

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: __Human Development and Family Studies_____ **Contact Name and Email** _____Anthony Walker
 Anthony.Walker@indstate.edu_____

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?	b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
1. Outcome 1: Identify and describe historical and current demographic, social, and cultural trends in families.	(1) Application Activities (2) AHS 336 Family Relationships taught by Dr. Walker in Fall of 15. A second section was taught by an adjunct who did not allow access to her course.	80% of students complete the measure with an 82% or higher.	On only 2 of 7 application activities did 80% of students reach or exceed 82% (36/43 or 84% and 38/43 or 88%).	(1) Anthony Walker (2) They have been emailed to all program faculty and will be discussed in an upcoming program meeting.
2. Outcome 2: Apply principles of family dynamics to novel case studies.	(1) Theory Reflection Questions (2) 2 AHS 309 Applied Theory in Family and Consumer Sciences courses taught by Dr. Walker and Dr. Behrendt Spring 16.	80% of students complete the measure with an 82% or higher	In Dr. Walker's Section, students met the established measure on 2 of a possible 10 assignments (38/44 or 86% and 39/44 or 89%). In Dr. Behrendt's section, students met the established measure on 3 of a possible 10 assignments (39/41 or 95%, 36/41 or 88% and 35/41 or 85%).	(1) Anthony Walker and Linda Behrendt (2) They have been emailed to all program faculty and will be discussed in an upcoming program meeting.

If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

Program Assessment Summary Report

- 1) Discoveries for AHS 336: Family Relationships. First, based on reported information, most students are not meeting the established standard of 80% earning an 82% or higher, with only 2 of a possible 7 reaching that expectation. A closer look at the reported performance data shows two issues: attendance and measurement. The assignments used to address this particular outcome are based on in-class assignments. If students are absent and fail to make up the assignment then that behavior will adversely affect meeting the expected standards. For AHS 336, this does appear to be the case, as when the zeros, representing assignments not turned in due to being absent, are removed, performance increases resulting in 5 of 7 measures meeting the expected standard. A second issue is intertwined with the 82% standard and the rubric used for grading the assignments designated for assessment. Specifically, the rubric that I use in 336 commonly provides a grade of exactly 8/10 if a student errors in the content of their answers, just below the 82% mark. Looking at the data shows that if the 8s are included as meeting the standard that would result in 5 of 7 measures meeting the expected standard.

Discoveries for AHS 309: Applied Theory in Family and Consumer Sciences. Only 5 of a possible 20 measures (25%) met the expected standard. The only cross-over, meaning students from both sections met the standard with the same Chapter, came with review questions based on Family Systems Theory. This may reflect the clinical and academic training in Marriage and Family Therapy that instructors in both sections bring to the table. Using more extensive data from Dr. Walker's class, the performance issues that were present in AHS 336 also were present in AHS 309. Specifically, when scores of 8 are counted as meeting the 82% standard, the number of assignments meeting that standard rises to 7/10 or 10 of 20 (50%). Although these assignments were due before class started, rather than in class, missing assignments did have an impact. Specifically, if the zeros are removed from the denominator, the standard is then met by 4/10.

- 2) Changes or improvements: AHS 336. It seems apparent that a few changes could improve student performance and measurement. Specifically, a conversation regarding the 82% standard is warranted. If the intention is to capture students obtaining a B-, then it seems 80% would suffice. If it is decided that the 82% standard is not arbitrary, then Dr. Walker can revisit his grading rubric to be more sensitive to student performance. The current attendance policy in AHS 336 used both positive and negative reinforcement. If students miss only a few days during the semester they are awarded with an attendance bump to their final grade at the end of the class. If they miss a few more they lose the bump. If they miss 6 or more they fail the class. Perhaps the attendance policy needs to be adjusted to make in-class activity days mandatory. For AHS 309, at least in Dr. Walker's section, adjusting either the grading rubric or the 82% standard would improve measurement. The attendance policy in Dr. Walker's section is every day counts towards your grade and 6 or more absences means automatic failure.

Overall, it would benefit the HDFS program if the assessment plan and what outcomes will be measured must be shared with all program faculty, including adjuncts, before class starts to insure buy-in and later access to relevant data. It would also be beneficial to review attendance/absence policies as they relate to student success in the classroom.

- 3) Currently the assessment plan has outcome 4, describe physiological, social, personal and moral aspects of human sexuality and outcome 5, account for the role of interpersonal skills in family dynamics scheduled to be assessed in both Fall 16 and Spring 17. The specific course listed as the source of assessment is AHS 336 Family Relationships, for both. However, given the attendance and measurement issues related to AHS 336, it may be useful to expand the sources of data for assessment to AHS 237, AHS 238, and /or AHS 305 for outcome one and AHS 145, 301, and 436 for outcome 5.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BS in Human Development and Family Studies Date: 7.26.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are student-centered. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program outcomes that and span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were

				assessed in this cycle.
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.

				<input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process. <input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed. <input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not clear and/or do not clearly connect to the results.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important

	plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<p>stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. Learning Outcomes

The two outcomes listed in the report are clear and measurable. The curriculum map indicates that there is appropriate coverage of most outcomes. Do the outcomes included in the outcomes library require students to employ sufficient higher-order skills? (analyze, evaluate, reflect...)

2. Measures & Performance Goals

Not enough detail is provided about the two assessment methods (application activities and theory reflection questions) for me to know for certain that they are appropriate to the outcomes. What do these activities entail? How are they evaluated? As your comments in Part Two suggest, the performance expectations may be ambitious, given the actual results.

3. Results

That students are not meeting the expectations set for them is not necessarily reason for concern so long as you can identify the causes of the low performance and take action to correct them. Beyond the numerical results, what specifically do you know about what students do and don't know, can and cannot do? Are you collecting sufficient information to improve student learning? Do include a link to your scoring rubric(s) in your next report so that I will have a better understanding of the specific traits and abilities that are being assessed.

4. Engagement & Improvement

Two faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing data, and there are plans to discuss it with the faculty as a whole. Do conversations about student learning/assessment occur regularly? Have the plans reported here (e.g., adjusting the attendance policy, revising the rubric, expanding participation in assessment) been shared and discussed? Do you have other plans that pertain more specifically to improving student learning (based on what you've learned about what students do and don't know, can and cannot do)?

Thanks for sharing this information about your assessment program. I look forward to learning more next year!