td>13.16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R156 Invested in my academic/personal success</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>28.95%</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 16: Suggestions: What were the best things about your classes/degree program?**

There were 33 respondents and themes that emerged included the quality of experiential classes that provided the opportunity to apply what they are learning in classes, i.e. practicum and field study. Also noted was the personal development that is fostered in courses where student self awareness is emphasized. There was also a theme that there were few, but not all, professors go over and beyond to serve as mentors and advisors.

In response to the changes that respondents suggested, there were a few main themes that emerged from the 34 students and then very specific recommendations related to curriculum within the three specializations. With the program changes that were made to meet accreditation requirements, there was disruption to the course of study that students were given when they first entered. The departments’ capacity to communicate the changes and implement them while students were in the pipeline created angst. The recommendations from students to develop a cohort system, uniform curriculum and unit caps are all being implemented in the Fall of 2010. Other suggestions related to smaller class sizes as the hiring of more faculty so that there can be more advising and greater communication between professors and students. These are areas that the faculty would also like to see improved and are dependent on funding.

While this report is only a synopsis of the Student Survey with brief reflections, the entire report which is being reviewed by the Department faculty on May 12th can be viewed by clicking on the URL:
https://skylight.wsu.edu/Reporting/Public/MultiPoolQuickReport.aspx?SurveyID=72b648cd-4f07-440e-b0d8-a6d80a375f90

Department faculty and staff were also provided with the URL on May 5th and encouraged to review the data and comments for themselves prior to the May 12th meeting.

**Case Studies:**

While the CPCE provides a standardized quantitative assessment of our graduates, the Case Study is the qualitative assessment that must meet the following criteria: (a) clarity of writing and responsiveness to the prompts; (b) integration of theory to practice; (c) demonstration of willingness to consider alternative perspectives as well as those that differ significantly from their own. This is a summative assessment. Students/candidates are allowed to re-write and re-submit this paper should criteria not meet approval of two of the three evaluators.

The paper is generally from 8 to 10 pages and many students go beyond the minimum. This paper is submitted from mid to final point of the final semester in their field study seminar. The student presents the case study orally to a group of her/his peers and to their faculty instructor. The oral presentation is evaluated by the field study instructor. The quality of the paper is reviewed by their field study seminar instructor, the Culminating Experience Instructor and the Chair of the Department. In Fall of 2009, students were provided with written feedback from the Department Chair on the quality of their Case Study and in several instances, the students were asked to elaborate, in writing, with particular questions related to their theoretical orientation and application of their orientation to the stated case study in addition to questions related to their observation and application of cross cultural understanding. For Spring of 2010, the Department Chair choose to meet with each student in lieu of written communication. These meetings were held weekly with each meeting serving as an exit interview and opportunity to discuss the merits of the case study as well as to discuss the students’ theoretical orientation, application and growth.
For Fall of 2009 and Spring of 2010, all 94 students passed the formal review process with only one student in each semester being instructed by the department chair to rewrite and elaborate on their Case Study before being provided with a final review.

Case Studies reflected sound connection between theory and practice with students clearly demonstrating the use of various counseling techniques and being able to discuss the theoretical orientation from which the technique is derived.

Sites at which students served their field study provide a wide range of clientele and subsequent experiences related to the counseling experience. Of particular strengths that has been noted in the Case Studies for Fall of 2009 & Spring of 2010 include the sections on Cultural Responsiveness in which students are not only able to reflect on the relational construct of themselves with their client but, even more intuitively understanding the perception that the client has of them given similarities and differences. With this documented understanding of the inter relationship of “self and other” students have drawn from identity development models as well as referencing the dynamic of power and privilege as it relates to adulthood, racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism.

Marriage, Family & Child Counseling students served clients at the following sites: Alliance for Excellence, Lighthouse Counseling and Family Center in Lincoln, CSUS’s Center for Counseling and Diagnostic Services, Pathways Success After Homelessness; a program that is part of Turning Point Community Programs, the White House Counseling Center in Carmichael, Visions Unlimited, Inc, The Child and Adolescent Abuse, Resource, Evaluation (CAARE) Diagnostic and Treatment Center which is part of UC Davis Children’s Hospital, the Effort, Inc. in North Highlands, Prairie Elementary School in Woodland, Amador Tuolumne Community Action Agency, Personal Growth and Counseling Center at California State University, Monterey Bay, Yolo County Family Service Agency in Woodland, River Oak Center for Children, Women’s Empowerment Project which serves unemployed women through Sacramento County, Capitol Counseling Center, Stanford Home for Children.

