1994

An evaluation of two master level psychology programs at San Jose State University

Hilary Wogan
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Wogan, Hilary, "An evaluation of two master level psychology programs at San Jose State University" (1994). *Master's Theses*. 882.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.t283-fvnj>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/882

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 1359085

**An evaluation of two master level psychology programs at San
Jose University**

Wogan, Hilary, M.S.

San Jose State University, 1994

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

AN EVALUATION OF TWO MASTER LEVEL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAMS
AT SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Psychology
San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
Hilary Wogan
August, 1994

©1994

Hilary Wogan

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Frank Payne", written over a horizontal line.

Frank Payne Ph.D.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Kelly", written over a horizontal line.

John Kelly Ph.D.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lynda Heiden", written over a horizontal line.

Lynda Heiden Ph.D.

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Lou Lewandowski", written over a horizontal line.

ABSTRACT

AN EVALUATION OF THE M.S. CLINICAL/COUNSELING PROGRAM AND THE M.S. MARRIAGE, FAMILY, AND CHILD COUNSELING PROGRAM AT SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY

by Hilary Wogan

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which graduates of the M.S. Clinical/Counseling and M.S. Marriage, Family, and Child Counseling programs were satisfied with their graduate training. The data collected was intended to provide information that could be incorporated into program planning and modification. Subjects consisted of 52 respondents who completed their program of study between 1985 and 1991.

The results of the survey found that a high percentage of respondents pursued and obtained employment in the mental health field. In general, respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the overall training received and felt it to be relevant and applicable to their placements in the mental health field. The specific areas that respondents were most satisfied with fell into the general categories of ethics, individual and family psychotherapy, and cross-cultural counseling. Respondents indicated that they were dissatisfied with career and curriculum advising, assistance received in obtaining internships and employment, and some areas of specific coursework in their program of study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I dedicate this thesis to Dr. Terri Thames, whom I consider to be an inspiration and a guiding force in my life. It is with the deepest gratitude I acknowledge her influence in my life.

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Frank Payne for his persistent and diligent efforts in helping me complete my thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. John Kelly and Dr. Lynda Heiden for their support and guidance in all facets of fulfilling my thesis requirements.

I would also like to give special thanks to those individuals without who's encouragement and/or help I would not have completed my thesis. Thank you Terry Vickers, Lisa Wogan, Whitney Wogan, Christie Withers, Tracy Graham, Susan Berry, Rosemary Lutus, Dan Tindle, Gail Black and Carson Crites.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
INTRODUCTION	3
SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
RESEARCH METHOD AND DESIGN	20
Sample	20
Measures	20
Procedures	25
Design	25
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	27
Evaluation of Demographics	27
Program Assessment	32
Question 1 and 7	33
Question 2	36
Question 3	41
Question 4	45
Question 5	50
Question 6	64
Question 8	66
Question 9	69
Question 10	69
CONCLUSION	71
Recommendations	73
Strengths and Limitations	77

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
REFERENCES	80
APPENDIX	82
Appendix A. Letter to Graduates	82
Appendix B. Survey	83
Appendix C. Expanded Table	102

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Program Goals and Objectives	13
2. Questions Addressed by Program Evaluation	15
3. Description of 9 Summary Scales	23
4. Demographic Information	28
5. Means and Standard Deviations for Number of Years Respondents Took to Complete their Program of Study	31
6. Description of Placements in the Community and Number of Respondents in the Placements	35
7. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Academic Coursework	37
8. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Individual Psychotherapy by Program of Study	39
9. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Family Psychotherapy by Program of Study	40
10. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Clinical Experience as Related to Employment Needs	42

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
11. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Relevance of Degree to Field by GPA	44
12. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Satisfaction as it Relates to Employment Needs	46
13. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Satisfaction as it Relates to Internship Needs by Sex	48
14. Means and Standard Deviations of Students' Ratings of Satisfaction as it Relates to Employment Needs by Sex	49
15. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Environment for Learning	52
16. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Scholarly Excellence	53
17. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Quality of Teaching	55
18. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Faculty Concern for Students	57
19. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Curriculum	59

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
20. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings for Depth of Subject Matter by GPA	60
21. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Available Resources	62
22. Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings for the Number of Support Staff by Sex	63
23. Means and Standard Deviations of Students' Ratings of Overall Satisfaction with Program	65
24. Means and Standard Deviations of Respondents Who Went on for Licensing	68
25. Expanded Version of Table 6	Appendix C

AN EVALUATION OF THE M.S. CLINICAL/COUNSELING PROGRAM
AND THE M.S. MARRIAGE, FAMILY, AND CHILD COUNSELING PROGRAM
AT SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY

Hilary Wogan
San Jose State University

Running head: PROGRAM EVALUATION

Footnotes

Requests for reprints should be sent to Hilary Wogan,
Department of Psychology, San Jose State University, San Jose,
California 95912.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which graduates of the M.S. Clinical/Counseling and M.S. Marriage, Family and Child Counseling programs were satisfied with their graduate training. The data collected was intended to provide information that could be incorporated into program planning and modification. Subjects consisted of 52 respondents who completed their program of study between 1985 and 1991. The results of the survey found that a high percentage of respondents pursued and obtained employment in the mental health field. In general respondents indicated they were satisfied with the overall training received and felt it was relevant and applicable to their placements in the mental health field. The specific areas that respondents were most satisfied with fell into the general categories of ethics, individual and family psychotherapy and cross-cultural counseling. Respondents indicated they were dissatisfied with the career and curriculum advising, the assistance received in obtaining internships and employment, and some areas of specific coursework in their program of study.

An Evaluation of the M.S. Clinical/Counseling Program and the
M.S. Marriage, Family, and Child Counseling Program
at San Jose State University

In pursuing a career helping people in distress, the mental health professional is exposed to an abundance of personal pain, challenges, and pressures that motivate people to seek professional help. It is in assisting others to deal with these experiences that many in the field find their greatest joy.

One key to meeting the challenges of this profession is education. It is in the classroom, with advisors, and through study and internship opportunities that professionals are prepared for the mental health field. Mental health opportunities in social work, clinical psychology, and psychiatry, or in additional areas including law, teaching, ministry, and a multitude of volunteer occupations require varying degrees of training and certification.

In general, training should prepare the professional for the realities of the workplace. A thorough education should provide a solid grounding in the current knowledge of the desired field and translate into job placement. These are the tools with which the graduate, the volunteer, the professional, and the paraprofessional can build a career.

This paper considers the training received at the master's level and evaluates two master's degree programs in psychology at San Jose State University (SJSU). The California State University System, directed by the Post-Secondary Education Commission, has

been developing and implementing psychology programs that lead to professional service in the community since the early 1900's. San Jose State's psychology department, in accordance with this general system goal, has developed four major educational goals:

(a) to provide a broad range of undergraduate courses which contribute to the breadth of understanding of 'liberally educated' undergraduates, (b) to provide an undergraduate degree program with concentrations that encompass all the mainstream specializations within psychology, (c) to provide a set of Masters of Science programs which cover the applied areas of psychology which are of interest to our student population and which provide training in areas for which there are job opportunities (particularly within our geographic area), and (d) to provide a Masters of Art program which offers broad training for students expecting to continue for the PhD and which offers substantial flexibility in specific content to best meet the specific interests and goals of individual students.
(Cooper, 1989, p.4)

San Jose State University, in compliance with these goals, has developed several undergraduate and graduate psychology programs. The primary objective of the undergraduate programs is to provide a broad basic foundation in psychological principles. The undergraduate framework can be applied to students seeking a liberal arts major and terminating at the baccalaureate level, or it

can be tailored for students intending to pursue graduate studies in psychology at either the master's or doctoral level.

The primary objective of the graduate programs is to provide training for professional service in the community. Students who complete these graduate programs would qualify for certificates or licenses authorizing them to offer services as marriage, family, and child counselors, psychological assistants, school psychologists, or rehabilitation counselors. Positions not requiring certification beyond the master's degree itself include industrial/organizational psychologist, community college teacher or counselor, human resource or personnel specialist, and career development specialist. The master's degree also allows for continuation of education at the Ph.D. level.

The graduate programs in psychology at SJSU were developed to reflect and incorporate a diversity of student needs and goals, economic and community needs, and departmental politics. Balancing such complicated factors presents an ongoing challenge to the psychology department's ability to maintain the quality of the academic and professional training it is providing. Assessing whether existing programs are attaining their intended goals can help maintain the efficiency and effectiveness of existing programs. The process of monitoring programs can play a critical role in determining the quality of programs.

One way to ascertain the status of a program is through a program evaluation. Tripodi, Fellin, and Epstein (1971) define "evaluation" as a management technique for providing feedback to

program administrators. "It is a continuous process that may involve more than one systematic collection of data and the use of more than one evaluative technique. It seeks to compile information about achievements or failures in program implementation" (p. 42).

The Psychology Curriculum Committee at SJSU has in fact implemented (approximately every 5 years) a review process to assess all of the department's undergraduate and graduate programs. The purpose of this internal review is to provide feedback that can integrate the current faculty talent and resources, assess community needs, and develop a cohesive and complementary plan in and between programs. Examples of two changes at the graduate level due to a program evaluation were the reactivation of the Industrial/Organizational program and the consolidation of three previous graduate programs (M.S. in Clinical, M.S. in Counseling, and M.S. in Clinical-Community) into the single M.S. in Clinical/Counseling program. The above examples demonstrate how an internal administrative program review provides useful and valuable information to the department.

This study extends the internal review process and provides a preliminary student evaluation by targeting graduates of master's level psychology programs at SJSU. The intent of the study is to provide information that will make a contribution to understanding the effectiveness and efficiency of these programs.

The two programs to be evaluated are the M.S. Clinical/Counseling (hereafter referred to as Clinical/Counseling) and M.S. Marriage, Family, and Child Counseling (hereafter referred to as

MFCC) programs. Originally, the M.S. Clinical and M.S. Counseling programs were separate. The current M.S. Clinical/Counseling program was the result of consolidating three previous graduate programs (M.S. in Counseling, M.S. in Clinical, and M.S. in Clinical-Community). This change was the result of increased interest in more traditional clinical training, the declining student demand for the community psychology option, and the need to avoid spreading limited financial resources too thin. The M.S. Marriage, Family, and Child Counseling program was developed in cooperation with the Department of Sociology and is a two-department, multidisciplinary program.

