

<NAME OF YOUR PROGRAM/DEPARTMENT/MAJOR OR MINOR>

ASSESSMENT REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR 2017 – 2018
REPORT DUE DATE: 10/26/2018

Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences. Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated.

Note: Dear Colleagues: In an effort to produce a more streamlined and less repetitive assessment report format, we are piloting this modified template for the present annual assessment cycle. We are requesting an assessment report that would not exceed eight pages of text. Supporting materials may be appended. We will be soliciting your feedback on the report as we attempt to make it more user-friendly.

Some useful contacts:

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCCD, Arts – adamati@usfca.edu
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCCD, Sciences – lendvay@usfca.edu
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCCD, Humanities – meritt@usfca.edu
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCCD, Social Sciences – mrjonas@usfca.edu
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – schakraborty2@usfca.edu
6. Ms. Corie Schwabenland, Academic Data & Assessment Specialist- ceschwabenland@usfca.edu

Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment>

Email to submit the report: assessment_cas@usfca.edu

Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line.

For example: FineArts_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor); FineArts_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)

I. LOGISTICS & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Interdisciplinary Minor in Child and Youth Studies (CHYS)

Minor

Interdisciplinary

Submitted by Dr. Allison Thorson - Director CHYS / Department of Communication Studies FT faculty

Please send feedback to athorson@usfca.edu

2. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor program.

No.

The purpose of the University of San Francisco Committee on Children and Youth (CCY), established in the spring of 2002, is to educate faculty, staff, students, and the surrounding community about issues that are important to children and adolescents locally and globally.

Specifically:

- (a) each year, the CCY will identify, develop, and implement a minimum of one campus colloquium focused on an issue important to children and youth;
- (b) the CCY will sponsor development of courses which focus on children and youth and promote the inclusion of content regarding children and youth into existing courses; and,
- (c) the CCY will collaborate with faculty, staff, students, and community members on activities related to children and youth and will serve as a consulting and referral body regarding relevant issues.

The CCY is composed of an interdisciplinary group of faculty with representation across USF's schools and colleges, each of whom typically serves a three-year term.

Child and Youth Studies (CHYS) Minor - Program Goal:

To promote an interdisciplinary understanding of issues related to children and youth.

3. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.

Note: Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, gamson@usfca.edu). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

No.

PLO 1: Students will articulate and define major theories or concepts used in the study of children / youth.

PLO2: Students will recognize the complexity of sociocultural diversity among children / youth.

PLO3: Students will participate in hands-on interactions involving the physical, intellectual, social, and/or emotional dimensions of childhood / youth.

4. Which particular Program Learning Outcome(s) did you assess for the academic year 2017-2018?

PLO 1: Students will articulate and define major theories or concepts used in the study of children / youth.

II. METHODOLOGY

5. Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).

For example, “the department used questions that were inputted in the final examination pertaining directly to the <said PLO>. An independent group of faculty (not teaching the course) then evaluated the responses to the questions and gave the students a grade for responses to those questions.”

Important Note – WSCUC advises us to use “direct methods” which relate to a direct evaluation of a student work product. “Indirect methods” like exit interviews or student surveys can be used only as additional complements to a direct method.

For any program with fewer than 10 students: If you currently have fewer than 10 students in your program (rendering your statistical analysis biased due to too few data points), it is fine to describe

a multi-year data collection strategy here. It would be important to remember that every 3 years, we would expect you to have enough data to conduct a meaningful analysis.

Important: Please attach, at the end of this report, a copy of the rubric used for assessment.

A) Student samples from 4 courses were used to assess PLO1 assessment

SOC 338 – Sociology of Education

PSYC 369 – Child Maltreatment

KIN 300 – Motor Development

COMS 302 - Dark Side of Family and Interpersonal Communication

B) Convenience sampling was used to determine which course and coursework to assess. Specifically, we asked CCY and CHYS Minor Committee members to look for assignments / test question from their classes that could be used to assess PLO 1. Hence, 21 direct student examples from 4 courses that had been identified as meeting this PLO were assessed. The description of each assignment is explained for each course and student data below. Each course meets PLO1 at the following level:

SOC 338 – Sociology of Education: Developing (3), assessed 9 student’s short essays

- Assignment description: Response Paper #1 - Purposes of Schooling: Sorting and the Hidden Curriculum
Q4: Respond to ONE of the following prompts (A or B). Make sure to indicate the letter and question for your response.
 - o A. According to Durkheim ([1925]2011), what is the purpose of discipline in schools? Would Crow Dog & Erodes ([1990]2011) agree with Durkheim? Explain.
 - o B. According to Bowles & Gintis ([1976]2011), what broader social change is the prerequisite for true educational reform? Would Jacobs (2003) agree? Explain.Q5: Scholars reference the importance of socialization through the “hidden curriculum.” a) Drawing on Gracey (1967) and/or Rist (1977), what is the “hidden curriculum”? b) How does the “hidden curriculum” affect individual law students and the legal profession, more generally (Granfield [1991]2011)?

