**2023-24 Annual Program Review Form (Antioch University New England)**

1. **Program(s) Identification**

Please select from the dropdown menu below your school, division or department (if applicable), degree type, and program on which you are reporting for the annual program review. If you are reporting on more than one degree type and program for the annual program review, please make those selections using the additional dropdown menu options indicated below.

* 1. **School:** Counseling, Psychology and Therapy
  2. **Division or Department** (if applicable)**:** Counseling

Semester Based CMHC -Previously Known as AUNE CMHC

* 1. **Degree Type(s):**  MASelect oneSelect oneSelect one

**Program(s):**  Counseling/Clinical Mental Health CounselingSelect one Select one MA Clinical Mental Health Counseling

MA Clinical Mental Health Counseling, Addiction Concentration

MA Clinical Mental Health Counseling, Art Therapy Concentration

MA Clinical Mental Health Counseling, Trauma Concentration

* 1. **Program(s) Chair(s) Name(s):** Kalesha Jenkins, Low Residential Chair, and Misty Grant, Residential Chair

**Outcome and Accreditation Chair:** Porshia Daniels

1. **Cycle of Inquiry Progress from Last Year (2022-23)**

All academic programs engage in cycles of inquiry as described in the [*Academic Assessment System & Program Review Manual*](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1of7IPdU9WgCgEwkRrXaNXuPx8blrlIue/view) (the process is described on pages 9 and 10; academic assessment definitions are provided on pages 5 and 6).

This section is for reporting on your program’s progress on **last year’s** annual program review cycle of inquiry. (Note: This is what you submitted October 31, 2023.)

1. Identify the critical question(s) about student learning under investigation from the last cycle of inquiry.
   * 1. Continued from Last Year: How can we continue with integrating intentional curricula and practice on Applied Advocacy into our program?
     2. How can we support students to engage in community and national advocacy practice?
     3. How can we increase student & faculty understanding of microaggressions and reduce the occurrence of these in classes, meetings, and department communication?
2. Describe why this inquiry was a priority. Previous report indicated continuance of previous cycle inquiries pertaining to Applied Advocacy and Social Justice Advocacy which included decreasing microaggressions within AUNE. Further these advocacy and social justice effort aligns with the CACREP standard “Advocacy processes needed to address institutional and social barriers hat impede access, equity and success for client.” While the AUNE CMHC program integration into the new Counseling Division, mitigation of previous critical inquiries was warranted to navigate into the newly appointed Collaborative Leadership mission. Since past review cycle, Counseling Division (AUNE and Seattle) have been undergone a collaborative leadership transition. This transition included the merger of both campuses (Seattle and AUNE) and all programs with the integration of social justice philosophies into its newly integrated Counseling Division. As previously indicated of both AUNE and Seattle, a pivotal component of the programs is social justice. However, there are many philosophies and ideologies that can be integrated into this perspective. Seattle focused on the practical and applicable foundations of social justice at various socioecological layers. This includes the individual to the macro/institutional levels. New England on the other hand, focused on the theoretical/ideological foundations to support student’s understanding and engagement of these topics. Though, neither are right or wrong in approaching injustice, it ultimately has demonstrated how injustice effects all. This brings in a pivotal factor that situates both campuses for sustainability. It is important to note that social justice work needs to be done from diverse perspectives for sustainability. Thus, this merger into one division challenges the infrastructure needs to support these perspectives **simultaneously**.

Over the past year, the Counseling Division has implemented the Collaborative Leadership council to enhance the collaborative social justice philosophy and ideology within the inclusion of both campuses and its programs. Thus, the goal is to integrate perspectives for the suitability and sustainability of all, faculty, staff and students. Over the course of the next 5 years, the new leadership structure will implement a new foundation for sustaining all these working pieces pertaining to social justice efforts. Thus, this program review(s) are indicative of where we (AUNE and Seattle) were and intend to go over the next 5 years. These program reviews will reflect such endeavors.

1. Report what you learned and what action steps you took in response to the results. Include any analysis, graph, chart, or figure that helps to communicate the results.

Direct Evaluation Methods of Summer 2024 Faculty Evaluations were utilized to determine implementation of social justice and advocacy effectiveness and its incorporation into curriculum. Three qualitative questions (indicated below) in the faculty evaluations were used to create nominal data to investigate the prevalence of social justice and advocacy in the summer courses. The questions identified core elements from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge Scale (MCAKS): Awareness, Knowledge, Skills and Action. This identified factors to determine the implementation of social justice and advocacy efforts. To do so, if a factor was discussed, it was counted.