Students from this specialization demonstrated application of theory drawn from: Carl Roger’s Person Centered Approach, Humanistic Theories, Adlerian Theory, Behavioral Therapy, Emotive Behavioral Therapy, Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy, Attachment Theory, Narrative Therapy, Solution Focused Therapy, Dialectical Behavioral Therapy, Gestalt Theory, Brief Solution-Focused Therapy, Rational Emotive Behavioral Therapy, Play Therapy and drew from a more specialization focused body of theories and assessments such as Structural Family Therapy Approach, Family System’s Theory, Social Learning Theory, Transpersonal Theory, Motivational Interviewing Techniques, Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavior Therapy Theory. All students in this specialization applied the use of the DSM in determining client pathology. These are capacities needed in order to work in agencies where billing and accountability are required.

Exit Survey: Overall, 82% of Counselor Education students received financial assistance. The Spring 2010 Survey resulted in 16 responses from MFCC students. In many cases, it was not possible to distinguish them from all students in the program. However, only MFCC students would be eligible for licensure and would thus be able to obtain employment in the following settings in which students indicated employment: Community Counseling Agencies, Outpatient Clinics, Other Inpatient Facilities, General Hospitals. Employment in the field is considered an indicator of Knowledge, Skill, and Professional Judgment in counseling.
III. Analysis of Student/Candidate Assessment Data

**Strengths:** Both the CPCE scores and the Basic Skills Evaluations used in EDC 280, EDC 475, and EDC 480 indicate that our students are performing well, and that their performance improves when feedback is given. On the CPCE, students scored above the national mean in

**Areas for improvement:** The one CPCE subtest in which CSUS students scored below the national mean was Research and Program Evaluation. Student comments indicate that more emphasis on Research needs to be included in all the courses, so that understanding and knowledge will be increased. The program plans on including more emphasis on research in various courses starting in Fall, 2010.

Faculty are aware and have thoroughly discussed the possibility that the assessments given in EDC 280 may be kinder and less stringent than those given in more advanced classes. This perspective is based on the fact that occasionally a student reaches EDC 475 and is seeing clients from the community when that student cannot demonstrate good basic skills with these clients. The department is strongly emphasizing to faculty the need for stringency in EDC 280.

IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Student/Candidate Performance and Program Effectiveness (1-2 pages)

The mid-term skills evaluations provided to students in several courses have had a significant effect in motivating them to improve their own performance and to help other students improve theirs. This is evidenced by the evaluations usually received at the end of each course being higher than the mid-term evaluations. The skill assessments are detailed, and provide the student specific information on exactly which skills need to be improved. The evaluations by Practicum Instructors evaluate actual client-counselor interactions in counseling sessions. The evaluations by field supervisors employed in various non-profit community agencies which are required in EDC 480 are particularly effective, for students are aware these are the equivalent of an on-the-job work evaluation. Low evaluations given at mid-term have sometimes been very helpful in helping students decide whether or not this is really the most appropriate career for them, and have been useful to faculty in terms of advising. Students who do not do well in any of the courses may take them over again. Very rarely, a sufficiently low assessment has resulted in a student dropping a course and retraining in a specific area before attempting the course work again. Even more rarely, the assessments result in a student being asked to leave the program. Faculty have a professional and ethical responsibility to ensure that no counseling client is harmed.

Assessment results of the CPCE have been systematically used to improve program effectiveness, and the test scores indicate this has been very effective in improving student performance. The CPCE was first administered in Fall of 2007, and has been administered every semester since then. Since 2007, average scores have steadily risen, from the overall mean score in Spring 2007 of 87.22 to the Spring 2010 mean score of 98.05. Sub-test scores have been carefully analyzed, and courses enriched when necessary. Positive results were obvious in all areas tested, but largest and most pronounced in the areas of Human Growth and Development and in Helping Relationships.
The use of the CPCE as an exit evaluation has proved very useful both in assessing student performance, and in enabling us to determine which components of the program need strengthening. Each semester, the results are carefully examined and analyzed at a full meeting of the department faculty. The Spring, 2010 results indicated that in the overall scores our students scored ten points, almost a Standard Deviation, above the national mean. They also scored above the national mean in Human Growth & Development, Social & Cultural Foundations, Helping Relationships, Group Work, Career & Lifestyle Development, Appraisal, and Professional Orientation & Ethics.

A major outcome of the CPCE analysis plus the new LPCC license requirements has been that starting in Spring, 2011, all students will be required to take a course in Marriage and Family Counseling and Therapy. This is an area where School and Career students had previously indicated that they felt a lack of knowledge, because they did not take the course.
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SECTION A – PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

I. CONTEXT

Table One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2009 N=</th>
<th>Spring 2010 N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students or candidates enrolled</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students graduating or candidates completing the program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide a brief description of the program characteristics (e.g., program length, cohorted/non-cohorted, field components, on-line/hybrid components, innovations, themes, etc.) that may affect the experience of students or candidates in the program.