PSYC 369 – Child Maltreatment: Mastery (5), assessed 10 student’s exams, 1 question from the exam

- Question description: Students were asked the following question: Identify two theories used to explain child maltreatment (e.g., ecological, intergenerational, social learning theory, correlation data). Define, explain, and provide an example of each, using literature from class. Discuss your understanding – again relying on course materials – and your opinion of whether or not these are credible explanations.

KIN 300 – Motor Development: Introductory (1), assessed 1 student’s answers from multiple questions on 2 exams

- Question description:

Exam 1: Write concise but complete answers to each item in the space provided.

- Define growth and its underlying processes.
- Define maturation, the types we assess, and how we might assess each type.
- List the three stages or periods of prenatal development, and identify the time periods and major events associated with each stage.
- Is regular physical activity essential to support normal growth and maturation? Briefly explain your answer.

Exam 2: Write concise but complete answers to each item in the space provided.

- Pick a locomotor or object manipulation skill with which you are familiar, describe immature and mature patterns, and discuss how you might improve the child’s competence in that skill.
- Explain what developmental skills involve learning to absorb force, and how would you help a child improve in his/her ability?
- Explain the Pyramidal Model of Skill Development. Define and explain all relevant terms, or give an example. How would this model represent the concept of readiness for sport in children?

COMS 302 - Dark Side of Family and Interpersonal Communication: Developing (3), assessed 1 student’s final paper

- Assignment description: For the final term paper, you will compose a well-written comprehensive review of research studies published on a particular communication topic of your choice. Based on your synthesis of these studies, you will make an argument for a new study that will test and explore a set of research questions or hypotheses that you will propose at the end of your literature review. To extend your literature review, you will develop a methods and data analysis section that details the procedures you would employ to explore the research questions or hypotheses you offered and analyze your data. * If you are a Child and Youth Studies Minor taking this course for Minor credit, you must propose a study involving youth aged 0 – 18.

C) Exemplars from 21 students (over 25% of students in the minor) were analyzed. Note: As of September 17, 2018, there were 83 CHYS minors.

D) To assess, we refined a previous PLO 1 assessment rubric (see attached). This is our final rubric for PLO 1.

E) Each assessment item was analyzed by the CHYS PLO 1 Assessment Sub-Committee (all FT faculty members who instruct at least one course in the minor).

Dr. Allison Thorson, Department of Communication Studies, Chair Committee on Children and Youth, Chair CHYS Minor, Chair of CHYS Assessment Committee

Dr. Saralyn Ruff, Department of Psychology, Committee on Children and Youth Member, CHYS Minor Committee Member, CHYS Assessment Committee Member

Dr. Eve-Anne Doohan, Chair of Department of Communication Studies, Committee on Children and Youth Member, CHYS Minor Committee Member, CHYS Assessment Committee Member

III. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

6. What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

This section is for you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:

A) Assessment Results:

SOC 338 Paper 1, Questions 4 & 5 (Expectation for class = 3, Developing)

Assessment Item #	Assignment Name	Rating 1: Dr. Doohan	Rating 2: Dr. Ruff	Rating 3: Dr. Thorson	Mode
1	Paper 1, Questions 4 & 5 (S1)	5	5	5	5
2	Paper 1, Questions 4 & 5 (S2)	5	5	5	5
3	Paper 1, Questions 4 & 5 (S4)	4	4	5	4
4	Paper 1, Questions 4 & 5 (S5)	5	4	4	4
5	Paper 1, Questions 4 & 5 (S6)	5	5	5	5
6	Paper 1, Questions 4 & 5 (S7)	5	5	5	5
7	Paper 1, Questions 4 & 5 (S8)	4	5	5	5
8	Paper 1, Questions 4 & 5 (S9)	5	5	5	5