The primary educational goal in both the Clinical/Counseling and MFCC programs is to prepare students for professional service in the community. Students can expect, upon completion of the graduate program, to qualify for certificates or licenses authorizing services as marriage, family, and child counselors, psychological assistants, and/or rehabilitation counselors. Other career options available for graduates of the two programs include research assistant, community college teacher and/or counselor, professional in corporate human resources, and continuation of education to the PhD level.

In conclusion, this study evaluates the extent to which the two training programs have successfully achieved their goals (as defined in the Method and Design section). The target population is the alumni of the Clinical/Counseling and MFCC programs. The survey focuses on students' evaluations of their program in terms of what

they perceived as valuable in their training and what they perceived as areas in need of improvement. In addition, the survey contributes first-hand information regarding students' professional accomplishments in the field of psychology after completing their program of study.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Evaluation of graduate training in psychology dates back to the 1950's (Kelly & Fiske, 1951), and since that time numerous studies document efforts in this area (Guydish & Markley, 1986; Harway & Serafica, 1977; LaPidus, 1990; Levy, 1983; Searight, 1990; Stevenson, Norcross, King, & Kevin, 1984; Walfish, Kaufman, & Kinder, 1980). The literature review revealed a variety of approaches, topics, and respondent groups that could be employed in program evaluation. But, it found virtually no information on how effectively program evaluations have been implemented. Factors cited as impediments in program evaluation were lack of personnel, lack of funding, problems in methodology, and time constraints. Despite the problems associated with program evaluation, the above studies arrived at a consensus about the positive value of completed program evaluations. Specifically, completed program evaluations were viewed as valuable in that the information provided acts as a feedback loop for individuals assessing, planning, and implementing present and future program decisions.

The above literature included a framework for developing and implementing a program evaluation. The approach involved the following steps: (a) general questions to assess parameters of the evaluation, (b) selection of appropriate techniques, (c) goal definition, (d) implementation of study, (e) data analysis, and (f) discussion and feedback of the results. The present study

followed each step in developing the current program evaluation at SJSU.

Questions used to assess the general parameters of an evaluation were derived from Coursey (1977). He recommended that five basic questions be considered prior to beginning a program evaluation. They are: (a) What is the purpose of the evaluation?, (b) Who is it for?, (c) What is to be examined?, (d) When in the life of the program is the evaluation to take place?, and (e) What constitutes success?

The above questions when applied to San Jose State's programs yielded the following information.

1. What is the purpose of the evaluation? The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which the two training programs have successfully achieved their goals (as defined in the Method and Design section). The target population was alumni of the Clinical/Counseling and MFCC programs. A sample from this population provided feedback about what students perceived as valuable in their training and what they perceived as areas in need of improvement. This provided information regarding the effectiveness of the programs, which then could be incorporated into program planning and modification.

2. Who is the study for? The study is designed for use by departmental faculty involved in the Clinical/Counseling and MFCC programs.

3. What is to be examined? The study examines the effectiveness and efficiency of the Clinical/Counseling and MFCC programs in meeting operationally defined program goals.

4. When in the life of the program is the evaluation to take place? In terms of Tripodi et al. (1971), the two programs in this study are in the third stage. This stage is known as Program Implementation and is the final stage of program development. The requirement of this stage demands that the program be fully engaged, since it is in this stage that the goals of the program are defined and the outcome of those goals can be measured.

5. What constitutes success? Success of the program is determined by assessing whether the performance of the graduates meets the criterion level of the operationally defined goals. According to Coursey (1977), "program effectiveness or outcome is a frequent criterion for program evaluation and usually requires operationalizing program goals" (p.14).

The next step in developing a program evaluation was the selection of appropriate techniques. The choice made should provide the most unbiased information pertinent to the goals of the study.

"These techniques can be grouped into three major categories, as follows: (a) Monitoring techniques such as accountability audits, administrative audits, and time-and-motion studies; (b) Social research techniques such as experiments, surveys and case studies; and (c) Cost-analytic techniques such as cost-accounting and cost-outcome analyses." (Schiller, 1982, p.7)

The technique that was used in the present study was the survey which is one of the social research methods that is commonly applied to, and taught in, training programs such as those at SJSU.

Once the appropriate technique is selected, the third step is to define the program goals. According to Guydish and Markley (1986), a strategy to define goals can be based on the goal-oriented approach. This strategy is the framework utilized for defining the goals of the SJSU programs. The strategy involves three steps: (a) prioritizing goals, (b) developing hypotheses, and (c) setting criteria for confirmation of hypotheses.

Guydish and Markley (1986) asserted that the first step of identifying the program goals "is perhaps the single most critical step within a goal-oriented approach since the quality and utility of the entire evaluation effort depend heavily on the depth, breadth, and relevance of the goals selected" (p.154). Therefore, it is incumbent on the researcher to define program goals and then to translate them into measurable terms. The general goals and measurable objectives of the SJSU programs are stated in Table 1. These goals and objectives are ranked as primary or secondary. The process used to define goals is described in the Methods and Design section (p. 19).

The second step according to Guydish and Markley (1986) is to develop questions to be evaluated. Table 2 presents these evaluation questions. The third and final step is to set criteria for confirmation of evaluation questions.

Table 1

Program Goals and Objectives

Program Goals	Measurable Objectives
<p>I. To train students to perform 1. adequately in those settings 2. in which they are likely to function.</p> <p>* <i>Adequate</i> training or preparation is defined by judgments of survey respondents.</p>	<p>Training imparts marketable skills</p> <p>Training enables adequate performance in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Psychopathology •Individual Psychotherapy •Family Psychotherapy •Group Psychotherapy •Cross-Cultural Counseling •Clinical Diagnosis •Needs Assessment •Cross-Cultural Sensitivity/Awareness •Professional Ethics •Designing/Doing Research <p>3. Training includes clinical experience that is useful in terms of subsequent employment.</p> <p>4. Adequate career and curriculum advising that students find satisfactory in terms of employment requirements.</p>

Table 1

Program Goals and Objectives

Program Goals	Measurable Objectives
II. To help meet community mental health needs. III. To adequately prepare students for the Marriage, Family, Child Counselor license. IV. To adequately prepare graduate students for further academic training. V. To provide a sufficiently high number of ethnically diverse trained professionals.	5. Adequate educational learning environment that was conducive to students learning. (Environment defined based on such factors as: faculty, administrators, class size). 6. Training includes overall graduate satisfaction with the program of study. Determine the proportion of graduates employed in the community. Determine the proportion of graduates who have successfully acquired their MFCC license. Determine the proportion of graduates who pursued graduate study beyond the M.S. degree. Determine the proportion of ethnically diverse graduates.

Table 2

Questions Addressed by Program Evaluation

Evaluation Questions	
1.	Most graduates are now or have been at some time employed in training-related positions. (Goal 1, Objective 1)
2.	<p>Graduates rate training as adequate in (Goal 1, Objective 2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Psychopathology •Individual Psychotherapy •Family Psychotherapy •Group Psychotherapy •Cross-Cultural Counseling •Clinical Diagnosis •Needs Assessment •Cross-Cultural Sensitivity/Awareness •Professional Ethics •Designing/Doing Research
3.	Graduates report that clinical experiences were useful in terms of employment needs. (Goal 1, Objective 3)
4.	Graduates report overall satisfaction with career and curriculum advising as it relates to employment needs. (Goal 1, Objective 4)
5.	Graduates report overall satisfaction with the educational learning environment in their program of study. (Goal 1, Objective 5)

Table 2

Questions Addressed by Program Evaluation

Evaluation Questions	
<hr/>	
6.	Graduates report overall satisfaction with their program of study. (Goal I, Objective 6)
7.	A large number of graduates are employed in mental health settings. (Goal II)
8.	A proportion of graduate students went on to pursue a Marriage, Family, and Child Counselor license. (Goal III)
9.	A proportion of graduate students went on to pursue education beyond the master's degree. (Goal IV)
10.	A proportion of graduate students were from ethnically diverse backgrounds. (Goal V)

Specific confirmation criteria were not stated due to the arbitrary nature of defining the expected outcomes for evaluation questions confirmation. Instead, for the purposes of this study, the goals and objectives were utilized as a framework for providing descriptive feedback to the program committee members.

The above research review helped to assess the first three steps in a program evaluation. A literature review of other program evaluations revealed the following information.

Reviews of program evaluations of doctoral level clinical psychology programs specifically involving feedback from graduate students about their training program were limited. In these studies, questionnaires were sent to both present and former students to gain information regarding the strongest and weakest aspects of their programs. The questions were developed to obtain information about the effectiveness of different aspects of clinical training programs in order to determine what composes the ideal training program for clinical psychology.

Clement and Sartoris (1967) used the survey method on 61 APA approved clinical psychology training programs. The goal of the study was to sample the attitudes of graduate students who were currently receiving training in clinical psychology. The results of the study yielded a mixed view on what the ideal training program would look like. However, a general division occurred between clinical training carried out in a professional school of psychology versus that acquired in a university-based department of psychology.

A majority of the respondents favored establishing professional schools for those who wanted them. The authors felt that having both types of program would better accommodate the needs of psychology, society, and those being trained than would either type alone. A majority of the participants favored placing primary emphasis on applied training, with secondary emphasis on experimental-theoretical training. Respondents favored eliminating foreign language requirements, requiring a dissertation, having flexible time schedules (but not less than four years required), and not requiring a specific amount of personal psychotherapy. In general, the respondents indicated that the emphasis in present training programs does not correspond to their professional goals and that many training programs are doing an inadequate job of informing their students of the various problems facing clinical psychologists.

Another evaluative study by Walfish, et al. (1980) used the survey technique. The target group consisted of 62 graduates from APA-approved doctoral programs in clinical psychology. The goal of the study was to assess respondents' satisfaction with their graduate training and their satisfaction with psychology as a profession. The results of their survey indicated that a majority of respondents were satisfied with their graduate training in a variety of skill areas. The specific areas the respondents were most satisfied with fell into the general categories of traditional therapy and assessment. As recent graduates, the respondents reported satisfaction with their overall graduate training, available role models, and relevance to current position. The results of this study

suggested that graduate programs are doing an adequate job of training new psychologists, at least from the graduates' point of view. But, the authors of this study recommended a follow-up study in 3 to 4 years to ascertain if the previous findings could be replicated.

A study done by Weiss (1975) focused on the clinical internship training program at the University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center. The survey assessed those areas in the graduates' training respondents found most valuable. Respondents found diagnostic supervision the most valuable experience, with therapy supervision as the second strongest aspect of the training program. A high value was placed on elective educational experiences as well as those activities that minimized the status distinction between trainees and professionals. According to Weiss (1975), the survey results indicated that the participants seek out and value those educational experiences that offer opportunities to function as professionals in pursuit of personally meaningful interests and goals.