These questions were primarily used for the alignment of the Multicultural Social Justice Counseling Competencies, which indicates counselors and counselor educators being competent in awareness and advocating for diverse individuals and communities (Ratts et al., 2016). Through investigating the three questions in the faculty evaluations the following results were identified:

Out of the five identified factors, knowledge and awareness were highly evident in the courses. Indicating that the curriculum aligns with social justice and advocacy efforts. Students discussed that most courses had a good balance of such information in their courses. Students notes feeling professors were quite knowledgeable in these areas and felt confident in discussing diversity content within their course. It is important to note that a foundational component of social justice and advocacy work is awareness and knowledge (Lee, 2012). Further without a strong foundation advocacy effort are often sparse and less targeted. Skills were indicated in the evaluations. Students described several assignments aligned eloquently with demonstrating their skills in social justice content. Skills can contribute to building actionable steps towards improving injustice (Ratts et. Al, 20. Thus, this is a good indicator for setting a precedence of skills to determine the direction of incorporating more actionable social justice frameworks to the curriculum. The last factor that was discussed in the evaluations was cultural humility. Though this factor is not part of the MSCAKS scale, it is important to note that students indicated the presence of cultural humility in their courses. A prevalence of cultural humility supports a reduction of unconscious bias (Atkins & Lorelle, 2022).

These results show that the program’s efforts to integrate intentional curricula is evident within the classroom. Thus, critical questions 1 and 2 were evident in the faculty evaluations. Having cultural humility in the classroom, critical question 3, pertaining to microaggressions can start to be examined and decreased. Thus, when social justice and advocacy efforts increases, unconscious bias and microaggression can be decreased.



Faculty Evaluation Questions:

Question No. 1. Please comment on the attention to issues of diversity, equity and inclusion in the course content (e.g. age disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, language, national origin, race, religion, culture, sexual orientation, and/or socioeconomic status.)

Question No. 2. Please comment on the awareness, knowledge and/or skills of faculty in addressing issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion between and among faculty and students (including divergent opinions and/or difficult and sensitive subjects).

Question No. 3. Please make recommendations or suggestions that could bring Social Justice concepts to the class/classroom.

1. List resources you received or used and list what you continue to need to implement recommendations based on your analysis of last year’s cycle of inquiry.

Based off of last year’s cycle and aligning with the collaborative leadership model, the program will continue to put time and allocate funds to professional development and trainings. As to date, the division is providing space for various faculty and staff trainings to update all faculty for the support of the students for their growth, competency and development.

**III. Core Attributes**

The **core attributes are the institutional learning outcomes** shared across school and programs that were developed by faculty in 2018. As a part of academic assessment and in the service of identifying the essential elements shared by Antioch programs, faculty mapped core attributes to program-level student learning outcomes for the 2018-19 annual program review cycle of inquiry. It is time to revisit the core attributes in relation to PLOs and reinvigorate the conversation for how these attributes of an Antiochian education permeate student learning at the program level.

These can be found on the Antioch University Academic Assessment webpage, in the Academic Assessment System & Program Review Manual (page 4), and in the Antioch University Catalog.

**Self.** Antioch University students attain the knowledge and critical skills of their disciplines to develop themselves personally and professionally. Students actively reflect upon those acquired knowledge and skills, as well as their own and others’ values, biases, and behaviors.

**Community.** Antioch University students develop social and cultural responsiveness through participation in academic, civic, and professional communities. Students recognize the diverse perspectives and relational dynamics necessary to be effective community members.

**Action.** Antioch University students apply the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind acquired through their studies. By anchoring their professional goals in social responsibility, students take actions that advance justice and lead to positive change.

1. Please update your **program’s curriculum map, connecting the PLOs to the three core attributes** and identifying the learning outcome that allows students to demonstrate their achievement. Use the following [**curriculum and core attributes mapping template**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nHyQDte3b7TuK3rTHZ_pZHMf1GrZdh4q/edit) and submit with this completed report. **Note:** **Make a copy of the template to use as your own.**  **If you are reporting on multiple programs, please make multiple copies of the template using one copy per program. Do not directly type into the template linked above.**
2. What **evidence of students achieving one or more of the Core Attributes** does your program’s assessment of student learning from the last few years demonstrate? **Note:** evidence can include specific analysis derived from prior years’ cycles of inquiry.

**IV. Reflection & Plans for This Year’s Cycle of Inquiry (2023-24)**

This section is for reporting on your program’s critical question(s) for **this year’s** annual program review cycle of inquiry. This year, instead of developing a critical question on any area of interest as you’ve done in the past, we ask you to come up with a critical question that is **directly tied to student learning outcomes**.