The mission of the Department of Counselor Education at California State University, Sacramento is to prepare highly qualified counseling professionals. The Department is committed to creating and facilitating the ongoing design and implementation of an exemplary teaching/learning community. The counseling program prepares individuals to function as professional counselors in a variety of settings including schools, colleges, business and industry, community agencies, and mental health settings. Currently, the Department offers three areas of specialization: School Counseling, Marriage and Family Counseling, and Career Counseling.

This non-cohorted 60-unit graduate program allows the flexibility of part or full time course of study in which evening and day time classes are available. The duration of completion ranges from six semesters for full time study to a part time option of seven years completion as allowed by University policy. One of the major hallmarks of the program is the hands on experience provided. As early as the third semester of our program, students receive hands on training in designated service sites. These sites range from public school based, a University based Counseling Center to serving clients in mental health facilities.

A 600 hour field study experience provides real world counseling experience prior to completion of the program. Strengthened by the framework of national standards into the curriculum and training of our students, our program has most recently incorporated the use of the Comprehensive Professional Counselor Examination as an exit exam for our graduates.

The Department’s School Counseling Specialization has been accredited by CCTC since 1956. The Department continues to maintain partnerships with the San Juan Unified School District, the Elk Grove Unified School District and Sacramento City Unified District. The schools and communities involved in these partnerships serve as designated field study sites, designated centers, where a university-community scholarship strategy is implemented. This strategy seeks to combine education, community service and research. Most students completing the requirements for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential perform all of their field hours at one or more of these designated centers. Additionally, the CSUS program maintains its ongoing commitment to assisting local and regional school districts via recommendation of the Pupil Personnel Services Internship Credential. Persons who obtain the Internship Credential through
the program at CSUS are permitted to work under the credential for a maximum of two years. The school counseling specialization has made the following changes since the commission’s approval:

a) Adopting the Board of Behavioral Sciences (BBS) Licensed Professional Counselor curriculum (LPCC) that will allow students completing a Master’s in Counseling to be eligible for the LPCC, Spring 2011.
b) Counselor Education Cohort Group, Fall 2010.
c) Fall 2008, clinical practice course in which students receive focused micro-skills training for work with children and youth prior to their field practicum course, EDC 242.
d) Fall 2008, we have added an additional unit to our 2-unit Counseling Theories course, EDC 216.
e) Fall 2006, triadic supervision in field practica and field study courses, EDC 475; EDC 480.
f) Fall 2006, all practicum field hours are now completed in the field practicum course, EDC 475.
g) Fall 2006, a required law and ethics course w/ a focus on relevant school laws (e.g. FERPA, IDEA), EDC 252.

II. Student/Candidate Performance Assessment and Program Effectiveness Information

a. Primary Program Learning Outcomes

Our department utilizes two key assessments to make critical decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for program completion, including: Basic Skills Evaluation and the Comprehensive Professional Counselor Examination (CPCE) which addresses the field related categories of Human Growth and Development (C1), Social & Cultural Foundations (C2), Helping Relationships (C3) Group Work (C4), Career & Lifestyle Development (C5), Appraisal (C6), Research & Program Evaluation (C7) and Professional Orientation and Ethics (C8).

As faculty, we selected assessment instruments that would provide a wide measure of candidates’ performance in a number of counseling domains. Our ultimate goal is to ensure that our candidates develop the necessary counseling skill sets as well as create a productive learning environment for our candidates. Both of the assessment instruments have items that adequately measure candidates’ performance as related to 1) Skill Assessment and 2) Field Related Knowledge Base.

Our data from the CPCE results reveal that our candidates’ performance remains above the national average. The basic counseling skills checklists allows faculty to evaluate candidates twice during the semester which informs us on how well candidates’ develop and practice the fundamental counseling skills. This provides an opportunity for candidates to receive constructive feedback throughout the semester and program, thus, giving them opportunities to practice and improve in their deficit areas. In addition, we review the student case studies as a way to evaluate our candidates’ performance. The field site supervisor feedback which takes place half way through the semester and at semester’s end provides direct feedback related to the candidates performance in the field and their capacity to demonstrate satisfactory application of knowledge related to the counseling domains in real world settings.
The CPCE provides us the opportunity to determine how effective our curriculum and instruction meets the standards in the field of counseling. Given that the CPCE is an instrument used nationally in the counseling field, we use our candidates’ results as a way to both measure and inform our curriculum changes. We discuss the test results as a faculty and assist the Curriculum Review Committee develop a plan of action to address any program deficit areas. The following table provides key information about the assessments:

b. Primary Student/Candidate Assessments

Table Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
<th>Type of Assessment</th>
<th>Variable Measured</th>
<th>Data Capture Points</th>
<th>Evaluators</th>
<th>Process of Data Capture</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills Evaluation</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Basic Counseling Skills Students rated on a 1 (low) to 5 (high) point scale</td>
<td>EDC 280: Midterm &amp; Final EDC 475: Midterm &amp; Final</td>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>Hard Copies &amp; University URL</td>
<td>CTC CACREP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPCE</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Comprehensive: Theory/Knowledge, Skill &amp; Professional Judgment</td>
<td>EDC 290</td>
<td>Faculty Committees</td>
<td>Hard Copies</td>
<td>CTC, CACREP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table One provides a summation of enrollment and graduation trends for students in the school specialization. While we tend to, as a department, have a large graduating class in the Spring, our overall numbers will be reduced due to the fact that we were not allowed to bring in new students in Spring of 2010. Enrollment trends for our incoming cohort do show a leveling out of the number of students working toward the Pupil Personnel Credential.

Data related to Table Two for Fall of 2009 and Spring of 2010 in the data capture points of EDC 280 (Midterm & Final), EDC 475 (Midterm & Final) and EDC 290 (CPCE) specifically for School Specialization Students can be found in Table Three:

Table Three:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Tools</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDC 280</td>
<td>EDC 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1. Basic Skills Evaluation*</td>
<td>Midterm: 3.57 Final: 3.60</td>
<td>Midterm: 2.64 Final: 3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midterm: 3.55 Final: 4.53</td>
<td>Midterm: 3.28 Final: 4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2. National CPCE**</td>
<td>99.77</td>
<td>97.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Average national percentile ranking for our students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employer Survey:
No data was collected during this time period.

Student Exit Survey:
All students exiting the program were asked to rate their overall training. This overall programmatic appraisal is conducted at the end of each semester concluding students’ culminating experience. Data is reported using a Likert scale (1-8), 1=“very inadequate” and 7=“excellent,” 8=“not applicable.” Overall, students reported their training to be more than adequate in most areas such as individual counseling and cultural diversity training and knowledge.

No data was gathered for the Fall 2009 graduating class which consisted of 32 students. For Spring of 2010, however, 40 of the 62 graduates participated in the on-line survey which consists of 16 questions which address topics such as job status as well as program quality. Of these 40 students, 9 were from the Career Specialization, 15 were from School Specialization and 16 were from Marriage, Family & Child Counseling Specialization. This accounts for 63.16% of the Spring of 2010 graduates participating.

The following is a synopsis of responses & ratings to key questions from the Student Exit Survey:

**Question 3: Job Status**
15.79% (6) of reporting students are employed full time, 52.63% (20) employed part time and 15.79% (6) reported being unemployed.

**Question 4: Job Title/Description**
There was a wide range of positions that our students hold at this time; from Counseling Intern, Behavior Specialist, High School Counselor, Human Service Specialist, Clinician, Program Manager, Program Director and Sex Educator. This is an indication that a number of our graduates are already working in the counseling field.

**Question 5: Current/Primary Employment**
Of the 34 students who responded to this question the general areas in which people are employed were broken down into the following categories:
Community Counseling Agency: 15.79% (6)
Elementary or Secondary School: 21.05% (8)
College/University Counseling Center: 2.63% (1)
College/University Faculty: 2.63% (1)
Community/Junior College: 2.63% (1)
General Hospital: 2.63% (1)
Inpatient Facility: 2.63% (1)
Outpatient Clinic: 5.26% (2)
Other: 34.21% (13)

**Question 6: Employment, Related to Degree: if you have obtained employment in a job related to your degree, please indicate how you heard about this position.**
10.53% (4) of students indicated that they had obtained employment from a Personal Contact, 10.53% (4) indicated that employment was secured through their practicum and 2.63% (1) was through an announcement forwarded by the department. An additional 6 students reported having secured employment related to degree through Edjoin, field study, on line or through self initiated contact.
Question 7: Present Employment, Not Degree-Related:

23 students responded with many indicating that they were waiting to complete their program before applying for positions or were already searching for full time employment in the field.