The present literature review discussed several survey studies that sampled the attitudes of graduate students who were currently enrolled in or who had graduated from a clinical psychology program. These studies were successful in providing valuable information and feedback about the programs being evaluated. The intent of the present study is to provide the Psychology Department at SJSU with similar information about the Clinical/Counseling and MFCC programs.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD AND DESIGN

Sample

Two groups were surveyed. One group included students ($N=125$) who completed the M.S. Clinical/Counseling program between 1985 and 1991. The second group included students ($N=58$) who completed the M.S. Marriage, Family and Child Counseling program between 1985 and 1991.

Measures

A three-part alumni survey was used for the study. The survey was developed to determine the extent to which the graduate programs had successfully achieved their program goals. Ten goals with measurable outcomes were defined (Table 1 in the previous section). Ten issues were developed based on the program goals (Table 2 in the previous section).

The underlying assumption in developing the survey was that the perceptions and judgments of the alumni, students, and faculty would contribute to a better understanding of the functioning and quality of the master's programs. Although obtaining information from all three sources would have been ideal, such a survey was beyond the scope of this study. Instead, as a preliminary step, the alumni were the target population in a comprehensive program evaluation.

The development of the survey instrument was based upon:

- (a) input from faculty members involved in the SJSU psychology master's programs;
- (b) an existing survey developed by the Educational Testing Service, known as the Graduate Program Self-Assessment: Master's Level Programs Alumni Questionnaire;
- (c) questions developed from the operationally defined goals of each program; and
- (d) a field test of the instrument in a master's level applied research class.

The survey items were separated into three sections (see Appendix B). The first section dealt with demographic information about the respondent, such as gender, age, program of study, date of graduation, Grade-Point-Average (GPA) in program of study, pursuits after graduation (i.e., licensing, PhD, etc.), and work experience after graduation.

The second section consisted of a series of items stated in terms of a five-point Likert scale. These items were targeted to assess the following characteristics: environment for learning, scholarly excellence, quality of teaching, faculty concern for students, curriculum, departmental procedures, available resources, student satisfaction with program, family clinic, internship/fieldwork and pre-marital counseling experiences, and employment assistance. A supplemental space at the end of the section allowed respondents to write questions or statements that could potentially yield additional information for the department.

The third section of the survey gave respondents an opportunity to provide descriptive feedback about any of the prior questions and to indicate strengths and weaknesses in their program of study. There were 94 items in the survey.

The core of the questionnaire (approximately 55 statements in the second section) was adapted from the ETS Graduate Program Self-Assessment (GPSA). The same rating options of either "agree-to-disagree" or "poor-to-excellent" were utilized for the item response options. The individual items provide information about important quality-related program characteristics in seven areas: program purposes, faculty training, student ability and performance, resources, academic and social environments of the program, program procedures, and alumni achievements. Judgments about the individual items are combined to form 16 summary scale scores. For the purposes of this study only 10 scales were analyzed; four scales were not analyzed since they do not pertain to the target population of alumni. Items 55 through 64, which deal with specific areas in the program, were analyzed individually. The summary scales are reported as averages of the item responses making up the scales. Table 3 lists the 9 summary scales and the specific items related to each individual scale.

Table 3

Description of the 9 Summary Scales

Summary Scale and Associated Individual Survey items	
<hr/>	
1.	Environment for Learning - The extent to which the department provides a supportive environment characterized by mutual respect and concern between students and professors, students' helpfulness to one another, and department openness to new ideas and different points of view. (Items 3, 4, 5, 16, 17, 18, 19)
2.	Scholarly Excellence - Rated excellence of the department faculty, ability of students, and intellectual stimulation in the program. (Items 23, 26, 32, 34)
3.	Quality of Teaching - Faculty excitement for new ideas and helpfulness in dealing with class work; student evaluation of faculty teaching methods, grading procedures, and preparation for class. (Items 13, 37, 38, 48, 49, 50)
4.	Faculty Concern for Students - The extent to which faculty members are perceived to be interested in the welfare and professional development of students, be accessible, and be aware of student needs, concerns, and suggestions. (Items 1, 2, 20, 21, 22, 27, 39, 40)
5.	Curriculum - Ratings of the variety and depth of graduate course and program offerings, program flexibility, opportunities for individual projects, and interactions with related departments. (Items 33, 41, 42, 43, 44, 52)
6.	Available Resources - Ratings of available facilities such as libraries and laboratories, and overall adequacy of physical and financial resources for a master's program. (Items 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 47, 51, 53, 54)

Table 3

Description of the 9 Summary Scales

Summary Scale and Associated Individual Survey items	
<hr/>	
7.	Student Satisfaction with Program - Self-reported student satisfaction with the program as reflected in judgments about the amount that has been learned, preparation for intended career, desire to transfer, and willingness to recommend the program to a friend. (items 6, 7, 14, 15)
8.	Student Assistantship or Internship Experience - Ratings of preparation for and supervision of assigned duties; contribution of the experience to academic and professional development. (items 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83)
9.	Value of Educational Experiences for Employment - Alumni judgments about their graduate school experiences as preparation for present work demands in areas such as required and elective courses, associations with faculty members and students, departmental standards, and gains in specific knowledge or skills. (items 8, 9)

Note: From Validity and Reliability of the Graduate Program Self-Assessment (GPSA) Instruments for Evaluating Nursing Doctoral Education, by D.B. Chambers and W.L. Holzemer, 1988.

A final consideration of this survey was the issue of anonymity and confidentiality. Anonymity was maintained for this study since no employers or outside sources were contacted. Confidentiality was safeguarded by eliminating identifying information from the survey instrument. A code number for each individual survey was used for the sole purpose of determining which respondents completed the questionnaire. Once checked against the master list, the code was eliminated from the questionnaire to ensure the confidentiality of the respondents.

Procedure

The surveys were mailed to alumni with an attached cover letter (see Appendix A). A stamped return envelope was included. The alumni were informed that a master list with their names and corresponding code numbers was used in the study for follow-up procedures and that the master list was destroyed before analyzing the data to ensure confidentiality.

Design

This thesis project was based on a formative evaluation of the Master of Science programs in Clinical/Counseling Psychology and Marriage, Family and Child Counseling. According to Tuckman (1971), "formative evaluation" refers to the internal evaluation of a program in which performance of individuals in a program is compared to the goals of the program. It attempts to determine whether a program is

successfully meeting its goals. Its primary purpose is to help the program committee identify areas that may need some improvements to meet their goals.

The survey was based on the goal-oriented approach to determine whether the performance of the graduates meets certain goals of the program. Program effectiveness is assessed based on: (a) graduates' perceptions and judgments about their program of study, and (b) the status of graduates as they pursue their career in the field of psychology.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Evaluation and Summary of Demographic Information

Of the 183 surveys sent, fifty-four were returned and fifty-two (28%) were complete and usable for analysis. Table 4 presents demographic data for the sample. As revealed in Table 4, the mean age of the respondents was 41, with a range of 27 to 61. Forty-one (79%) respondents were females and eleven (21%) respondents were males. There were forty-six (88%) Caucasian respondents, two (4%) Hispanic respondents, two (4%) Asian respondents, and two (4%) respondents that marked "other." The extremely high percentage of Caucasians limited the possibility of utilizing ethnicity as a variable in the analysis.

Thirty-one (60%) respondents were from the Clinical/Counseling program and twenty-one (40%) were from the MFCC program. A bi-modal response occurred for the year graduated, with twelve (23%) respondents graduating in 1991 and eleven (21%) respondents graduating in 1985. Of those surveyed, forty-three (83%) respondents completed the comprehensive exam, seven (13%) respondents completed a thesis, and two (4%) respondents completed a special project. Forty-seven (90%) respondents indicated the primary purpose for pursuing a degree was to prepare for

Table 4

Demographic Information

Demographic Scale			Number	Percentage
1.	Sex	male	11	21%
		female	41	79%
2.	Age	27 to 35	15	29%
		36 to 42	14	27%
		43 to 49	13	25%
		50 to 61	9	17%
		Missing	1	2%
3.	Ethnicity	African-American	0	0
		Asian	2	4%
		Caucasian	46	88%
		Hispanic	2	4%
		Other	2	4%
4.	Program	Clinical/Counseling	31	60%
		MFCC	21	40%
5.	Year of Graduation	1985	11	21%
		1986	4	8%
		1987	6	11%
		1988	3	6%
		1989	3	6%

Table 4

Demographic Information

Demographic Scale			Number	Percentage
5.	Year of Graduation	1990	6	11%
		1991	12	23%
		Missing	7	13%
6.	Project	Thesis	7	13%
		Special Project	2	4%
		Final Exam	43	83%
7.	Purpose of Degree	Professional	47	90%
		Scholarly	2	4%
		Future Studies	2	4%
		Higher Pay	1	2%
8.	Grade-Point-Average	4.00-3.75	29	56%
		3.74-3.25	18	35%
		3.24 and below	3	6%
		Missing	2	4%
9.	Post-Graduate Pursuits	MFCC	41	79%
		PhD	3	6%
		Other	1	2%
		Missing	7	13%

professional or technical practice in the field. Twenty-nine (56%) respondents had grade point averages (GPAs) between 4.00-3.75, eighteen (35%) had GPAs between 3.74-3.25, and 3 (6%) had GPAs below 3.24. Questions regarding professional pursuits after graduation indicated that forty-one (79%) respondents went on to pursue a Marriage, Family, and Child Counseling license, three (6%) respondents went on to pursue higher education, one (2%) respondent went on to pursue some other educational or professional career path, and seven (13%) respondents did not respond to this question.

Evaluating the time it took respondents to complete their program of study, it was determined that MFCC respondents completed their program of study in a shorter period of time than Clinical/Counseling students. This difference was statistically significant [$t = 2.31$; $df = 42$; $p < .05$] (see Table 5). Specifically, respondents in the MFCC program completed their program of study in a shorter period of time, averaging 2.11 years, than the Clinical/Counseling program respondents, who took an average of 2.84 years to complete their program of study.

Since the amount of coursework is the same for the two programs, the above finding may suggest that MFCC respondents were more able to concentrate on their program of study. Some possible conjectures for this might include that students in the MFCC program had fewer outside commitments (e.g., family, work, etc.), and/or that the Clinical/Counseling program accepted more part-time students.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Number of Years Respondents Took
to Complete their Program of Study

Group	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Clinical/Counseling	2.84	1.25	26
MFCC	2.11	.58	18

Another factor that could have contributed to these findings is that the programs are structured differently. Specifically, the MFCC program consistently provides and encourages peer support (e.g., mentor support and student study groups). Additionally, faculty turnover during the years of this study in the Clinical/Counseling program was higher than in the MFCC program. One could speculate that this turnover caused instructors to be less informed and, therefore, less able to guide students.