9	Paper 1, Questions 4 & 5 (S10)	5	5	5	5
---	--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---

PSYC 369 Exam, Question 3 (Expectation for class = 5, Mastery)

Student	Assignment	Rating 1: Dr. Doohan	Rating 2: Dr. Ruff	Rating 3: Dr. Thorson	Mode
10	Exam Q3, student S-Y	5	5	5	5
11	Exam Q3, student R-R	4	4	4	4
12	Exam Q3, student C-F	3	4	4	4
13	Exam Q3, student K-E	4	4	5	4
14	Exam Q3, student Y-B	5	4	4	4
15	Exam Q3, student J-A	5	5	5	5
16	Exam Q3, student	5	5	5	5
17	Exam Q3, student A-Z	5	4	5	5
18	Exam Q3, student C-M	4	3	4	4
19	Exam Q3, student S-S	3	4	4	4

KIN 300, Exam 1, Questions 28, 29, 36, 39 & Exam 2, Questions 42, 45, 46 (Expectation for class = 1, Introductory)

Student	Assignment	Rating 1: Dr. Doohan	Rating 2: Dr. Ruff	Rating 3: Dr. Thorson	Mode
20	Exam 1 / Exam 2	4	5	5	5

COMS 302, Student final paper (Expectation for class = 3, Developing)

Student	Assignment	Rating 1: Dr. Doohan	Rating 2: Dr. Ruff	Rating 3: Dr. Thorson	Mode
21	Paper	5	5	5	5

****Cronbach's alpha for PLO 1 rubric (α)= .789.**

a. how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to,

Using the mode for each rating, assessment of student work (direct data) found that student work met or exceeded the PLO that was intended to be met over 71% of the time.

11 (> **52%** of students' work) of the 21 items assessed **exceeded expectations**

4 (> **19%** of students' work) of the 21 items assessed **met expectations**

6 (28% of students' work) of the 21 items assessed were below expectations

Note: First, only 4 of the direct assessment items was not given a rating of 5 among the 3 raters. Second, these items were only marginally below what was expected, rated between 3 and 5 when the expectation was a 5. Last, among the data that did not meet expectations, these results were based on assessing one exam question from an entire semester-long class. In order to determine whether this course meets PLO at the expected, Mastery level, more data from this class should be assessed.

b. any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles, and

Last year, when 7 direct student samples from one class were analyzed, we found that 72% of the student data met or exceeded expectations (i.e., 1 paper (14%) met expectations, 5 papers (57%) exceeded expectations). Unexpectedly, these findings are almost EXACTLY the same as what we found this year when analyzing 21 direct student samples from 4 classes (i.e., 15 (72%) examples of student work either exceeded or met expectations). Thus, our findings from this year's assessment are consistent with our previous report, despite having updated our assessment rubric.

These results indicate that we should retain these classes (i.e., those analyzed) for the minor.

Students are learning what is expected in these courses based on our assessment.

c. the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used.

To address this, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:

Level	Percentage of Students
Exceeded or met outcome at the level intended	72% (>52% exceeded expectations, >19% met expectations)

Complete Mastery of the outcome (even if Mastery was not intended)	61%
Did not master the outcome at the level intended	* 28%

* Note: Among the data that did not meet expectations, these results were based on assessing one exam question from an entire semester-long class. In order to determine whether this course meets PLO at the expected, Mastery level, more data from this class should be assessed.

IV. CLOSING THE LOOP

7. **Based on your results, what changes/modifications are you planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require that any changes need to be implemented in the next academic year itself.**

In order to further assess the minor, data from additional courses which have not yet been assessed should be evaluated.

We will continually collect data from these and other courses which will show evidence of PLO 1 being mastered.

We will use more than one exam question to based our assessment of the PLO on in case that question does not accurately represent what was learned in the class as a whole.

- The committee will spend the following year developing a rubric for PLO 2. A committee has been formed to assess PLO 2 at the introductory, developing, and mastery level. Data from classes are being gathered.

8. **What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2016-2017, submitted in October 2017)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?**

The largest suggestion from the CHYS 2016 -2017 report was that we consider collecting indirect data from students to assess the minor. Thank you for the suggestion. Per WSCSC's recommendations which advise "us to use "direct methods" which relate to a direct evaluation of a student work product" (see p. 3 of this report), we did not collect indirect assessment data

at this time. Perhaps at a future date we could sent out a survey to students asking them the extent to which they mastered each PLO.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)