

## Gerontology Minor

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

#### 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).

Prior to Jan 1, 2019: Lisa Wagner; wagnerL@usfca.edu

From Jan 1, 2019 – Dec. 30, 2019: Alison Thorson, 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

#### Mission Statement:

The Minor in Gerontology provides undergraduate students with an interdisciplinary understanding of the many aspects of the aging process and gives them the knowledge to pursue a career in the growing field of gerontology. Students are provided opportunities to experience the connection between learning about aging and working with older adults in the community. The Gerontology Minor promotes social justice for people of all ages and inspiration to improve the lives of older adults.

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.

No

**Program Learning Outcomes:**

1. Students will be able to describe biological, social, or psychological aspects of the aging process.
2. Students will be able to articulate the importance of engagement in social justice for people of all ages.

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

**PLO1:**

1. Students will be able to describe biological, social, or psychological aspects of the aging process.

**II. METHODOLOGY**

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

We assessed PLO1 in the two social science required courses in the minor: Psyc 339 Adulthood and Aging (1 section F17, 1 section S18) and Kin 335 Physical Activity and Aging (F17).

We used summative papers from each course: Psyc 339 F17 interview paper, Psyc 339 S18 term paper, KIN 335 response paper.

We determined who were the gerontology minors in each course and asked the instructors to share the papers from those students: Psyc 339 F17 (n=3), Psyc 339 S18 (n=6), Kin 335 (n=5) for a total of 14. We developed a rubric to assess the PLO. Three committee members (all full-time faculty members, one who taught one of the courses, two who taught neither of the courses) each rated 1 paper from each section (3 papers total) to calibrate ratings and to examine effectiveness of the rubric. The faculty members discussed ratings and determined the rubric to be an effective rating tool. The rest of the papers were randomly assigned to the three committee members and rated according to the rubric. The only exception was that the faculty member who taught one of the sections did not rate any additional papers from her section.

**Rubric used to assess PLO 1:**

	<b>Mastery (3)</b>	<b>Developing (2)</b>	<b>Introductory (1)</b>	<b>Poor (0)</b>
<b>Ability to describe biological, social, or psychological aspects of the aging process</b>	Identifies and explains 2 or more biological, social, or psychological aspects of the aging process.	Identifies and explains at least one biological, social, or psychological aspect of the aging process	Identifies a biological, social, or psychological aspect of the aging process with no elaboration.	No mention of biological, social, or psychological aspects of the aging process.

--	--	--	--	--

An earlier evaluation of the Gerontology program learning outcomes (PLOs) had determined that students in both Psyc 339 and Kin 335 should demonstrate mastery of PLO1 in these required courses, thus ratings of 3 would indicate mastery.

### III. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

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

Overall average rating of describing aspects of the aging process (PLO1) was 2.79 (*SD* = .43).

Another way to examine these data are in percentages:

Level	Percentage of Students
Mastery of the outcome	78%
Developing	22%
Introductory	0%
Poor	0%

Results were presented to the Interdisciplinary Committee on Aging and we determined that mastery of the ability to describe biological, social, or psychological aspects of the aging process is being satisfactorily met in these two courses with an average rating of 2.79 and 78% of student products achieving mastery ratings.

We also examined the ratings by course and average rating in each class were 3 (*SD* = 0) for Psyc 339 F17, 3 (*SD* = 0) for Psyc 339 S18, and 2.4 (*SD* = .55) for Kin 335 and noted that ratings of student outcomes were lower in the Kin 335 class.

Two alternative explanations were discussed. First is the possibility that a response paper is not the best student product to use to assess PLO1 in that course. Raters noted that students mentioned aspects of aging, but their papers focused on their response to the activity (related to the paper) rather than the aging content of the course. Given that the product being assessed in Kin 335 was a response paper, perhaps a different student product from the course would be better to use to assess PLO1. Second, there is also the possibility that PLO1 is not being delivered at the mastery level in this course and perhaps our PLOxCurriculum map incorrectly labeled it at the mastery level.

### 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.

We determined that in AY18-19, a different student product should be selected from Kin 335 and PLO1 reassessed. Discussions with faculty who teach that course to determine whether mastery of PLO1 is an appropriate expectation will also occur.

AY2018-2019 Assessment Plan:

In prior assessments, we have created rubrics to evaluate our two PLOs and we have used them to evaluate two of our required courses. For AY18-19, we will use both rubrics to begin the evaluation of our elective courses. Some of those courses may not currently enroll any gerontology minors, in which case we will gather products from the class to determine the appropriateness of the course within the minor.

We will evaluate: Comm Studies 368, Dance 360, HS 301 and Phil 240

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?

Feedback from FDCD was much appreciated as it was very helpful to know that we were heading in the correct direction. We learned in January 2018 and this was confirmed when we received the FDCD feedback on our report in May 2018, that we should have only assessed products from *minors* in the program (not all students in the class). In AY16-17 assessment we randomly selected papers from all students in two of the three required courses in the minor instead of only evaluating Gerontology minor students in the class. We corrected this mistake for our AY17-18 evaluation and thus data reported here come only from gerontology minors. Although we have more than 10 students enrolled in the minor (ranges from 30-40), at any given time relatively few are enrolled in any gerontology course, let alone one that we are assessing in a given year. This means that Gerontology assessments will be based on relatively small sample sizes.

## ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

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

Rubric used to assess PLO 1:

	<b>Mastery (3)</b>	<b>Developing (2)</b>	<b>Introductory (1)</b>	<b>Poor (0)</b>
--	--------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	-----------------

<b>Ability to describe biological, social, or psychological aspects of the aging process</b>	Identifies and explains 2 or more biological, social, or psychological aspects of the aging process.	Identifies and explains at least one biological, social, or psychological aspect of the aging process	Identifies a biological, social, or psychological aspect of the aging process with no elaboration.	No mention of biological, social, or psychological aspects of the aging process.
--	--	---	--	--