Program Assessment

The remaining portion of the results section reports on the ratings and the descriptive responses to the open-ended questions. When calculating *t*-tests and ANOVAs, four demographic variables [age, GPA, sex, and program of study] were used. Three of these variables (age, GPA, and program of study) were collapsed into smaller categories due to the small numbers of individuals in some of the original categories. Age was collapsed into four groups. Group 1 consisted of fifteen (29%) respondents aged 27 to 35, group 2 consisted of fourteen (27%) respondents aged 36 to 42, group 3 consisted of thirteen (25%) respondents aged 43-49, and group 4 consisted of nine (17%) respondents aged 50 to 61. One respondent did not report an age and was not included in the analyses. GPAs were compressed into three groups. Group 1 consisted of twenty-nine (56%) respondents whose GPA was between 4.00-3.75; group 2 consisted of eighteen (35%) respondents whose GPA was between 3.74-3.25; and group 3 consisted of five (10%) respondents whose

GPA was 3.24 or lower. Two (4%) respondents did not report their GPA and were not included in these analyses. Program of study was compressed into two groups. Group 1 consisted of thirty-one (60%) respondents from the Clinical program, the Counseling program and the Clinical/Counseling program; group 2 consisted of twenty-one (40%) respondents from the MFCC program.

The findings reported are evaluated according to each of the nine issues stated in Table 2. Each issue is restated in the heading followed by a summary of the findings and significant results. When applicable, a summary of the descriptive feedback is provided followed by a discussion of the results. When reading the mean ratings in the tables, the lower the rating the more relevant the finding (e.g., a rating of 1 reflects "Excellent" or "Strongly Agree").

Questions 1 and 7: Employment In Training-Related Positions

Questions 1 and 7 were combined because the survey instrument and respondent answers did not successfully differentiate between internship placements and after-graduation employment. The one exception to this was in the area of those respondents who had been licensed and who then indicated their subsequent employment after licensure.

Placements reported by respondents revealed that forty-seven (90%) respondents have worked and/or are currently working in training-related positions, one (2%) reported leaving the field to pursue another career, and five (8%) declined to answer the question. Table 6 lists the range and diversity of placements. An expanded

version of the specific placements is located in Appendix C, Table 25. Placements are grouped by area (e.g., Children, Adolescents and Families) and are listed in descending order, from the highest to the lowest number of reported placements.

The actual placements in the community had the highest concentration in the area dealing with Children, Adolescents and Families. The remaining placements were spread more evenly between various settings and in areas dealing with specific populations and issues.

Interestingly, a somewhat different pattern emerged for that subset of the total consisting of the nineteen respondents who are licensed. For the fifteen individuals from this group who responded, nine are in private practice, two are clinical directors in counseling agencies, two work in hospital settings, one is a therapist for a county agency, and one is a clinical director of training at a training institute.

A primary goal of the program is to train and place individuals in mental health settings. This was achieved as reflected in the high percentage of respondents reporting placements in the mental health field. Furthermore, it appears that opportunities in settings that provide services for children, adolescents, and families and/or that involved drug and alcohol issues were most substantial. These findings may be driven by societal needs and subsequent available funding.

Table 6
Description of Placements in the Community and Number of
Respondents in the Placements

Placements	Number of respondents
Children, Adolescents, and Families	27
Drug & Alcohol Program	10
General Therapy	10
Hospitals	9
Private Practice	9
University and College Settings	9
County Mental Health	7
Domestic Violence	7
Related Areas in the Field of Psychology	5
Teaching	2

Question 2: Respondents' Ratings of Adequacy of Training in Specific Areas of Study

The second question explored graduates' attitudes about specific coursework in their program. The findings for this area are summarized in Table 7. Items are listed in ascending order, from the lowest mean rating (indicating greatest satisfaction) to the highest (indicating lowest satisfaction).

Overall, the mean ratings were between 1.92 and 3.21 for the specific areas of study in their program. The area respondents were most satisfied with was the training they received in professional ethics, giving it a mean rating of 1.92 (very close to "Very Good"). Family psychotherapy, individual psychotherapy, cross-cultural sensitivity/awareness, and cross-cultural counseling were given mean ratings between 2.31 and 2.39, indicating respondents felt very good about the training they received in these areas. However, respondents reported progressively less satisfaction with the training they received in the areas of clinical diagnosis, needs assessment, psychopathology, group psychotherapy and doing/designing research, giving these areas lower mean ratings between 2.68 and 3.21 (close to "Fair").

Such a high level of satisfaction in the area of professional ethics could be attributed to quality of instruction, student interest, and/or motivation for learning. Clearly the vital relevance and importance of professional ethics may inspire a high level of student interest and attentiveness. Satisfaction with other coursework areas might be determined more by the degree of relevancy to the

Table 7
Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Academic Coursework

Coursework	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Professional Ethics	1.92	.87	51
Family Psychotherapy	2.18	.92	50
Individual Psychotherapy	2.26	.88	50
Cross-Cultural Sensitivity/Awareness	2.31	.99	51
Cross-Cultural Counseling	2.39	.87	51
Clinical Diagnosis	2.57	1.04	49
Needs Assessment	2.68	.83	47
Psychopathology	2.72	1.01	50
Group Psychotherapy	2.96	.81	47
Designing/Doing Research	3.21	.87	47

individual study program of respondents and intended goals in the field of mental health. Other coursework variables could or would be applicable on a more selective basis depending on the area of chosen interest.

The t -test calculated for satisfaction with individual psychotherapy coursework (Table 8) by program of study yielded significant results ($t = -2.47$; $df = 48$; $p < .05$). The Clinical/Counseling program respondents rated individual psychotherapy higher (close to "Very Good") than the MFCC respondents (close to "Fair"). The t -test calculated for satisfaction with family psychotherapy coursework (Table 9) by program of study also yielded significant results ($t = 4.22$; $df = 48$; $p < .005$). The MFCC program respondents rated family psychotherapy higher (close to "Very Good") than those respondents in the Clinical/Counseling program (close to "Fair").

Considering that these findings are consistent with the respective emphasis and focus of the Clinical/Counseling and MFCC program, these findings are not surprising.

Descriptive feedback from the open-ended questions indicated overall feedback that coursework was good. A general comment, reported by more than half of the respondents, was that the program had provided a good foundation for later professional work. Reports evaluating the program revealed a tendency by the respondents to compare their program of study to other clinical psychology programs at local colleges and universities. When using this

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations for Ratings of Individual
Psychotherapy Coursework by Program of Study

Group	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Clinical/Counseling	2.03	.79	31
MFCC	2.63	.89	19

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations for Ratings of Family Psychotherapy
Coursework by Program of Study

Group	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
MFCC	1.60	.60	20
Clinical/Counseling	2.57	.90	30

criterion, overwhelmingly respondents felt satisfied with the level of training they had received.

Respondents' open-ended responses echoed the findings in the statistical analyses above indicating that they were satisfied with the training they received in the areas of ethics, assessment, and clinical training. Areas which they judged as less adequate included chemical dependency, children and adolescents, severely mentally ill, and aspects regarding practical (i.e., licensing issues) and business aspects (i.e., private practice issues) of the profession.

Question 3: Respondents' Perception of Usefulness of Clinical Experiences in Terms of Employment Needs

The third question evaluated graduates' perceptions regarding the usefulness of their clinical experiences in terms of employment needs. The findings for items related to this area are summarized in Table 10. Items are listed in descending order, from the best to the worst mean ratings.

Overall, ratings by respondents regarding the usefulness of their clinical experiences in terms of employment needs were given mean ratings between 1.98 and 2.53 (very close to "agree"). These scores reflect a high level of agreement that clinical experiences were useful in relation to graduates' employment needs.

Clinical experience was evaluated based on graduates' ratings of learning acquired in the academic portion of their studies and clinical experience acquired in the actual clinic and internship placements. In the area of academic experience forty-three (83%)

Table 10
Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Clinical Experience as
Related to Employment Needs

Individual Survey Item	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Degree relevant to work in field	1.98	.83	52
Program provided good preparation for professional work	2.00	.82	52
Applied learning from pre-marital clinic	2.23	1.02	22
Applied learning from internship	2.33	.72	48
Applied learning from family clinic	2.53	1.00	49

respondents agreed that their program was very good preparation for later professional work. Forty-one (79%) respondents rated the relevance of the degree to work in the field as very good.

Ratings for the clinical experiences indicated that thirty-six (69%) respondents in the family clinic experiences and thirty-eight (73%) respondents in the internship experiences felt the placements were very good opportunities to practice professional skills. Fifteen (71%) out of the twenty-one MFCC respondents in the pre-marital clinic indicated that they felt the pre-marital clinic experiences were an excellent opportunity to practice professional skills.

In general, respondents were highly satisfied with their actual experiential coursework practices (e.g., family clinics and internships). This suggests that from formal classroom work, to applied learning, to actual practice in the mental health field, respondents were able to successfully and appropriately integrate and use all facets of their academic and experiential training and found it to be highly relevant and useful in relation to their eventual employment needs.

Analyses of the usefulness of the clinical experiences in terms of employment needs by the demographic variables yielded one noteworthy result. An ANOVA comparing the ratings of relevance of degree to field for the three GPA categories yielded significant results ($F = 6.40$; $df = 2,49$; $p < .05$). Table 11 illustrates that respondents with a GPA of 4.00-3.75 considered their degree to be highly relevant to the field whereas the groups with GPA's of

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Relevance of Degree to
Field by GPA

Group		<u>MEAN</u>	N
1.	4.00-3.75	2.65*	29
2.	3.74-3.25	3.39	18
3.	3.24- and below	3.67	5

* Group 1 differed significantly from Group 2 and 3 at the $p < .05$ level

3.74-3.25 or 3.24 or below judged it to be only fairly relevant to their field. This conclusion supports an expected finding that those students who excelled in their program of study would have perceived their degree to be highly relevant and applicable to their careers.

In summary, a high percentage of the respondents rated the clinical experience acquired in the academic portion of their program as useful in terms of employment. There was also agreement among the respondents that the clinic and internship experiences were useful for later professional work.

Question 4: Overall Satisfaction of Respondents with Career and Curriculum Advising as It Relates to Employment Needs

The fourth question evaluated graduates' level of satisfaction with the career and curriculum advising they received. The findings for the items related to this area are summarized in Table 12.