1. Identify the **critical question(s) about student learning outcomes** that you plan to investigate for this year’s cycle of inquiry:
   * 1. How does the curriculum integrate and assess students' understanding of intersectionality and its relevance to social and racial justice?
     2. In what ways does the program facilitate student reflection on personal biases and values, and how does this influence their engagement with diverse communities?
     3. How are the program's learning outcomes fostering students' ability to advocate for marginalized populations in their future professional roles?
2. Describe why this inquiry is a priority: The identified critical questions about student learning outcomes inquiry are a priority and best described through the following components:
   * 1. Alignment with CACREP standards for Advocacy
     2. Integration of Counseling Divisions
     3. Social Justice Mission across Programs
3. Discuss how this year's critical question about a student learning outcome connects to at least one of the three **core attributes** and will allow the program to evaluate student achievement of the attribute(s): This year’s critical questions about student learning outcomes are in alignment with the following core attributes:
   * 1. Social Justice Mission and Ideology
     2. Collaborative Leadership Model
     3. Counseling Division
4. Identify the **direct and indirect data collection methods** you plan to use: The direct and indirect data collection methods include but are not limited to aggregated statistical software to illustrate nominal data of identified factors.
5. Identify **planned action steps** for the coming year’s cycle of inquiry: The planned action steps of this year’s cycle of inquiry include the following:
   * 1. Maximize the collaborative leadership model
     2. Integrate faculty perspectives
     3. Infuse data driven methods into program reviews
     4. Integrate results of alumni surveys
6. List **resources** needed to complete the inquiry: At this time, the identified resources include support of professional development funds across faculty and furthered connections with alumni populations of the programs. Additional resources will continue to be supported through faculty shared perspectives and student needs.

**V. Co-curricular Activity**

Use this section to share learning that students demonstrated through co-curricular activities. Examples are provided in [*Antioch definition and assessment of co-curricular activity*](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hNPD6uIYJ282V3o-7E6SCIXkInhLhswR3xGF-Z38ocE/edit?usp=sharing), and the following is how Antioch defines co-curricular activities (this definition is also provided on page 6 of the manual and can be found in the link above):

* Sponsored by the university, location, or program,
* Non-credited,
* Voluntary, and
* Supportive of program learning outcomes or core attributes.
  1. What, if any, co-curricular activities did your program offer since the last annual program review?

1. SPECTRUM: Support meetings for student members of the LGBTQIA+ community. Meetings focused on the current political climate and legislative attacks on the LGBTQIA+ community.
2. First Year Student Experience: 90-minute meetings spread out across the entire semester for first semester students. Meetings were designed to introduce students to the department and the counseling profession. Examples of topics include, but are not limited to: counselor development, introduction to social justice, self-care, and library/writing center resources.
3. Counseling Skills Practice: 90-minute meetings held in the weeks leading up to residency. Meetings gave students the opportunity to practice and receive feedback on their skills.
4. Licensure Exam Preparation: 90-minute informational meetings held each semester to help students prepare for their state required exams for becoming a licensed counselor.
5. Graduating Student Q&A: Initiated in the Fall of 2023, 60-minute meetings intended to mentor and support graduating students who will soon join the profession.
6. Private Practice Conversations: 90-minute meetings focused on the ethical, practical, and economic consideration in opening a private counseling practice.
7. Chi Sigma Iota: Provided continued opportunities for students to increase awareness, knowledge, and application of advocacy in collaboration with workshops.
8. Counselors for Social Justice: Provided advocacy workshops that increased social justice efforts.
9. Latinx Mental Health and Social Justice Institute: Through different activities such as a webinar series, the annual symposium, and the institute’s website itself, the institute offers information about opportunities for advocacy and creates opportunities for Latinx/e professionals to share their expertise, work, and voices.
   1. Were student learning outcomes or core attributes assessed? Previous APR indicated that student learning outcomes were to be assessed in relation to co-curricular activities. The program continues to support student advocacy efforts in and outside the classroom.
   2. If student learning outcomes or core attributes were assessed, what direct or indirect methods were used for assessment? How effective was the activity in supporting student learning or fostering any of the core attributes? Previous APR indicated SLOs were assessed through indirect methods and were essential to the learning environment and increasing a cohesive community within the department and university. Student engaged in various activities such as CSI and CSJ. Both co-curricular activities have improved engagement amongst students. Students incorporated the knowledge they were using in the classroom pertaining to social justice and advocacy and initiated advocacy workshops and presentations in the program.
   3. What would you plan for future events based on this information?

Continued support for student led to opportunities that increases awareness, knowledge and action regarding social justice and advocacy.

