

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

ASSESSMENT REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR 2018 – 2019
REPORT DUE DATE: 11/01/2019

Some useful contacts:

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – adamati@usfca.edu
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – lendvay@usfca.edu
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – meritt@usfca.edu
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – mrjonas@usfca.edu
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – schakraborty2@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

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).

Submitted by Dr. Allison Thorson, Program Director & Faculty Assessment Coordinator:
Interdisciplinary Minor in Gerontology (GERO)

Please send feedback to athorson@usfca.edu

2. Please indicate if you are submitting report for (a) a Major, (b) a Minor, (c) a Major and Minor aggregated report (in which case, each should be explained in a separate paragraph as in this template), (d) a Graduate or (e) a Certificate Program

Undergraduate Minor
Interdisciplinary Minor in Gerontology (GERO)

3. Please note that a Curricular Map should accompany every assessment report. Have there been any revisions to the Curricular Map?

Yes - the structure of the curriculum was updated. The courses that are part of the GERO minor have not changed. Still, a new Curricular Map will accompany this report.

II. MISSION STATEMENT & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? 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 programs

- **Mission Statement (Minor):**

No changes.

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.

2. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? 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: It is expected that PLOs will vary in level of mastery between different programs in the same discipline (e. g., a major and minor in the same subject area). 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.

- **PLOs (Minor):**

No changes.

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

PLO 2: Students will be able to articulate the importance of engagement in social justice for people of all ages.

3. State the particular program learning outcome(s) you assessed for the academic year 2018-2019.

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

What rubric did you use?

	Mastery (3)	Developing (2)	Introductory (1)	Poor (0)
Ability to describe biological, social, or psychological aspects of the aging process	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.

- **PLO(s) being assessed (Minor):**

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

III. METHODOLOGY

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

- **Methodology used (Minor):**

A) Student samples from 2 courses were used to assess PLO1.

COMS 368– Communication and Aging

PHIL 240 Ethics (Biomedical Issues section only)

B) To gather assessment samples, we asked GERO Minor Committee members to look for assignments / test question from their classes that could be used to assess PLO 1. We also

directly reached out to a professor who has taught PHIL 240 (Biomedical Ethics section) for direct student samples.

To this end, 17 direct student samples from 2 courses that had been identified as meeting this PLO were assessed. None of these samples, however, were from declared GERO minors. Rather, all direct student samples were from non-GERO minors in each of these courses.

Thus, the courses were assessed in an attempt to ensure that aging material was being addressed -no matter whether or not students minored in Gerontology.

The description of each assignment is explained for each course and student data below. Each course meets PLO1 at the following level:

COMS 368– Communication and Aging: Expected to meet PLO 1 at Rubric Level 2/ Developing. To initially test our rubric, we examined 1 short-answer exam question from 2 exams.

- Question description: Exam 1 - Briefly (in 1-2 sentences maximum) explain each approach to studying aging (2 items): (a) biological; (b) sociological, (c) psychological, and; (d) communication.

PHIL 240 Ethics (Biomedical Issues section only): Expected to meet PLO 1 at Rubric Level 1/Introductory. To initially test our rubric, we examined 3 short essays from 2 students' papers (6 items). One essay was an "article review". One essay was a "bioethics in the news executive summary". The last essay was a "final paper".

C) Each assessment item was analyzed by the GERO PLO 1 Assessment Sub-Committee.

Dr. Allison Thorson, Department of Communication Studies, Chair Interdisciplinary Committee on Aging, Chair GERO Minor, Chair of GERO Assessment Committee

Dr. Marisa Knight, Department of Psychology, Interdisciplinary Committee on Aging Member, GERO Minor Committee Member, GERO Assessment Committee Member

Dr. Erin Grinshteyn, School of Nursing and Health Professions, Interdisciplinary Committee on Aging Member, GERO Minor Committee Member, GERO Assessment Committee Member

E) After assessing the first eight assignments (2 items from COMS 368 and 6 items from PHIL 240; 4 student samples) and establishing reliability amongst committee members, the assessment committee continued evaluating an additional 7 student samples from COMS 368 and 6 student samples from PHIL 240.

C) In total, examples from 17 non-GERO minor students were analyzed. (Note: As of October 14, 2019, there were 45 declared GERO minors.)