Question 8: Estimated number of hours per week spent in the following activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Select if Applicable</th>
<th>Select if Not Applicable</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Skip Count</th>
<th>Comment Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Counseling</td>
<td>92.11% (35)</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>94.74% (36)</td>
<td>5.26% (2)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Counseling</td>
<td>50% (19)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>81.58% (31)</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples/family counseling</td>
<td>28.95% (11)</td>
<td>44.74% (17)</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>71.05% (27)</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>84.21% (32)</td>
<td>15.79% (6)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis/Assessment</td>
<td>44.74% (17)</td>
<td>31.58% (12)</td>
<td>76.32% (29)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/scholarly writing</td>
<td>50% (19)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>76.32% (29)</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>52.63% (20)</td>
<td>71.05% (27)</td>
<td>28.95% (11)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>34.21% (13)</td>
<td>39.47% (15)</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td>60.53% (23)</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>78.95% (30)</td>
<td>21.05% (8)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based Meetings</td>
<td>42.11% (16)</td>
<td>31.58% (12)</td>
<td>73.68% (28)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify; include # of hours)</td>
<td>28.95% (11)</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>55.26% (21)</td>
<td>44.74% (17)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses indicate strong use of skill base in the contexts of Individual Counseling, Supervision, Consultation and Report Writing. Other areas in which skill base is in use includes Group Counseling and Research/Scholarly Writing, Diagnosis/Assessment and School-based Meetings.

**Question 9: Memberships**

Of the 38 students who participated in the survey, there were 18 who indicated they were members in a professional organization. These consist of: 5 in American Counseling Association, 2 in American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy, 4 in American School Counselor Association, 6 in California Career Development Association, 6 in California Association for Marriage and Family Therapy.

**Question 11: Achievements, Leadership, Honors, and Service**

10 students indicated that they are members of our student honor society, Chi Sigma Iota, and other students have received scholarships or hold office related to professional organizations mentioned under Question #9.

**Question 12: Scholarly Work**

There were only a handful of students who indicated involvement in conference presentations or publishing. One student had presented at a national conference, 2 at other conferences, 1 had contributed to a refereed publication, 1 to a non-refereed publication and 1 to another publication.

**Question 13: Financial Support**

31 students reported receiving some range of financial aid from loans to grants. 50% (19) of the students who responded to the extent to which they felt financially supported by the department indicated that they felt “Completely Unsupported.” 21% (8) indicated that they felt “Somewhat Unsupported.” Another 21% (8) expressed that they felt “Somewhat Supported” while only 2 students (5.13%) felt “Strongly or Very Strongly Supported” in relation to how financially supported they felt by the department.

In light of rising costs of tuition, minimal scholarship availability for graduate students and increased costs for books, parking, juxtaposed with a shrinking job market there is a larger context impacting student capability to keep up with the cost of earning a graduate degree.

**Question 14: Training**

Students were asked to provide a rating on a scale of 1 to 7 with 7 being “Excellent Training” and 1 being “Very Inadequate Training” in relation to 18 areas of training. The Student Exit Survey table is provided below and followed by discussion about student ratings. Highlighted are the ranged scores that reflect the concentration of student ratings:
| R089 | 1. Individual counseling | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 2.63% (1) | 5.26% (2) | 23.68% (9) | 31.58% (12) | 36.84% (14) | 0% (0) | 100% (38) |
| R090 | 2. Group counseling | 0% (0) | 2.63% (1) | 0% (0) | 7.89% (3) | 23.68% (9) | 47.37% (18) | 18.42% (7) | 0% (0) | 100% (38) |
| R091 | 3. Marriage counseling | 5.26% (2) | 7.89% (3) | 10.53% (4) | 23.68% (9) | 15.79% (6) | 10.53% (4) | 5.26% (2) | 21.05% (8) | 100% (38) |
| R092 | 4. Family Therapy | 5.26% (2) | 7.89% (3) | 2.63% (1) | 10.53% (4) | 28.95% (11) | 18.42% (7) | 7.89% (3) | 18.42% (7) | 100% (38) |
| R093 | 5. Career counseling | 2.63% (1) | 5.26% (2) | 10.53% (4) | 13.16% (5) | 23.68% (9) | 13.16% (5) | 2.63% (1) | 18.42% (7) | 100% (38) |
| R094 | 6. Psychopathology | 10.53% (4) | 7.89% (3) | 10.53% (4) | 13.16% (5) | 23.68% (9) | 13.16% (5) | 2.63% (1) | 18.42% (7) | 100% (38) |
| R095 | 7. Statistics and research design | 15.79% (6) | 13.16% (5) | 15.79% (6) | 21.05% (8) | 18.42% (7) | 7.89% (3) | 2.63% (1) | 2.63% (1) | 97.37% (37) |
| R096 | 8. Counseling diverse populations | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 2.63% (1) | 5.26% (2) | 7.89% (3) | 34.21% (13) | 50% (19) | 0% (0) | 100% (38) |
| R097 | 9. Ethical/legal issues | 0% (0) | 5.26% (2) | 0% (0) | 15.79% (6) | 15.79% (6) | 39.47% (15) | 23.68% (9) | 0% (0) | 100% (38) |
| R098 | 10. Assessment | 0% (0) | 18.42% (7) | 2.63% (1) | 7.89% (3) | 34.21% (13) | 26.32% (10) | 18.42% (7) | 0% (0) | 100% (38) |
| R099 | 11. Broad theoretical knowledge | 0% (0) | 7.89% (3) | 5.26% (2) | 13.16% (5) | 28.95% (11) | 26.32% (10) | 18.42% (7) | 0% (0) | 100% (38) |
| R100 | 12. Integration of theory, research & practice | 2.63% (1) | 13.16% (5) | 5.26% (2) | 18.42% (7) | 26.32% (10) | 23.68% (9) | 10.53% (4) | 0% (0) | 100% (38) |
| R101 | 13. Professional identity | 2.63% (1) | 5.26% (2) | 7.89% (3) | 7.89% (3) | 26.32% (10) | 34.21% (13) | 15.79% (6) | 0% (0) | 100% (38) |
| R102 | 14. Professional research and writing | 7.89% (3) | 7.89% (3) | 13.16% (5) | 23.68% (9) | 23.68% (9) | 21.05% (8) | 0% (0) | 0% (0) | 97.37% (37) |
| R103 | 15. Program evaluation | 7.89% (3) | 7.89% (3) | 13.16% (5) | 18.42% (7) | 13.16% (5) | 26.32% (10) | 5.26% (2) | 5.26% (2) | 97.37% (37) |
| R104 | 16. Consultation skills | 10.53% (4) | 0% (0) | 13.16% (5) | 13.16% (5) | 21.05% (8) | 31.58% (12) | 10.53% (4) | 0% (0) | 100% (38) |
| R105 | 17. Human development | 2.63% (1) | 5.26% (2) | 13.16% (5) | 10.53% (4) | 28.95% (11) | 15.79% (6) | 21.05% (8) | 0% (0) | 97.37% (37) |
| R106 | 18. Knowledge of current health care market | 18.42% (7) | 21.05% (8) | 13.16% (5) | 21.05% (8) | 21.05% (8) | 7.89% (3) | 10.53% (4) | 0% (0) | 7.89% (3) | 100% (38) |