**VI. Student Data Analysis & Plan**

Enrollment, Persistence, & Completion Data**.**

1. Analyze and describe the enrollment, persistence, and completion data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE).
   * 1. Describe any important patterns or trends: The following important patterns and trends were identified in the annual program review data:
        1. Combined graduated and active student totals are higher than withdrawn student data
        2. Completion rates in the Clinical Mental Health Counseling program are higher than withdrawal rates
     2. Identify any program plans as a result of the enrollment data analysis, particularly in response to the noted patterns or trends described: Program plans of the identified patterns and trends will be supported in future collaborations.

**VII.** [**Program Profile**](http://programprofile.antioch.edu/ProgramProfile#/home) **Updates**

1. Please update/add the following documents to your program profile:
   1. Program Outcomes: Not Applicable
   2. Student Learning Outcomes: Not Applicable
   3. [Curriculum & Core Attributes Maps](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nHyQDte3b7TuK3rTHZ_pZHMf1GrZdh4q/edit) (showing how student learning outcomes are taught and assessed within a curriculum including where Antioch’s Core Attributes (see section III. above) intersect in the curriculum): **Please see attached Semester Based CMHC Curriculum Matrix**
   4. Evaluation Rubrics (for various learning experiences and assignments) (please see examples listed below under Resources): Not Applicable
   5. Finalized Annual Program Review Report **(this document)**
2. Please indicate if any of the above materials could not be updated to the Program Profile: Google Drive is not accessible at this time to share program profiles.

# 

# **ANNUAL PROGRAM REVIEW FEEDBACK RUBRIC**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** Select oneSelect oneSelect one | | **Degree Type:** Select oneSelect one | **Dean:** |
| **School:** Select one | **Div/Dept** (if applicable)**:** Select One | **Program Chair:** | **Academic Year:** 2023-2024 |
| **1 = Standard Not Met 2 = Standard Partially Met 3 = Standard Met 4 = Exceeds Standard Expectations** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria**  ***Standard for this Area of the APR*** | ***1*** | ***2*** | ***3*** | ***4*** | ***N/A*** | **Feedback** |
| **Results from Prior Cycle of Inquiry (Section II.)** | | | | | | |
| Results are documented, analyzed, and clearly described.  (Skip if this is the first cycle of inquiry for the program or if this cycle has not yet gotten to results.) (II.c.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Realistic action steps and resource needs are identified based on results.  (Skip if this is the first cycle of inquiry for the program.) (II.c.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Co-Curricular Activities & Core Attributes (Sections III. & V.)** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria**  ***Standard for this Area of the APR*** | ***1*** | ***2*** | ***3*** | ***4*** | ***N/A*** | **Feedback** |
| Core Attribute(s) is clearly evident in the stated student learning achievement assessed by the program. (III.b.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direct and indirect data methods are used or planned to be used to examine student learning in the context of the co-curricular activities described. (V.c.)  (Skip if this is not relevant to the program.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Proposed Cycle of Inquiry & Critical Question(s) (Section IV.)** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria**  ***Standard for this Area of the APR*** | ***1*** | ***2*** | ***3*** | ***4*** | ***N/A*** | **Feedback** |
| Critical question(s) is addressable through empirical evidence. ( IV.a.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical question(s) directly relates to program-level assessment of student learning outcomes. (IV.a.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical question(s) about a student learning outcome clearly connects to at least one of the three core attributes (IV.c.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multiple direct and indirect data methods are used or planned to be used to examine the critical question(s). (IV.d.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action steps clearly outlined and tied to the critical question(s). (IV.e.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resource needs are clearly linked to the critical question(s). (IV.f.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1 = Standard Not Met 2 = Standard Partially Met 3 = Standard Met 4 = Exceeds Standard Expectations** | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Dean & Program Alignment with the APR Report**  **(Section IV. e. & f. & Section VI.)** | | |
| **Areas of Concern or Divergence\*** | **Criteria**  ***Areas where Dean and Program should achieve sufficient alignment to take appropriate action, provide needed resources, and be responsive to trends in the program’s student data.*** | **Areas of Support & Next Steps** |
|  | The dean supports the program’s identification of action steps between now and the next annual program review. (IV.e.) |  |
|  | The dean supports the program’s resource recommendations and requests. (IV.f.) |  |
|  | The dean supports the program’s reflections and analysis of student data (enrollments, persistence, & completion). (Section VI.) |  |
| **Summary & Action Steps (including resource allocations):** | | |

**\*Please discuss with the program chair to address any areas of growth or recommendations and to discuss areas within the analysis where there is not sufficient agreement or there are concerns. The hope is that active discussion between the dean and programs will foster growth, collaboration, and meaningful action steps including appropriate resource allocations for programs.**

**Dean Name: Dean Signature: Date:**

**Program Chair Name: Program Chair Signature: Date:**