The survey yielded mean ratings between 4.08 and 4.19 (4 = "Disagree" and 5 = "Strongly Disagree"). In general, all items in this area reflected a high level of dissatisfaction with the assistance and advising received as it related to employment needs. Specifically, thirty-nine (75%) respondents disagreed that the faculty helped graduates find appropriate internship placements. Forty-four (85%) disagreed that faculty helped graduates of the master's program find employment. Forty-two (80%) respondents rated the career and curriculum advising as fair and ten (20%) rated that advising as poor.

Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Satisfaction as It
Relates to Employment Needs

Individual Survey Item	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Career advising	3.19	.74	52
Helped find appropriate internship			
Program faculty	3.28	.78	46
Program coordinator	3.31	.83	48
Helped find appropriate employment			
Program faculty	3.57	.58	46
Program coordinator	3.58	.66	45

Analysis of the career and curriculum advising by demographic variables yielded two noteworthy results. The t -test calculated to reveal differences in response by sex for faculty helping students with internship placements yielded a significant result ($t = -2.32$; $df = 44$; $p < .05$). As indicated in Table 13, male respondents rated the level of faculty help higher than female respondents; however, both sexes were dissatisfied with the degree to which faculty helped students to find internship placements. Males disagreed that faculty helped them find appropriate internship placements, while females tended to strongly disagree that the faculty helped them to find appropriate internship placements.

The t -test calculated for differences between the sexes for faculty helping graduates find employment yielded a significant result ($t = -3.12$; $df = 44$; $p < .005$). As indicated in Table 14 male respondents rated the level of faculty help higher than female respondents. Males disagreed that faculty helped them find appropriate employment while females tended to strongly disagree that the faculty helped them to find appropriate employment.

In summary, graduates disagree that the faculty was helpful regarding employment needs and career and curriculum advising. Regardless of respondents attitudes it should be noted that both programs require their students to obtain their own internship placements such that these are congruent with students' training needs and ultimate career objectives. Furthermore, females reported a higher level of dissatisfaction in this regard than the males did.

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Satisfaction as It
Relates to Internship Needs by Sex

Group	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Male	3.80	.63	10
Female	4.42	.77	36

Table 14

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Satisfaction as It
Relates to Employment Needs by Sex

Group	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Male	4.10	.57	10
Female	4.69	.52	36

The variation in male and female response could be attributed to societal differences between male and female expectations which in turn affected their evaluation of assistance received. Also the demand for male professionals in the mental health field is greater due to the limited number of males pursuing this career path. These differences between male and female marketability in the mental health field could have resulted in increased advantages, opportunities, and subsequent placements for male graduates.

Question 5: Respondents' Overall Satisfaction with the Educational Learning Environment in their Program of Study

The fifth question evaluated graduates' overall satisfaction with the educational learning environment in their program of study. The educational learning environment was so broad in its scope that summary scales were developed to report on a number of discrete areas within the larger content area of the educational learning environment. The summary scales include: (a) environment for learning, (b) scholarly excellence, (c) quality of teaching, and (d) faculty concern for resources. The findings for these areas are reported in Tables 15, 16, 17, and 18.

Items grouped in the area of environment for learning were selected to evaluate the extent to which the department provided a supportive environment, characterized by mutual respect and concern between students and professors, students' helpfulness to one another, and the department's openness to new ideas and different

points of view. Table 15 lists in descending order, from the best mean rating to the worst mean rating, those items related to the environment for learning.

Overall ratings for this summary scale were between 2.00 and 2.67. Respondents were generally equally divided in terms of their agreement regarding level of satisfaction with the environment for learning. When asked about the acceptance of different scholarly viewpoints, twenty-four (46%) respondents agreed that different scholarly viewpoints were encouraged. However, when asked if some different scholarly viewpoints were encouraged, forty-one (79%) respondents agreed. Twenty-eight (54%) respondents agreed that the department was a humane environment characterized by mutual respect between students and professors. When asked about whether faculty worked together, twenty-three (44%) respondents agreed and twenty-eight (54%) disagreed that faculty work together.

Items grouped in the area of scholarly excellence were selected to evaluate the overall excellence of the department faculty, students' academic and professional performance and promise, and the intellectual stimulation and challenge of the program. Table 16 lists in descending order, from the highest mean rating to the lowest mean rating, those items related to the area of scholarly excellence.

Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Environment for Learning

Individual Survey Item	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Some scholarly viewpoints encouraged	2.00	.76	49
Humane learning environment	2.54	.83	51
Scholarly viewpoints encouraged	2.63	.77	51
Faculty worked together	2.67	.89	51

Table 16

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Scholarly Excellence

Individual Survey Item	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Faculty professional and scholarly excellence	2.06	.73	51
Department intellectually stimulating	2.18	.91	49
Intellectual environment	2.20	.77	51
Students professional and scholarly promise	2.23	.52	44

Overall, respondents were satisfied with the scholarly excellence of their program of study, giving it mean ratings between 2.06 and 2.23. Specifically, thirty-eight (73%) respondents rated the scholarly and professional competence of the faculty as very good or higher. Thirty-two (62%) respondents agreed that the department was an intellectually challenging environment and a stimulating place to study. Thirty-two (62%) respondents rated the professional and scholarly promise of students as very good or higher.

Items grouped in the area related to quality of teaching were selected to evaluate degree of faculty excitement for new ideas, faculty helpfulness in dealing with class work, teaching methods, grading procedures, and preparation for class. Table 17 lists in descending order, from the best mean rating to the worst mean rating, those items related to the area of quality of teaching.

Respondents judged the evaluation procedures, faculty preparedness, and faculty awareness of new developments as very good or higher, giving mean ratings of 2.22 or better. Only slightly lower mean ratings (between 2.29 and 2.41) were given for teaching methods, usefulness of faculty criticism, and faculty helpfulness in dealing with class work.

Items grouped in the area of faculty concern for students were selected to evaluate the extent to which faculty members are perceived to be interested in the welfare and professional development of students, accessibility of faculty, and faculty

Table 17

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Quality of Teaching

Individual Survey Item	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Evaluation procedures	2.15	.57	52
Faculty aware of new developments	2.22	.82	50
Faculty prepared for classes	2.22	.68	49
Teaching methods	2.29	.70	52
Useful faculty criticism	2.40	.88	50
Faculty helpful with coursework	2.41	.88	51

awareness of student needs and concerns. Table 18 lists in descending order, from the best mean rating to the worst mean rating, those items related to the area of faculty concern for students.

Respondents' level of satisfaction regarding faculty concern for students had a broad range of mean ratings, extending from 1.42 to 3.19. Thirty-three (63%) respondents agreed that faculty were genuinely interested in students (mean rating = 2.33). When a further distinction was made in qualifying whether some rather than all faculty were genuinely interested in students, the mean rating improved to 1.42. Furthermore forty-seven (90%) respondents agreed some faculty were interested, while three (6%) respondents disagreed that some faculty were interested.

Thirty-three (63%) respondents disagreed that there was good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs, concerns, and suggestions (mean rating = 2.80). Thirty-nine (75%) respondents disagreed that there were many opportunities outside the classroom to interact with the program coordinator (mean rating = 3.13). Thirty-seven (71%) respondents disagreed that there were opportunities to interact with the program faculty (mean rating = 2.90). Respondents were the least satisfied with the curriculum and career advising, which had a mean rating of 3.19 with forty-two (80%) respondents rating this item as fair or poor.

Table 18

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Faculty Concern for
Students

Individual Survey Item	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	N
Some faculty interested in students	1.42	.61	50
Faculty interested in students	2.33	.73	52
Accessibility of faculty	2.57	.83	51
Good communication between faculty and students	2.80	.75	51
Opportunities to interact with faculty	2.90	.71	50
Opportunities to interact with coordinator	3.13	.72	46
Curriculum & career advising	3.19	.74	52

Items grouped in the area of curriculum were selected to evaluate the variety and depth of graduate courses offered, program flexibility, and interaction with related disciplines. Table 19 lists in descending order, from the best mean rating to the worst mean rating, those items related to the area of curriculum.

Respondents' levels of satisfaction were equally divided when rating items in the area of curriculum, giving mean ratings between 2.25 and 2.88. To begin with, the depth of subject matter of the courses and program offerings received a mean rating of 2.25 and was rated by thirty-six (69%) respondents as very good or above. However, only twenty-four (46%) respondents rated the frequency of course offerings as very good or higher (mean rating = 2.32) and twenty-seven (52%) respondents rated the frequency of specific graduate courses offered as fair or lower. Respondents were the least satisfied with the flexibility of the program to meet the needs of individual students (mean rating = 2.88) with thirty-four (64%) respondents rating this item fair or poor.

Analyses of the individual items in the summary scale, curriculum, yielded one noteworthy result. An ANOVA calculated for the depth of subject matter (Table 20) by GPA yielded a significant result ($F = 3.87$; $df = 2,48$; $p < .05$). Respondents with GPAs between 4.00-3.75 rated the depth of subject matter higher than those with GPAs between 3.74-3.25. This finding suggests that those students with higher GPAs rated the depth of subject matter higher because of their increased and deeper understanding of the subject matter covered.

Table 19

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Curriculum

Individual Survey Item	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Depth of subject matter	2.25	.66	51
Frequency of course offerings	2.32	.73	51
Flexibility to individual needs	2.88	.75	49

Table 20

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings for Depth of Subject Matter
by GPA

Group		<u>MEAN</u>	<u>N</u>
1.	4.00-3.75	2.03*	29
2.	3.74-3.25	2.53	18
3.	3.24- and below	2.67	5

* Groups 1 differed significantly from Groups 2 and 3 at the $p < .05$ level

Items grouped in the area of available resources were selected to evaluate the available facilities and the adequacy of physical and financial resources. Table 21 lists in descending order, from the best mean rating to the worst mean rating, those items related to the area of available resources.

Overall, respondents rated items for available resources between 1.87 and 2.58. Thirty-six (69%) respondents rated the quality of the support staff as very good or higher (mean rating = 1.87). Thirty-four (65%) respondents rated the library holdings as very good and related to their field (mean rating = 2.28). Class size was rated by thirty-three (63%) respondents as very good or higher, with a mean rating of 2.31. The department's commitment to the program was rated by twenty-seven (52%) respondents as very good or higher (mean rating = 2.38). The number of support staff and adequacy of space were about evenly divided with twenty-three (44%) respondents agreeing and twenty-five (48%) disagreeing that there were enough support and space (mean ratings of 2.48 and 2.58, respectively).