IV. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

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

A) Assessment Results:

Assessment Sample	Rating 1: Dr. Thorson	Rating 2: Dr. Knight	Rating 3: Dr. Grinshteyn	Mode
COMS 368_Fall 2018_Exam 1 question				
*Participant 1	3	3	3	3
*Participant 2	2	2	1	2
Participant 3	3	3	2	3
Participant 4	3	3	3	3
Participant 5	3	3	3	3
Participant 6	3	3	3	3
Participant 7	3	2	3	3
Participant 8	3	2	3	3
Participant 9	2	2	2	2
PHIL 240 - BIO Issues Ethics _essays				
*1 Copy of BIO Issues Ethics	0	0	0	0
*2 Copy of BIO Issues Ethics	0	0	0	0
3 Copy of BIO Issues Ethics	0	0	0	0
4 Copy of BIO Issues Ethics	0	0	0	0
5 Copy of BIO Issues Ethics	0	0	0	0
6 Copy of BIO Issues Ethics	0	0	0	0
7 Copy of BIO Issues Ethics	0	0	0	0
8 Copy of BIO Issues Ethics	0	0	0	0

* = samples evaluated as part of initial assessment

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

Combined, 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 41% of the time.

For COMS 368, non-GERO minors' work met or exceeded the PLO over 77% of the time.

For PHIL 240 (Biomedical Ethics), non-GERO minors' work met or exceeded the PLO 0% of the time.

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

Compared to previous findings, our results differ from what was found in previous reports. Specifically, two years ago we found that 72% of the student data met or exceeded expectations. Last year we also found that 78% of the examples of student work either exceeded or met expectations.

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

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

Results (Minor):

	Percentage of Students
Exceeded or met outcome at the level intended	41%
Below expectations	59%

We feel that many student samples did not meet or exceed expectations of PLO 1 because the student work came from non-GERO minors. However, this measure obscures some important details. Specifically, non-GERO minors taking COMS 368 were able to describe biological, social, or psychological aspects of the aging process most of the time. However, the topics that non-GERO minors taking PHIL 240 (Biomedical Ethics) chose for their “article review”, “bioethics in the news executive summary”, or “final paper” were likely more in alignment with their career path, which was not in Gerontology. Thus, their topics did not relate to aging. While the COMS 368 samples were more in line with previous trends, the PHIL 240 samples skewed the overall percentage of meets/exceeds expectations since none of these samples related to aging.

A discussion of how we will address this moving forward is described in section V.

V. CLOSING THE LOOP: ACTION PLAN BASED ON ASSESSMENT RESULTS

1. Based on your analysis in Section 4, what are the next steps that you are 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 any changes to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

- **Closing the Loop (Minor):**

Our findings this year indicate that we should continue to assess GERO classes using samples from GERO minors (not the general student population). They also suggest that, when a GERO minor is enrolled in a course that counts for their GERO minor, we should alert the Professor teaching this class, to ensure that aging related issues are addressed in those assignments in which students are given a choice as to what topic they discuss/address/review.

Moving forward, data from additional courses that have not yet been assessed should be evaluated (possibly Dance 360 or HS 301)

2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2017-2018, submitted in October 2018)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in the more recent assessment discussed in this report?

- **Suggestions (Minor):**

After our last assessment report, we were informed that we have “utilized the assessment process exactly as intended and this has resulted in considered faculty discussions about how to improve your program.”

We will continue moving forward – assessing only GERO minor student samples.

VI. BIG PICTURE

What have you learned about your program from successive rounds of assessment? Is a picture of the whole program starting to emerge? For example, what areas of strength have emerged? What opportunities of improvement have you identified?

- **Big Picture (Minor):**

What we have learned is that the courses we are offering/requiring students to take are meeting our mission and PLOs most of the time – especially among GERO minors taking these courses. Non-GERO minors taking courses that are part of this minor may not be as interested in GERO issues, and therefore may be choosing to focus on non-aging related topics for their “choice” assignments. All in all, this exercise has reinforced an earlier suggestion that we should continue to assess GERO classes using samples from only GERO minors (not the general student population).

VII. Feedback to your Assessment Team

What suggestions do you have for your assessment team (the Faculty Directors of Curriculum Development and the Associate Dean for Academic Effectiveness)? What can we do to improve the process?

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

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