

Program Performance Review: Culmination Meeting Memo Counseling, M.S.

The 2013-2014 Program Performance Review (PPR) process for the Counseling, M.S. Program concluded with a culmination meeting on September 11, 2015.

During the meeting, the program was commended for the following excellent practices:

1. The program is already excellent, and could be a leader in California if they started a Counselor Educational and Supervision Doctorate.
 - a. The faculty expressed that while the department would like to start a doctoral program, there are a lot of challenges. Some of the barriers include push-backs from the UC system, and the lack of counseling doctoral programs on the west coast for collaboration. However, the program will continue to update the Provost/Deputy Provost to continue this conversation.
 - b. The college supported the program's position by stating that without a doctoral program, faculty recruitment is difficult.
 - c. The AVPAP suggested that this discussion should also take place in the Academic Master Plan committee, as well as the Graduate Education committee.
 - d. The program will provide supporting documents justifying a doctoral program to the Graduate Education committee.
2. Faculty is collegial and is known for their mentorship and personal interaction with the students, great communication with the adjunct faculty, and strong collaborative relationships with site supervisors.
3. The excellent support staff handles a lot of work for the size of the graduate program.
4. Site supervisors commented that they are always impressed with CSUF students and believe they are better trained than most.
5. The curriculum and training are comprehensive and reflect professional needs. Students are well trained and appear to be taught each of the clinical mental health standard areas.

The major recommendations and concerns raised through the PPR process were discussed. Suggestions on how to address them are provided:

1. Recognition that the training of graduate-level trainees in counseling is more intensive than teaching in most undergraduate programs.
 - a. The program has an average of 13.1 SFR, and class sizes vary. While the 10:1 SFR recommended by CACREP is desirable, the resources do not allow it. The program has bigger undergraduate classes to balance out the small class size at the graduate level.
 - b. The program indicated that this is not uncommon across the nation.
2. Graduate assistantships:
 - a. The college now gives 3 GAs, each working 15-20hrs/wk, to the program. The GAs assist faculty with research. The cost is partially supported by the revenue coming from

Program Performance Review: Culmination Meeting Memo Counseling, M.S.

the Garden Grove site. The program will likely reduce the number from 3 to 2 after one of the current GAs graduates.

3. Limited budget and more resource needs:
 - a. The college recognizes that the program has 151 FTES this semester, and the corresponding resources are quite limited. The college appreciates the program's willingness to work with the resources available.
 - b. The program pointed out 2 areas that it has less resources than other programs in the country – Graduate Assistants, and supporting staff (currently 1 for the entire department).
4. Clearer documentation of practicum hours:
 - a. The program has already updated the form for students in their first practicum to accurately reflect their hours. This issue is addressed.
5. More meaningful assessment rubric system and result reporting:
 - a. The program recognized that the assessment system was set up too quickly, and was not sensitive enough to capture student performance in all aspects.
 - b. The program has already allocated resources to support the assessment committee to update the system, as well as the corresponding reporting structure. It is working carefully to integrate the program SLOs, CACREP standards, and the criteria of the licensing body. It is also working closely with the HHD assessment liaison to train faculty and align with the university expectations.
 - c. The AVPAP mentioned that the Graduate Education committee is working on developing university-wide learning goals for graduate programs.
 - d. The program suggested that the learning goals for graduate programs could be fewer given the shorter amount of time graduate students spend in the program. This position was supported by the AVPAP.

The Dean and the AVPAP commended the chair for her outstanding leadership, and stated that the college will do its best to support the program.