Analyses of the available resources by the demographic variables yielded one significant result. The t -test calculated for number of support staff by sex yielded a significant result ($t = -2.35$; $df = 46$; $p < .05$). Males were more satisfied with the number of support staff than were females (see Table 22).

Table 21

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Available Resources

Individual Survey Item	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Quality of support staff	1.87	.84	48
Relevant library material	2.28	.93	50
Classes optimal size	2.31	.90	52
Department commitment to program	2.38	.81	45
Number of support staff	2.48	.88	48
Adequacy of space	2.58	.76	50

Table 22

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings for the Number of SupportStaff by Sex

<u>Group</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Male	1.89	.78	9
Female	2.61	.85	39

In reviewing all summary scales related to the education learning environment, the general findings indicate the environment to be perceived as humane, intellectually stimulating and challenging and the faculty to be viewed as very competent by this sampling of respondents. The environment was further perceived to be somewhat less favorable but still positive in the area of supportive staff; above adequate in the areas of library facilities and encouragement by staff and faculty of student viewpoints. Areas of concern and inadequacy were poor faculty communication, unmet individual study needs, and a lack of curriculum and career advising.

Question 6: Overall Satisfaction of Respondents with Program of Study

The sixth question explored graduates' attitudes about their overall satisfaction toward their program of study. Student satisfaction with their program was indicated by the extent to which students reported satisfaction with the amount that had been learned, preparation for intended career, and willingness to recommend the program to a friend. Findings for this area are summarized in Table 23. The mean ratings are listed in descending order, from the best mean rating to the worst mean rating.

Respondents generally judged their program of study with a high degree of overall satisfaction. As revealed in Table 23, the most favorable mean rating was for amount learned from the program with forty-nine (94%) respondents agreeing that they had learned a great deal from their program of study (mean rating = 1.49).

Table 23

Means and Standard Deviations of Ratings of Overall Satisfaction
with Program

Individual Survey Item	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Learned from program	1.49	.70	51
Agreement between degree requirements and program objectives	2.00	.70	50
Good preparation for professional work	2.00	.82	52
Advise others to enter program	2.08	.99	50
Re-enroll in program	2.16	.95	50

Also, a high number of respondents, forty (77%), agreed that degree requirements and objectives of the program were consistent (mean rating = 2.00). Consistent with the above findings respondents rated their program as being good preparation for professional work, giving a mean rating of 2.00 (equal to "Very Good"). Furthermore, thirty-eight (73%) of the respondents agreed (mean rating = 2.08) that they would advise a friend with similar interests to enter their program of study. However, only thirty-three (63%) agreed that, if they were starting over, they would re-enroll in their master's program again (mean rating = 2.16).

The respondents were in agreement that they had learned a good deal from their program of study. The level of satisfaction was supported by the fact that a high percentage of the respondents would recommend the program to others. The only sign of hesitation appeared in the number of graduates questioning if they would re-enroll in their program of study.

Question 8: Proportion of Respondents Pursuing a Marriage, Family, and Child Counseling License

The eighth question assessed what percentage of students went on to pursue licensing as Marriage, Family, and Child Counselors (MFCCs). Overall findings revealed that after graduating, forty-one (80%) respondents pursued and/or obtained the MFCC license, three (6%) respondents pursued and/or obtained a PhD degree, while one (2%) respondents pursued another area of interest. Seven (14%) respondents declined to answer the question. Of the forty-one

respondents who have gone on for licensure, nineteen (36%) have been licensed, four (8%) are in the process of taking the licensing examinations, and eighteen (35%) are collecting the supervised hours of clinical experience required for licensure.

Of the nineteen who have received their license, eighteen were female and one was male. Respondents were evenly divided between programs, with ten Clinical/Counseling program graduates and nine MFCC program graduates.

The MFCC license involves passing both a written and an oral examination. Respondents must pass the written portion of the examination before continuing on to the oral portion of the examination. Table 24 summarizes the respondents' experiences with the licensing process.

Twenty-one (96%) of the twenty-three respondents who have passed the written examination, passed on the first attempt. Twenty (87%) of the above twenty-three went on to pass the oral portion of the examination. Respondents' pass rates on the oral portion of the examination were as follows: eight (42%) passed on the first attempt, eight (42%) passed on the second attempt, two (10%) passed on the third attempt, one (5%) passed on the fourth attempt, and one (5%) passed on the fifth attempt.

From the high percentage of currently licensed respondents, it can be concluded that a primary goal of students in these programs is eventual licensing and practice in the marketplace.

Table 24

Means and Standard Deviations of the Respondents Who Went on for
Licensing

<u>Variable</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Attempts for Written MFCC License	1.13	.46	23
Attempts for Oral MFCC	1.9	1.10	20

Question 9: Proportion of Respondents Who Went on to Pursue a Doctoral Degree

The ninth question evaluated the percentage of graduates who went on to pursue a doctoral degree. Only three of the respondents reported that they had continued their education at the PhD level. One of the three pursued the doctoral degree in health psychology and the other two pursued PhDs in clinical psychology. Thus, only a small minority of the respondents utilized this program as a springboard to a higher degree. This suggests that the majority of respondents in this sample utilized both programs to reach the ultimate goal of licensing and the marketplace rather than to obtaining a higher educational degree.

Question 10: Proportion of Respondents Who Were from Ethnically Diverse Backgrounds

The tenth question dealt with the proportion of ethnic minority individuals represented in the sample of respondents. The general findings represented a high percentage and over representation of Caucasian respondents. The specific ethnic distribution among respondents was forty-six (88%) Caucasian, two (4%) Hispanic, two (4%) Asian, and two (4%) other.

Although respondents to this particular study were overwhelmingly Caucasian, actual enrollment figures in the two graduate programs do not support this lack of ethnic diversity.

Thus, for whatever reason, returns for the present study are not in agreement with the ethnic percentages of students actually enrolling and graduating from the programs.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

As indicated by responses in this study, the general level of satisfaction with the programs offered at SJSU was found to be very high. Respondents were found to have pursued and obtained employment in the mental health field in high percentages. These two findings reflect the overall general effectiveness and efficiency of the programs under study.

In conjunction with overall satisfaction, the programs were found to include material that was relevant and actually applicable in the graduates' placements in the mental health field. This finding is significant because it validates the programs content and emphasis.

Academically, it was found that ethics, individual psychotherapy, and family psychotherapy were the areas of greatest satisfaction for the respondents. Related to this finding, the clinical training and field placements were found to be highly useful in regard to professional development.

Additionally, a vast majority of the respondents rated the professional competency of the faculty at a very high level. This indicates that students' perceptions might support the assumption that a competent faculty would engender an effective and efficient program.

While statistics of this study show an overall and generally favorable view of the programs being evaluated, there were

consistent ratings of dissatisfaction in the areas of student guidance, student support and program administration. Specific concerns and greatest dissatisfaction related to the assistance received in internship and employment placements and career and curriculum advising. The consistently poor ratings in these very important components of the programs indicate that students' education is being hindered in this area.

Furthermore, the responses indicated unhappiness with coursework in several areas. Discontent was voiced by a high percentage of respondents in specific coursework offered in psychopathology, needs assessment, clinical diagnosis, and group psychotherapy. Graduates' answers to open-ended questions suggested an absence of coursework covering what they now perceive as crucial areas of knowledge needed in their eventual professional placements. These were specifically outlined in the descriptive portion of the survey as drug and alcohol dependency, severe mental illness, and child and adolescent psychotherapy. Finally, respondents indicated a lack of attention in the curriculum to the practical and business related aspects of clinical practice.

In summation this study indicates that the respondents to this survey found their educational experience at SJSU to be valuable and applicable to their future interest and employment requirements. Most respondents are now working in the mental health field. A high level of competency was found for the programs, faculty, support staff, and the educational experience as a whole, but within this framework there were also found to be some areas of concern. These

areas of concern are highlighted and suggestions are made for improvements in the following section.

Recommendations

Evaluation and study of the survey responses indicates that attention to the areas outlined in this section will enhance and improve the educational experience of the students in the Clinical/Counseling and the MFCC programs at SJSU. Specific recommendations are presented below.

Career and Curriculum Advising. This study strongly suggests that career and curriculum advising need improvement. A strong guidance program in career and curriculum is essential to developing students' full potential and maximizing their educational experience. This evaluation recommends the following changes to address the criticism from the alumni respondents.

It should be made clear that because the recommendations herein are drawn from the broad conclusions of this study and because of the high level of dissatisfaction of these responses, more in-depth review of the current advising system is warranted. For example, the differences in male and female dissatisfaction should be examined for validity.

Modifications in the areas of advising materials and faculty contact with students could be easily implemented and would hopefully yield substantial results. Clear and concise guidelines should be updated and kept current. The timeliness and clarity of

advising material is the cornerstone of any advising program. If this area can be effectively handled, the entire student experience is enhanced.

To improve dissemination of all materials among students, availability of written materials should be expanded to an on-line program. This resource would enhance and support, not replace, the interpersonal and individual advising. In the long run, more widely available and accurate written material should reduce miscommunication and time spent on clarifying small details, and should increase time available for one-on-one advising. Furthermore, creating more options for accessing information will result in reaching more students with up-to-date information.

Survey respondents indicated that they were frustrated by the limited time allotted for advising and expressed confusion about who was available for advising. These complaints suggest a combination of several potential problems that should be further explored. The core problem may be that the student need for advising has outstripped what the department can currently provide. Additional problems may stem from a breakdown in communication between faculty and students, which could be addressed through the improvement of materials recommended above.

Since respondents indicated favorable ratings for assistance received from support staff, these individuals should be included more in assisting students, if possible.

These recommendations are made with the goal of improving the career and curriculum advising so that students can plan

intelligently and with forethought, and so that they can take responsibility for their educational process more fully.

Internships and Employment Placements. The importance of internships and employment placements in developing professional competence cannot be understated. As such, the dissatisfaction with this area expressed by respondents necessitates that, as with career and curriculum counseling, placement procedures deserve further review. Based on the findings of this study, a recommendation is made to develop a "mentor/mentee" program not unlike the one established and functioning within the California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists. A mentor/mentee type program at SJSU would link willing and available second year students with incoming students. A mentor would be a source of guidance for possible placements and a resource for the internship process.

Central to developing successful internship and employment placements is the creation and maintenance of a historical and current database of student and graduate placements. As a general guide, the data collected in this study may provide a good source of general placement information. (Note: This is a possibility only as long as confidentiality of the respondents is not compromised). Additionally, it has been evidenced in other programs at other local universities that a more active participation and interaction on the part of instructors enhances and facilitates more internships and employment placements for students.