There are clear strengths in the ratings. For example, Counseling diverse populations was rated by 37 out of 38 students in the mid-point (4) to “Excellent Training” (7) provided range. 19 (50%) of the students rated this category as “Excellent.” Other areas receiving strong ratings include Individual counseling which was rated from mid-point (4) to Excellent (7) by 37 out of 38 students with 14 (36.84%) rating as Excellent. Training in Career Counseling also enjoyed strong ratings with 28 students rating at mid point to excellent and 9 rating as excellent. These areas of training were followed by other clusters of perceived strengths such as Group Counseling, Ethical/legal issues, Assessment, Broad theoretical knowledge, Integration of theory, research & practice, Professional Identity, Consultation Skills and Human Development.
Areas receiving ratings more in the mid-range include Marriage counseling, Family Therapy, and Psychopathology. Areas of training that students rated toward the lower range of the scale included Statistics and Research Design with 25 out of 37 students rating their training from mid-point (4) to “Very Inadequate” (1). Also in the lower range was Knowledge of current health care market which was rated by 28 out of 38 students in the mid to lowest range.

Other Areas

Also addressed under the category of “Training”, students were asked to respond to other categories not directly related to skill development of counselors but nonetheless are areas related to the field. In the category of “Participation in service to the profession”, 26 out of 38 students rated their training in our department at mid-point to excellent. In the category of Community Outreach and Education, 24 out of 38 rated their training at mid-point to excellent. In the category of Supervision, our department’s training was rated by 33 out of 36 students in the mid-point to excellent range. The lowest rating related to the category of Learning to teach which was rated by 24 out of 38 students from mid-point to the lowest rating of “Inadequate.”

What is important to note from the 38 student respondents was that 33 of the 38 students rated their “Overall evaluation of the training received at Sacramento State” from mid-point to excellent with the greatest concentration of students rating their training (14 out of 38) at a 2, followed by 11 students rating their experience at a 3, and 5 students rating their experience at a 7. Given the tremendous economic crisis under which our department has attempted to provide optimal program delivery, these final ratings account for an overall positive experience despite the many challenges.