Coursework Needed. The respondents identified coursework that was missing or offered outside the program of study. Licensing requirements and employment demands in today's mental health field were areas of coursework judged by graduates to have extreme relevance but to be absent from the SJSU program. Furthermore, coursework in the areas of drug and alcohol dependence and child and adolescent counseling were also identified as important but missing from the program.

As society, funding, and field-of-interest trends and needs influence mental health, it is recommended that curriculum be modified to reflect these trends. Also, coursework should be evaluated, rated, and adjusted to accommodate both licensing requirements and actual applied needs in society and the marketplace.

Coursework Offered. To give optimal and equal attention to all possible negative findings in this study, those regarding coursework currently offered must be explored. Consistently, ratings averaged in the "Fair to Poor" range in the areas of psychopathology, needs assessment, clinical diagnosis, group psychotherapy, and doing/designing research. As these areas were specifically criticized over the six-year span of the students' experience at SJSU, the findings are judged to be relevant but beyond the scope of this study. It would be difficult to ascertain what factors were contributing to the level of dissatisfaction from this study alone. The survey questions were designed for a general analysis of the

program. Their greatest contribution in this area is in identifying the areas that warrant review.

Strengths and Limitations

The survey was successful in meeting the primary goal of providing a program evaluation based on graduates' perspectives of the Clinical Counseling and MFCC programs that can act as a feedback loop for evaluating the effectiveness of the graduate clinical psychology program at SJSU. The information obtained has provided a unique opportunity to evaluate, from the graduates' perspective, what in their training program was valuable and what areas were less valuable.

A second strength of the survey was that it provided, for the first time, information about graduates' pursuits and placements after graduation. Simply evaluating the students' satisfaction with their program of study is not enough. Knowing pursuits and placements in the field is key to evaluating whether a program is successful. As suggested earlier, this survey's findings on field placement and licensing could provide a foundation for a program of ongoing follow-up of SJSU graduates' professional and educational pursuits.

A third strength is the recommendations and suggestions for further study derived from survey results. In keeping with the decision making aspect of this evaluation, when appropriate, specific recommendations have been expressed. For example, the survey respondents indicated dissatisfaction with the level of training in

some specific areas (e.g., drug and alcohol dependence). The resulting recommendation was to incorporate curricula to meet the graduates' need for training in this identified area.

Several features of this study suggest that caution should be exercised in generalizing from the results. The first limitation that needs to be considered arises from the response rate. A response rate of 28% raises questions about how representative the sample can be judged to be. A second limitation of the present study that needs to be considered is the potential effects of response bias. It is possible that only alumni favorably disposed toward their training responded to the survey.

These factors impact the current findings and suggest caution be used in generalizing the results. Nonetheless, the study's results have provided information that can be useful in understanding alumni perspective and their subsequent activities in the field of psychology.

REFERENCES

- Clement, P.W. & Sartoris, P.C. (1967). Clinical students evaluate present APA approved training programs and make suggestions for changes. Journal Of Clinical Psychology, 23, 57-62.
- Chambers, D.B. & Holzemer, W.L. (1988). Validity and reliability of the graduate program self-assessment (GPSA) instruments for evaluating nursing doctoral education. San Francisco: University of California, San Francisco, School of Nursing. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 295 959)
- Cooper, R.G., Jr. (Ed.). (1989). Psychology department program review self-evaluation. Unpublished manuscript, San Jose State University, San Jose, CA.
- Coursey, R.D. (Ed.). (1977). Program Evaluation for mental health methods, strategies and participants. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Guydish, J., & Markley R. (1986). Evaluation of psychology training: A goal oriented approach. Evaluation and Program Planning, 8, 153-159.

- Harway, N., & Serafica, F. (1977). Issues in the evaluation of the psychology department clinic. Professional Psychology, 8, 650-658.
- Kelly, E., & Fiske, D. (1951). The prediction of performance in clinical psychology. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. (Reprinted by Greenwood Press, 1969).
- LaPidus, J. (1990). Academic review of graduate programs. Washington D.C.: Council of Graduate Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317 120)
- Levy, L. (1983). Evaluation of students in clinical psychology programs : A program evaluation perspective. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 14, 497-503.
- Schiller, M. (1982). An evaluation of the M.S. program in clinical-community psychology at SJSU. Unpublished master's thesis, San Jose State University, San Jose CA.
- Searight, R. (1990). The neglect of qualitative evaluation in psychology training : Issues and alternatives. Journal of Training and Practice in Professional Psychology, 4, 33-43.

- Stevenson, J., Norcross, J., King J., & Kevin, G. (1984). Evaluating clinical training programs : A formative effort. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 15, 218-229.
- Tripodi, T., Fellin, P., & Epstein, I. (1971). Social program evaluation. Itasca, IL : Peacock
- Tuckman, B.W. (1971). Conducting educational research. San Francisco: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Walfish, S., Kaufman, K., & Kinder, B. (1980). Graduate training in clinical psychology : A view from the consumer. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 36, 1040-1045.
- Weiss, S.L. (1975). The clinical psychology intern evaluates the training experience. Professional Psychology, 6, 435-441.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO GRADUATES

SJSU

1992 ALUMNI SURVEY

Dear

I would appreciate if you would take a moment to fill out the enclosed survey. As a graduate of one the Psychology Master's programs, your input is essential as we evaluate the effectiveness of your program. As a student myself in the M.S. Clinical program, I am conducting an internal evaluation of the M.S. Clinical/Counseling Program and M.S. Marriage, Family and Child Counseling Programs. I am interested in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the existing programs to aid current program development and planning

The Survey should take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Please do not disclose your identity on the questionnaire. A code number at the top of the first page will be matched with a master list for follow-up purposes. This master list will be destroyed before analyzing the data to ensure confidentiality. If you have any questions regarding the questionnaire, please contact me at (408) 354-7268. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Hilary Wogan

Second Year Graduate Student

M.S. Clinical Psychology Program

APPENDIX B

SJSU**1992 ALUMNI SURVEY**

Questionnaire for Graduates of the Clinical/Counseling Psychology Program and the
Marriage, Family and Child Counseling Program

BACKGROUND INFORMATION :

1. _____ Age
2. _____ Sex

3. _____ Ethnicity:
_____ Asian/Pacific American
_____ African-American
_____ Caucasian
_____ Hispanic
_____ Other
4. Which program were you enrolled in. Please check one.
_____ M.S. Clinical
_____ M.S. Counseling
_____ M.S. Marriage, Family and Child Counseling
5. _____ What year did you enter the program
6. _____ What year did you graduate

7. Did you complete :

_____ Thesis
_____ Special Project
_____ Comprehensive Examination

8. Thinking back to the time you were a master's student in this program, what was your primary purpose in pursuing the degree ?

Circle the one most important purpose :

Preparation for professional or technical practice
in the field.	1
Preparation for scholarly research or teaching	2
Preparation for future graduate study.	3
Updating or improvement of professional or
technical skills.	4
Qualifying for higher pay or job advancement.	5
Personal enrichment.	6
Other.	7

Please Specify : _____

9. Overall, how well do you think your master's degree program satisfied your primary purpose for enrollment, as indicated in the previous question ?

Excellent	1
Very Good	2
Fair	3
Poor	4

10. Approximately what overall grade point average did you receive in your program of study ?

All A's	(4.00)	1
A	(3.75-3.99)	2
A -	(3.50-3.74)	3
B+	(3.25-3.49)	4
B	(3.00-3.24)	5
B -	(2.75-2.99)	6
C+	(2.50-2.74)	7
C	(2.49 or below)	8

11. After Graduation which did you pursue ? Please check and/or answer any of the following that apply :

_____ Marriage Family and Child License

Number of attempts for Licensing :

_____ Written Exam

_____ Oral Exam

_____ Date License Received

_____ In the process of taking Licensing Exam

_____ PhD Program

(Please specify)

_____ Field of Study

_____ University

_____ Date Entered/Date completed

Other Educational or Professional Pursuits

12. Describe your work experience in the field of psychology after graduation :

Dates	Name of Setting	Position(Job Title)	Job Function
-------	-----------------	---------------------	--------------

13. Describe other work experience **not** in the field of psychology after graduation :

Dates	Name of Setting	Position(Job Title)	Job Function
-------	-----------------	---------------------	--------------

14. If you chose a professional avenue other than psychology, why was the choice made ?

If you need additional space for your response, feel free to use the back of this page.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT :

To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the program in which you studied ? Please give your opinion based on your best recollection of your master's level graduate school experiences. If an item below does not apply to your field, circle N.A. (not applicable).

Please circle one number only for each item.

RATINGS

N.A. - Not Applicable

1 - Strongly agree

2 - Agree

3 - Disagree

4 - Strongly disagree

NA 1 2 3 4 1. Faculty members were genuinely interested in the welfare and professional development of master's students.

NA 1 2 3 4 2. Some faculty members were genuinely interested in the welfare and professional development of master's students.

NA 1 2 3 4 3. Different scholarly points of view were encouraged.

NA 1 2 3 4 4. Some different scholarly points of view were encouraged.

NA 1 2 3 4 5. The department had a humane environment characterized by mutual respect between students and professors.

NA 1 2 3 4 6. I learned a great deal as a master's student in my program.

NA 1 2 3 4 7. I would advise a friend with similar interests to study in the program.

NA 1 2 3 4 8. The program coordinator was available for advising master's students.

Please specify Who the Coordinator was:

NA 1 2 3 4 9. The program coordinator actively helped graduates of the master's program find appropriate internship placements.

NA 1 2 3 4 10. The program faculty actively helped graduates of the master's program find appropriate internship placements.

Please Specify Who :

NA 1 2 3 4 11. The program coordinator helped graduates of the master's program find appropriate employment.

- NA 1 2 3 4 12. The program faculty helped graduates of the master's program find appropriate employment.

Please Specify Who :

- NA 1 2 3 4 13. Faculty members prepared carefully for their master's level courses.

- NA 1 2 3 4 14. If I were starting over, I would enroll in this master's program again.

- NA 1 2 3 4 15. The program provided me with very good preparation for my later professional work.

- NA 1 2 3 4 16. Core faculty members in your program of study worked together to achieve program goals.

- NA 1 2 3 4 17. The department chair was receptive to new ideas and ways of doing things.

- NA 1 2 3 4 18. The program coordinator was receptive to new ideas and ways of doing things.

- NA 1 2 3 4 19. The program faculty were receptive to new ideas and ways of doing things.