Students were also asked select the three training areas that were of most value to them. The categories receiving the highest responses follow:

- Individual counseling: 34 Responses @ 89.47%
- Counseling Diverse Populations: 19 Responses @ 50%
- Group Counseling: 14 Responses @ 36.84%
- Family Therapy: 13 Responses @ 34.21%
- Career Counseling: 9 Responses @ 23.68%
- Ethical/legal issues: 9 Responses @ 23.68%

Also asked of the students were the three training areas in which they wish they had received more training. The categories receiving the highest responses follow:

- Marriage counseling: 13 Responses @ 34.21%
- Consultation Skills: 13 Responses @ 34.21%
- Integration of theory, research & practice: 12 Responses @ 31.58%
- Family Therapy: 11 Responses @ 28.95%
- Assessment: 9 Responses @ 23.68%
- Psychopathology: 9 Responses @ 23.68%
- Knowledge of Current Health Care Market: 9 Responses @ 23.68%

Question 15: Student-Faculty Relations

What follows is the table that reflects the rating scores of students in this particular category & followed by discussion about the ratings:
While there were apparent areas of strength in this set of ratings, there was one particular area that stood out as needing improvement due to the mixed ratings by students across the range. This area was in Advising. While about half of the respondents rated their experience with Advising at mid-point or above, it should also be noted that they other half rated their experience at mid-point or below.

Other areas that were more in the mid-range of ratings pertained to “Assistance in practicum/job placement”, “Availability to Students”, and “Invested in my academic/personal success.” While furloughs have had an impact on availability and there are less tenured faculty available for advising, the mixed experience of so many respondents indicates a need to provide consistent information through multiple avenues and availability & accessibility so that all students receive advising. The perception by some students as faculty not being invested in their academic/personal success also needs to be addressed.

The areas of strength appeared to be in “Respect for Diversity”, “Modeling the value of diversity as an important professional goal,” “Encouraging the integration of multicultural perspectives and skills into professional roles,” and “Respect for personal/professional boundaries.”

**Question 16: Suggestions: What were the best things about your classes/degree program?**

There were 33 respondents and themes that emerged included the quality of experiential classes that provided the opportunity to apply what they are learning in classes, i.e. practicum and field study. Also noted was the personal development that is fostered in courses where
student self awareness is emphasized. There was also a theme that there were few, but not all, professors go over and beyond to serve as mentors and advisors.

In response to the changes that respondents suggested, there were a few main themes that emerged from the 34 students and then very specific recommendations related to curriculum within the three specializations. With the program changes that were made to meet accreditation requirements, there was disruption to the course of study that students were given when they first entered. The departments’ capacity to communicate the changes and implement them while students were in the pipeline created angst. The recommendations from students to develop a cohort system, uniform curriculum and unit caps are all being implemented in the Fall of 2010. Other suggestions related to smaller class sizes as the hiring of more faculty so that there can be more advising and greater communication between professors and students. These are areas that the faculty would also like to see improved and are dependent on funding.

While this report is only a synopsis of the Student Survey with brief reflections, the entire report which is being reviewed by the Department faculty on May 12th can be viewed by clicking on the URL:
https://skylight.wsu.edu/Reporting/Public/MultiPoolQuickReport.aspx?SurveyID=72b648cd-4f07-440e-b0d8-a6d80a375f90

Department faculty and staff were also provided with the URL on May 5th and encouraged to review the data and comments for themselves prior to the May 12th meeting

Case Study:

Students/candidates typically produce an 8-10 page paper for this assignment which they submit at the end of the final semester in their field study seminar. The quality of the paper is reviewed by their field study seminar instructor, the Culminating Experience Instructor and the Chair of the Department. Quality of the case study is based on the following criteria: (a) clarity of writing and responsiveness to the prompts; (b) integration of theory to practice; (c) demonstration of willingness to consider alternative perspectives as well as those that differ significantly from their own. An oral presentation of this paper is presented by the student as part of this summative assessment. Candidates are allowed to re-write and re-submit this paper should criteria not meet approval of two of the three evaluators. In Fall 2009, 100% of school counseling candidates received the passing grade or above. In Spring, 2010, 100% of school counseling candidates achieved the target grade. Candidates demonstrated overall improvement in the following areas: integration of theory to practice and their willingness to consider diverse perspectives.

Students within the school counseling specialization reported serving child and adolescent clients at various elementary, middle and high school settings such as: Howe Elementary, Oak Ridge Elementary, Jackman Middle School, El Camino High School, and Valley High School. They further reported that the theories most applied were drawn from: Person Centered Theory (i.e., Gestalt, Existential), Adlerian Theory, Brief Solution Focused, Cognitive Behavioral, Rational-Emotive and Behavior Theory. Additional theories, assessments and techniques were drawn from play and art therapies & Choice Theory.
III. Analysis of Student/Candidate Assessment Data (1-3 pages)

In this section, we discuss the data displayed in Table Three and the additional data that was summarized in Section II.b. We focus our discussion on the strengths and areas for improvement revealed by the analysis of these data.

**Strengths**

a. **Candidate performance**: As faculty, we selected assessment instruments that would provide a wide measure of candidates’ performance in a number of counseling domains. Our ultimate goal is to ensure that school counseling candidates develop the necessary counseling skill sets as well as create a productive learning environment for our candidates. Both of the assessment instruments have items that adequately measure candidates’ performance. Our data from the CPCE results reveal that school counseling candidates’ performance has exceeded the national average consistently for the past two years.