- NA 1 2 3 4 20. There was good communication between faculty and master's students regarding student needs, concerns, and suggestions.
- NA 1 2 3 4 21. There were many opportunities outside the classroom for interaction between master's students and program coordinator.
- NA 1 2 3 4 22. There were many opportunities outside the classroom for interaction between master's students and the program faculty.
- NA 1 2 3 4 23. The department was an intellectually stimulating place in which to study.
- NA 1 2 3 4 24. Classes optimal size for learning.
25. If not optimal, were classes :
 _____ Too Small
 _____ Too Large
 If too large, which classes ?

How would you rate your graduate department's faculty and your master's level program? If an item below does not apply to your field, circle NA (not applicable).

Please circle one number only for each item.

RATINGS

NA - Not Applicable

1 - Excellent

2 - Very Good

3 - Fair

4 - Poor

NA 1 2 3 4 26. Intellectual environment.

NA 1 2 3 4 27. Curricular and career advising.

NA 1 2 3 4 28. Agreement between degree requirements and stated objectives of the program.

NA 1 2 3 4 29. University library holding relevant to your field.

NA 1 2 3 4 30. Specialized facilities, such as laboratories, studios, and equipment needed for teaching and creative work in your field.

NA	1	2	3	4	31.	Overall adequacy of space and other facilities for classes and administration.
NA	1	2	3	4	32.	Scholarly and professional competency of the graduate faculty in the program/department.
NA	1	2	3	4	33.	Frequency with which courses listed in catalog were offered.
NA	1	2	3	4	34.	Scholarly and professional promise of master's students who were in the program/department.
NA	1	2	3	4	35.	Opportunities for student participation in departmental decisions that affected your master's level program.
NA	1	2	3	4	36.	Relevance of degree requirements to your work in the field.
NA	1	2	3	4	37.	Evaluation procedures used in graduate courses (e.g. grades, papers).
NA	1	2	3	4	38.	Teaching methods used in graduate courses (e.g. lectures, seminars, audiovisual aids).
NA	1	2	3	4	39.	Accessibility of program coordinator to master's students.
NA	1	2	3	4	40.	Accessibility of program faculty to master's students.

NA	1	2	3	4	41.	Variety of master's level courses and program offerings.
NA	1	2	3	4	42.	Depth in subject matter of master's level course and program offerings.
NA	1	2	3	4	43.	Flexibility of the program to meet the needs of individual master's students.
NA	1	2	3	4	44.	Opportunities for master's students to pursue individual projects.
NA	1	2	3	4	45.	Evaluation of master's students progress towards degree.
NA	1	2	3	4	46.	Evaluation of the professional competency of master's students.
NA	1	2	3	4	47.	Psychology department's commitment to the program.
NA	1	2	3	4	48.	Useful faculty criticism of your work.
NA	1	2	3	4	49.	Faculty helpfulness in dealing with class work.
NA	1	2	3	4	50.	Faculty awareness of new developments in your field.

- NA 1 2 3 4 51. Overall adequacy of financial resources in support of the master's program in your field.
- NA 1 2 3 4 52. Interaction between the program and related disciplines or programs on the campus.
- NA 1 2 3 4 53. Number of support and clerical staff (including student assistants) in department/program.
- NA 1 2 3 4 54. Quality of support and clerical staff.

How would you rate your academic course work as part of your master's level program ?

Please give your opinion based on your best recollection of your master's level graduate school experiences. If an item below does not apply to your field, circle NA (not applicable). **Please circle one number only for each item.**

RATINGS

NA - Not Applicable

1 - Excellent

2 - Very Good

3 - Fair

4 - Poor

- NA 1 2 3 4 55. Understanding of psychopathology.

- NA 1 2 3 4 56. Individual Psychotherapy.
- NA 1 2 3 4 57. Family Psychotherapy
- NA 1 2 3 4 58. Group Psychotherapy.
- NA 1 2 3 4 59. Cross-cultural counseling.
- NA 1 2 3 4 60. Clinical diagnosis.
- NA 1 2 3 4 61. Needs assessment.
- NA 1 2 3 4 62. Cross-cultural sensitivity/awareness.
- NA 1 2 3 4 63. Professional ethics.
- NA 1 2 3 4 64. Designing and doing psychological research.

How would you rate your family clinic, fieldwork and pre-marital counseling experiences as part of your master's level program ? If an item below does not apply to your field, circle NA (not applicable). **Please circle one number only for each item.**

RATINGS

NA - Not Applicable

1 - Excellent

2 - Very Good

3 - Fair

4 - Poor

FAMILY CLINIC

NA 1 2 3 4 65. Program training to prepare you for the family clinic experience.

NA 1 2 3 4 66. Contribution of the family clinic experience to your academic development.

NA 1 2 3 4 67. Opportunities to practice your professional skills.

NA 1 2 3 4 68. Variety of assignments or activities.

NA 1 2 3 4 69. Supervision you received in the family clinic.

Please Specify Supervisor :

(Were they faculty member or Teach Assistant)

NA 1 2 3 4 70. Office space and equipment available for your use.

FIELDWORK

NA 1 2 3 4 71. Program training to prepare you for the fieldwork experience.

NA 1 2 3 4 72. Contribution of the fieldwork experience to your academic development.

NA 1 2 3 4 73. Opportunities to practice your professional skills.

NA 1 2 3 4 74. Variety of assignments or activities.

NA 1 2 3 4 75. Supervision in fieldwork class that you received during your fieldwork placement.

Please Specify Supervision :

NA 1 2 3 4 76. Supervision in your placement that you received during your fieldwork placement.

Please Specify Supervisor :

NA 1 2 3 4 77. Office space and equipment available for your use.

PRE-MARITAL COUNSELING

- NA 1 2 3 4 78. Program training to prepare you for the pre-marital counseling experience.
- NA 1 2 3 4 79. Contribution of the pre-marital counseling experience to your academic development.
- NA 1 2 3 4 80. Opportunities to practice your professional skills.
- NA 1 2 3 4 81. Variety of assignments or activities.
- NA 1 2 3 4 82. Supervision you receive in pre-marital counseling.
Please Specify Supervisor :
- NA 1 2 3 4 83. Office space and equipment available for your use.

Please list and rate any components of your program of study that you believe are relevant that were not covered in this survey.

RATINGS

NA - Not Applicable

1 - Excellent

2 - Very Good

3 - Fair

4 - Poor

Rating Scale

Relevant Program Component

NA 1 2 3 4 1.

NA 1 2 3 4 2.

OVERALL EVALUATION

The final portion of the survey is an opportunity for you to give feedback about any of the above questions. When answering a question already stated in the survey please indicate which question you are referring to. In addition, there are a few general questions to collect qualitative feedback about your program of study. The goal in this last section is to obtain your perceptions of the effectiveness of the program and to provide evaluative information for future students in your program.

84. How good was your master's program overall preparation for your internship and fieldwork placement ?

85. How would you rate your master's program overall preparation for your employment experience after graduation ?
86. To what extent did your first position after your master's degree make use of the training you received in your program ?
87. To what extent does your present position make use of the training your received in your program ?

88. Do you consider yourself under employed in your present position because it is not in your field or not consistent with your level of training and experience ?

Why ?

89. Do you have any feedback about specific instructors in your program ?

90. Do you have any suggestions or comments about areas for improvement, in your program of study, that would better meet the needs of students in their academic and professional development ?

APPENDIX C

Table 25

Description and Number of Placements in the Community

Placements	No. responses
Children, Adolescents, and Families	
Adolescent Residential Treatment	1
Adult And Child Guidance	2
Almaden Valley Youth Counseling	1
Alum Rock School District	2
Aspira Foster Family Services	1
Bridge Counseling Center	2
Campbell Union School District	1
Children's Counseling Center	1
County Adolescent Day Treatment	1
Families First	1
Gierretto Institute	1
Institute for Community as Extended Family	1
Kids are Special	3
LynnBrook High	1
Pacific Center	1
Palamors Group Home	1

Table 25

Description and Number of Placements in the Community

Placements	No. responses
Children, Adolescents, and Families	
Problem Pregnancy Help	1
P.V.P.S.A. Middle School	1
San Andreas Regional Center	1
Sarsee Elementary School	1
Teen Center	1
Zanta's Children Center	1
Total	27
Drug & Alcohol Programs	
Bureau of Alcohol Services	1
Central Alcohol	2
Chemical Dependency Institute	3
CPC Sierra Vista Hospital	1
Star Lodge Hospital	1
West Valley Alcohol Services	2
Total	10
General Therapy	
Alum Rock Counseling Center	1
Advance	1
Catholic Charities	1

Table 25

Description and Number of Placements in the Community

Placements	No. responses
General Therapy	
Center for Human Development	2
Family Services	2
Miramonte Mental Health	1
The Center	1
Valley Community Counseling Services	1
Total	10
Hospitals	
CPC Sierra Vista Hospital	1
El Camino Hospital	1
General Therapy	
Alum Rock Counseling Center	1
Avance	1
Catholic Charities	1
Center for Human Development	2
Family Services	2
Miramonte Mental Health	1
The Center	1
Valley Community Counseling Services	1
Total	10

Table 25

Description and Number of Placements in the Community

Placements	No. responses
Hospitals	
CPC Sierra Vista Hospital	1
El Camino Hospital	1
Oak Creek Hospital	1
Medical School	1
Merrithew Hospital	1
Mid-Peninsula Hospitals	1
Mills Peninsula Hospital	1
Mission Oaks Hospital	1
VA Hospital	1
Total	9
Private Practice	
Alliance Counseling Center	1
Private Practice	8
Total	9
University and College Settings	
Cabrillo College	1
Evergreen Valley Community College	1
Pacific Graduate School of Psychology	1
San Jose City College	2

Table 25

Description and Number of Placements in the Community

Placements	No. responses
University and College Settings	
San Jose State University	3
Stanford University	1
Total	9
County Mental Health	
Central Mental Health	2
South County Mental Health	1
West Valley Mental Health	4
Total	7
Domestic Violence	
Domestic Violence Project	1
Midpenninsula Support Network	1
Next Door	3
South County Alternatives	2
Total	7
Related Areas in the Field of Psychology and/or Mental Health	
Alzheimer's Center	1
Community Health Awareness Council	1
Growth & Leadership Center	1
Mental Research Institute	1

Table 25

Description and Number of Placements in the Community

Placements	No. responses
Related Areas in the Field of Psychology and/or Mental Health	
Private Non-Profit Housing Agency	1
Total	5
Teaching	
San Jose State University	1
San Jose City College	1
Total	2
Decline to State	5