The basic counseling skills checklists allows faculty to evaluate candidates twice during the semester which informs us on how well candidates’ develop and practice the fundamental counseling skills. It is based on a Likert scale, 1=”very low” and 5=”high.” This provides an opportunity for candidates to receive constructive feedback throughout the semester and program, thus, giving them opportunities to practice and improve in their deficit areas. The midterm results in EDC 280, a communication practice course, where the students work in triads with one another and practice a variety of counseling skills. The results indicate that students performed at supervisors’ expectations. EDC 475 is a practice course in which students counsel child and adolescent clients in a variety of school settings (i.e., elementary, middle and high schools). The overall results from the supervisor feedback evaluations suggest that candidates are performing at or above supervisors’ expectations in most of the counseling domains.

It is important to note that EDC 280 midterm and final evaluations for the fall do not indicate that candidates’ skills improved; however, there was demonstrated improvement in candidates’ overall skills in EDC 475. A possible explanation is that candidates are required to take EDC 280 their first semester in the program, their knowledge of counseling theories and their counseling abilities have not be developed.

b. **Program effectiveness**: We continue to use the CPCE to determine how effective our curriculum and instruction meets the standards in the field of counseling. Given that the CPCE is an instrument used nationally in the counseling field, we use our candidates’ results as a way to both measure and inform our curriculum changes. We discuss the test results as a faculty and assist the Curriculum Review Committee develop a plan of action to address any program deficit areas. The Basic Skills evaluation continues to serve as an accurate measure of candidates’ skills because they are required to practice counseling skills in both EDC 280 and EDC 475. Both courses require direct supervision from a qualified supervisor so candidates are followed from the beginning of the semester to the semester’s end with the same supervisor who provides ongoing verbal feedback as well as midterm and final summative evaluations.
Areas for improvement:
The midterm and final skills evaluation continue to be a useful measure in providing feedback to candidates and faculty regarding candidates’ strengths and weaknesses as well as programmatic strengths and areas of improvement. Some of the challenges faculty face in using the instrument is differing ideas about what constitutes a “1” or a “5.” We have yet to clearly define what constitutes a “1,” etc. thus, it is difficult to obtain consistent feedback for the purposes of programmatic improvement as well as consistency on how faculty utilizes the instrument to instruct/improve student performance.

As a department we continue to struggle with ways to improve our collection of data regarding candidate performance and the effectiveness of our program. We are a three specialization area department, the current data collection process integrates information for all three specialty areas. Our challenge continues to be finding ways to obtain both aggregated and disaggregated data for the school specialization on an ongoing basis. Additionally, given the state’s ongoing budget problems we continued to face challenges in obtaining sufficient resources (i.e., technology, faculty, staff) to conduct ongoing assessment within our department. We continue to work with the University and the College of Education to find creative ways to assist/support the data collection efforts within our department.

IV: Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

We have made a number of key changes to our Program as a result of ongoing program evaluation, whereby we continue to incorporate feedback from students, faculty, field supervisors and community partners. Importantly, the Department uses the results of the assessment instruments to directly inform our curriculum review process. The faculty uses the information from theses sources to inform program changes and how we will address problem areas that seem to repeatedly surface. Our Curriculum Review and Program Development Committee has revised and developed a new curriculum that is consistent with the requirements of the LPCC. The qualitative feedback we received last semester indicated a need for school counseling candidates to have proficiency in psychopathology and substance addiction. Beginning in Spring 2011, these two course will be required for school counseling candidates as a part of their core program.

Assessment results of the CPCE have been systematically used to improve program effectiveness, and the test scores indicate this has been very effective in improving student performance. The CPCE was first administered in Fall, 2007, and has been administered every semester thereafter. Average scores have steadily risen from the overall mean score in Spring 2007 of 87.22 to the Spring 2010 mean score of 98.05. Sub-test scores have been carefully analyzed, and courses enriched when necessary. Spring, 2010 results indicated that in the overall scores our students scored ten points, almost one standard deviation above the national mean. The use of the CPCE as an exit evaluation has proved very useful both in assessing candidate performance and in enabling faculty to determine which components of the program need strengthening.

As a result of our ongoing data gathering and review we are adopting a Counselor Education Cohort Group format in Fall, 2010. It is our belief that this format will improve candidates’ performance through providing candidates with a small group experience that allows them to take certain classes together, socialize, and participate in other extra-curricular programming designed specifically for emergent counselors. Additionally, we believe it will enhance our program in the face of limited resources and budgetary challenges.